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In this study, social-psychological variables were explored in the etiology of depression in women. Depression was examined as a function of undesirable life events, occupational and marital roles, and four vulnerability variables: (a) high relational and low direct achieving style, (b) dominance of partner, (c) powerlessness, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism.

The purpose of the study was to examine whether women in varying occupational and marital status groups would differ in degree of depression, proposed vulnerability variables, and selected background variables. The relationship of vulnerability and background variables to depression was explored. Depression was predicted as a function of these variables.

It was hypothesized that vulnerability variables and depression would be distributed differently among occupational groups of professionals, clerical/sales workers, homemakers, and semi/unskilled workers, and among marital status groups of married, never-married, and divorced/separated women. Rank-ordered differences were hypothesized for the former.

A stratified random sample of full-time employed women and full-time homemakers, age 25-50, was drawn from Kalamazoo County, Michigan. Of 240 contacted volunteering women, 89.6% responded: 58 professionals,
55 clerical/sales workers, 54 homemakers, and 48 semi/unskilled workers. The mailed questionnaire contained the PERI Life Events Scale, CES-Depression Scale, Achieving Styles Inventory, Dominance-Submission Scale, Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, FEM-Scale, and background items. Ordered means analyses of variance, analyses of variance and covariance, correlations, and multiple regression analyses were employed.

Findings revealed no significant differences among occupational groups in experienced undesirable life events. Divorced/separated women reported higher undesirable life events than married and never-married women. Professionals were less depressed than clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers. Homemakers reported lowest direct and total achieving styles; professionals the highest. Professionals perceived their partners as less dominant than did clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers. Semi/unskilled workers reported lowest mastery; professionals the highest. Positive attitudes toward feminism ranged from low to high: semi/unskilled workers < homemakers < clerical/sales workers < professionals. Divorced/separated women were more depressed than married and never-married women. Marital status groups did not differ significantly in achieving styles, dominance, mastery, and attitudes toward feminism.

Controlling for undesirable life events, professionals were least depressed. Divorced/separated semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers were most depressed. Divorced/separated professionals were slightly less depressed, though not significantly, than other married and never-married occupational groups. Professionals reported high
levels of protective variables: power-direct achieving style, mastery, positive attitudes toward feminism, and confiding relationships with partners.

Depression was positively related to viewing self and partner as dominant, needing others for achievement, lacking a confiding relationship, and feeling dissatisfied with life. Depression was inversely related to mastery, occupational prestige, educational level, and family income. Black women were more depressed than other minority and white women. The combination of occupational status, vulnerability variables, and background variables accounted for 60.1% of the variance on depression. Strongest predictors were life dissatisfaction (29.4%), attitudinal mastery (12.4%), global mastery (9.2%), lack of confiding relationship (10.7%), and reliant-relational achieving style (5.7%).

It was concluded that occupational levels need to be differentiated when examining the relation of women's employment and depression. The combination of work which fosters mastery, confiding relationship, neither perceiving self nor partner as dominant, and positive attitudes toward feminism appear to be protective against depression. Gaining access to higher level occupations may protect against hard economic consequences of divorce and may decrease women's epidemiological depression. Vulnerability versus protective variables to depression in women are discussed. Theoretical and practical implications are proposed, and recommendations for further research are offered.
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The increased prevalence of depression, in general and especially in women under age 35, is a mental health problem of epidemic proportions. Empirical data on the relationships between sex roles and mental health challenge traditional assumptions about what constitutes desirable adult psychological development in women. However, the research evidence on female development is scanty, contradictory, and lacks integration. Studies are needed which explore variables related to increased vulnerability to depression in women. Clearly, individuals differ in the resources with which they can respond to various life events and stressors. The development of effective psychoeducational interventions to prevent high vulnerabilities to depression in women requires the identification of those variables which underlie these vulnerabilities. This study examined the potential vulnerability variables of relational achieving style, direct achieving style, powerlessness, submissiveness, and negative attitudes toward feminism. Data were sought to clarify how different occupational and marital role-combinations in women may be related to these vulnerability variables and to depression.
Analysis of Related Literature

Women comprise over 50% of the human race. In empirical psychology, however, women as subjects have been a neglected minority because they have been considered unimportant and inconsequential (Frieze, Parsons, Johnson, Ruble, & Zellman, 1978); that men are viewed as more important than women has been reflected in the greater attention to men as subjects in psychological research. Frequent methodological errors—such as generalizing results from male subjects to female subjects, male-biased tasks, and artificial dichotomies such as masculinity and femininity—have led to biases in the study of women (Unger, 1979). These common errors have resulted in scanty, contradictory, and inconclusive data on female development. The need for extensive studies about the psychology of women as a basis for better understanding contemporary women's lives and roles has been emphasized in recent literature.

In the United States only one generation ago, most women's role-expectations were clearly defined and role-combinations for women were limited. However, recent societal changes—which are reflected in increased participation of women in the labor market, effective contraception, the women's liberation movement, and alternative life patterns—have raised questions about the appropriateness of the traditional socialization of women (Bernard, 1973, 1976; Giele, 1979; Miller, 1976). Even though the Equal Rights Amendment still has not been ratified, various legal changes and the public debates surrounding equal rights issues and affirmative action regulation have reduced
occupational, domestic, and financial discrimination against women and have increased opportunities for women to individualize their life patterns (Frieze et al., 1978). Thus, women are faced with new sets of complex decisions about various combinations of adult roles in work, marriage, and parenthood. The increase in role choices has created confusion, conflict, new responsibilities, and new growth opportunities for women.

Research on female socialization has indicated that girls often are not prepared to make independent choices about role-combinations in adulthood (Hoffman, 1975). Girls grow up in a protective environment which fosters dependency, passivity, and a delayed and often incomplete separation from the mother. Daughters, more so than sons, continue their identification with the mother and thus continue affiliative bonds and dependencies well into adulthood. Block, Von der Lippe, and Block (1973) pointed out that the socialization process for girls typically encourages nurturant, submissive, and conservative aspects of the female role, whereas assertiveness, achievement-orientation, and independence are explicitly discouraged. Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1978) claimed that women frequently learn to achieve through their husbands' and children's accomplishments rather than through their own. They concentrate so much on others' needs and feelings that they often do not identify and articulate their own. This "vicarious achievement ethic" (Lipman-Blumen, 1972) tends to lead women to assume traditional role-combinations in their lives. Miller (1976) illustrated women's beliefs that they should make others successful and happy and women's tendencies to blame
themselves when this goal proves unattainable. Because of their focus on others, women typically feel more responsible in interpersonal rather than impersonal situations (Alper, 1978). As suggested by Arieti (1979), women learn to excessively rely on others for acceptance, help, and support, which then leads to increased psychological vulnerability to loss and to higher incidence of depression.

Women who explore new role-combinations often meet with social criticism. Women who try to integrate work and family commitments frequently experience the stress of too many responsibilities. Women who are homemakers tend to apologize for "being just a housewife."

Mental health clinicians seem confused about what constitutes mental health in women. Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosencrantz (1972) showed that clinicians' descriptions of a "healthy male" matched the descriptions of a "healthy adult," while descriptions of a "healthy female" were also used to describe undesirable deviant characteristics in adults.

The American Psychological Association Task Force on Sex Bias and Sex Role Stereotyping in Psychotherapeutic Practice (1975) identified four categories of sexism in therapist behaviors: (a) fostering traditional sex roles, (b) bias in expectations and devaluation of women, (c) sexist use of psychoanalytic concepts, and (d) responding to women as sex objects, including seduction of female clients. From these categories, the same task force developed Guidelines for Therapy With Women (1978). These guidelines ask psychologists to recognize sex-discriminatory practices in society, to encourage and
facilitate client examination of options in dealing with sex discriminatory practices, and to "avoid establishing the source of personal problems within the client when they are more properly attributable to situational or cultural factors" (p. 1123). The symptoms of depression include low self-esteem, dependency, and passivity and may actually be encouraged in women by Western society. Depression is the most frequent psychological problem in women and needs to be understood from the cultural perspective of female socialization and adult female development—not only from an intrapsychic perspective.

Secunda (1973, p. 3; cited in Becker, 1977, p. 7) pointed out that "depression now rivals schizophrenia as the nation's number one mental health problem." Weissman and Klerman (1977) stated that more than twice as many women are depressed than men, and Arieti (1979) quoted the frequency of depression in women as five times greater than that of men. Various theories have been developed to explain the hereditary, neurophysiological, biochemical, psychodynamic, cognitive, and operant components of depression (for summaries of these, see Akiskal & McKinney, 1975; Beck, 1967; Becker, 1977).

Most theories focus on the individual as the "source" of depressive pathology. Explanations of depression typically are provided by psychiatrists and psychologists who tend to formulate problems from a clinical intrapsychic perspective. Weissman (Note 1) observed that attempts at remediation of depression traditionally consist of medication and individual therapy seeking modification of psychological variables in the client. Until recently, social-psychological models of depression have been lacking (Brown & Harris, 1978).
New research in the psychology and sociology of sex-roles has explored possible relationships of adult roles and depression. Weissman and Klerman (1977) examined etiological variables in the increasing rate of depression among women and concluded that "elements of the traditional female role may contribute to depression" (p. 109). Radloff and Monroe (1978) pointed to the frequency of depression in married women, and the frequency of depression in nonmarried men, suggesting that the role of marriage is positively related to depression in women, but inversely related to depression in men. Arieti (1979) pointed out that, in our patriarchal society, submissiveness to a "male-dominant-other" appears natural to women, and that the dependencies of women in economic, social, and psychological areas increase their vulnerabilities to depression. Miller (1976) illustrated how women are expected to serve others' needs and how much more difficult it is for them as compared to men to become psychologically independent adults. Birnbaum (1975) found that married professional women have significantly higher self-esteem than a comparable group of married homemakers, thereby suggesting that professionalism enhances the women's general sense of self-worth.

Other researchers reported conflicting evidence. Markus (Note 2) suggested that work per se does not lead directly to well-being of women but that it is necessary to consider women's views of self and their levels of career-orientation. She reported that employment was positively related to well-being only in women who were career-oriented, but not related to well-being in women who were employed but not career-oriented. Bardwick (1979) claimed that traditional
women in the roles of wife and mother were highest in their self-esteem and most satisfied, whereas women who voluntarily had no children or one child described themselves as less fulfilled or satisfied than women with two or more children.

Adult development in the past has been neglected as an area of study, theoretically as well as empirically. Levinson, Darrow, Klein, Levinson, and McKee (1978) offered the first in-depth study of the adult life-cycle in men and proposed a theory of adult male development. Steward (1977) examined the feasibility of Levinson and associates' theory for the adult life cycle in women. Steward reported greater variability of developmental sequences in women and more difficulties and complexities in the formation of adult role patterns. She focused her study on the "age-thirty-transition" (Levinson et al., 1978): the transitional stage between the preliminary choices of the twenties and the needs for more stability and integration in the thirties. She found the onset of the "age-thirty-transition" to be characterized by feelings of dissatisfaction with the past life pattern and by a reappraisal of one's roles and decisions. Thus, the period between ages 30 and 35 may well be a time in women's development when role conflicts become acute. The difficulties of this transitory phase may be reflected in the increased frequency of depression in women of this age group; in studies in the Yale Depression Unit, Weissman (cited in Scarf, 1979) observed that depression was no longer most frequent in women in their forties; instead, the typical depressed person who came for treatment was a woman under the age of 35.
Theoretical Framework of the Study

In this study, the conceptualization of depression parallels the psychosocial model of depression (Brown & Harris, 1978) which consists of (a) provoking agents or loss events, (b) vulnerability factors, and (c) symptom-formation factors. Brown and Harris summarized their model of depression as follows:

The provoking agents influence when the depression occurs, the vulnerability factors whether these agents will have an effect, and the symptom-formation factors the severity and form of the depressive disorder itself. (pp. 270-271)

Provoking agents are loss events in reference to individuals, objects, roles, or ideas. Generally, an individual experiences a loss or disappointment when s/he becomes deprived of a source of value or reward. Vulnerability factors refer to "the force with which a stress impacts on the distress of an individual" (Kessler, 1979, p. 101). Vulnerability factors increase the likelihood that provoking agents—or loss events or stressors—will result in depression. Stressors refer generally to more recent losses and disappointments whereas vulnerability factors refer to long-term—static or dynamic—characteristics of the individual and of her/his environment. The distinction between stressors and vulnerability factors is relative in that a present stressor may become a future vulnerability factor; this lack of clarity in the theoretical model of depression has been recognized by Brown and Harris (1978). Brown and Harris found that the following factors contributed most significantly to vulnerability to depression: (a) loss of mother before age 11, (b) presence at home of three or more children under age 14,
(c) absence of a confiding relationship, especially with husband, and
(d) lack of a full- or part-time job.

In this study, the **provoking agents or stressors** were assessed
with the Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview (PERI) Life
Events Scale (Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978).
This scale requires subjects to mark, on a list of 102 life events,
those events which, for better or for worse, interrupted their usual
activities during a specified period of time; the time period to
which life events were referenced in this study consisted of the past
6 months (Dohrenwend, Note 3).

The weighted mean score of life changes was utilized to control
for differences in recent loss experiences of the subjects in this
study.

Eight **vulnerability variables** were considered. In addition to
the four vulnerability factors identified by Brown and Harris (1978),
the following potential vulnerability variables were examined:
(a) low mastery orientation—or powerlessness, (b) high relational
achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (c) submis-
sive relationship with dominant person, and (d) negative attitudes
toward feminism.

The **symptom-formation** factors in this study were defined as
degree of depression as measured by the Center for Epidemiological
Surveys Depression (CES-D) Scale (Radloff, 1977).

In addition to (a) provoking agents, (b) vulnerability variables,
and (c) symptom-formation factors, the subjects were asked to indi-
cate their career- or homemaker-orientation, the degree of their
social contact over the past 6 months, desired life changes, their
general life-satisfaction, and other selected background variables.
The subjects' occupational and marital statuses served as the major
classification variables.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to describe relationships among
different occupational and marital statuses, achieving styles,
mastery/powerlessness-orientation, perceived dominance of self and of partner, attitudes toward feminism, and depression in women.

Specifically, the goals of the study were:

1. To measure whether women of differing occupational and mar­
tal status groups will also differ on undesirable life events experi­enced over the past 6 months.

2. To measure whether women in differing occupational and mar­
tal status groups will also differ in degree of depression.

3. To measure whether women in differing occupational and mar­
tal status groups will also differ on the four potential vulnerabil­
ity variables: (a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (b) powerlessness-orientation, (c) submissive relationship with dominant person, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism.

4. To measure the degree of association of the four potential vulnerability variables and depression.

5. To measure the associations of the four potential vulnerabil­
ity variables among each other.
6. To identify a set of variables, from the eight vulnerability factors and selected background variables, which most efficiently predicts degree of depression.

The core of the study was to determine whether the four variables are in fact vulnerability factors in depression in women, and whether these variables are additionally related to certain role-combinations of occupational-by-marital status. Also, it was examined whether the opposite direction of these potential vulnerability variables served as protective variables to depression in women. These four—vulnerability versus protective—variables are:

1. **Relational** versus **direct** achieving style.
2. **Powerlessness** versus **mastery-orientation**.
3. **Submissive** relationship with dominant person versus **egalitarian** relationship with egalitarian person.
4. **Negative** versus **positive** attitudes toward feminism.

Four occupational status groups were studied with respect to differences on the four vulnerability variables and on depression: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) semi/unskilled workers, and (d) homemakers. A sufficient number of subjects responded who were (a) never-married, (b) divorced/separated, or (c) married; the three marital status groups were studied with respect to differences between these groups on the four vulnerability variables and on depression. In addition, the combined effects of occupational and marital status on depression was examined.
Research Questions

1. Will the four occupational status groups and the three marital status groups differ in undesirable life events?

2. Will the four occupational status groups differ in depression?

3. Will the three marital status groups differ in depression?

4. Will depression vary as a function of occupational and marital status?

5. Will the four occupational status groups differ in (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism?

6. Will the three marital status groups differ in (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism?

7. Will the four potential vulnerability factors--(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (b) powerlessness orientation, (c) perceived dominance of partner, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism--be related to depression?

8. Will the four variables--(a) achieving style, (b) mastery orientation, (c) perceived dominance, and (d) attitudes toward feminism--be related with each other?

9. Will selected background variables and the Brown and Harris (1978) variables be related to depression?

10. Will the four vulnerability measures of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures, and selected background variables predict the degree of depression?
Significance of the Study

The potential significance of this study is its contribution to an understanding of possible relationships between role-combinations and depression in women. While there are studies which have related selected roles to depression in women, little research has focused on a variety of specific occupational and marital role-combinations.

Although attention has been given before to the potential relationship of the type of achievement-orientation and depression (Lewis, 1976; Miller, 1976), the present study generated empirical data to substantiate this assertion. Arieti (1979), on the basis of clinical data, suggested that dependency on a "dominant other" contributes to women's increased vulnerability to and experience of depression. This study was designed to empirically explore this suggested relationship. In addition, this study contributed to an understanding of the relationships among role-combinations of occupational-by-marital status, attitudes toward feminism, and depression.

If it can be shown that high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, powerlessness, submissive relationship with dominant person, and negative attitudes toward feminism all form a cluster which tends to occur more frequently in certain role-combinations rather than in others—and which in fact is related to depression in women—then progress will be made toward the development of a theoretical framework for further understanding women's roles and women's increased vulnerability to depression.
Furthermore, this study encourages other researchers to work toward descriptive and experimental integration of related factors in depressogenic versus healthy adult female development. For the practitioner, this study may suggest treatment goals different from those traditionally accepted as indicative of "optimal adjustment" in women. Because vulnerability factors of social and psychological origin in women were identified in this study, this study contributed to the development of preventive interventions for depression in women.

Limitations of the Study

The study population was limited to women between the ages of 25 and 50 who live in Kalamazoo County, Michigan. The target population consisted of those women whose names, addresses, and phone numbers were listed in both the city directory and in the telephone book of Kalamazoo, who could be contacted by phone, and who agreed to participate in this study during the initial phone contact. The final sample consisted of women who completed and mailed the questionnaire. Due to probable selection biases, results were generalized only to other populations of women similar to the final sample.

The results of the study consisted of degrees of association between variables, and no causal interpretations were made due to the nonexperimental nature of the study. In addition, this study was limited to the exploration of a selection of potential vulnerability variables of psychosocial origin. This selection was not intended to be comprehensive of the realm of psychosocial variables which may contribute to depression in women. In this study, psychosocial
variables were viewed as an important facet in the complex network of depressogenic variables in humans.

Overview of Chapters II and III

Chapter II consists of the Review of Selected Literature. It is divided into four major sections: (a) Undesirable Life Events and Occupational and Marital Status, (b) Depression in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status, (c) Vulnerability Variables in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status, and (d) Vulnerability and Other Variables Related to Depression in Women. The four sections serve as rationales for the research hypotheses listed in Chapter II, and for the operational and null hypotheses listed in Chapter III.

Chapter III is comprised of Design and Methodology. It includes (a) Population, Sampling Procedures, and Sample Description, (b) Classification Variables, (c) Dependent Variable and Measurement, (d) Control Variable and Its Measurement, (e) Predictor Variables and Their Measurement, (f) Data Collection, and (g) Operational and Null Hypotheses and Inferential Procedures.

Definition of Terms

Achievement: the degree of accomplishment or completion of a goal, attributable to the individual's efforts and/or skills.

Achievement motivation: the readiness of an individual to engage in a variety of goal-oriented behaviors based upon certain performance standards.
Achieving style: the characteristic way in which an individual approaches achieving situations, whether directly or through relationships with others.

Direct achieving style: the direct acting on the world and the direct confrontation of the achievement task, using one's personal efforts of mind and body to accomplish the goal.

Relational achieving style: the seeking of success or achievement through the medium of relationships by establishing, contributing to, acting through, depending on, or manipulating relationships to achieve one's goals.

Adult development: the continuous process of change due to learning and maturation in individuals from their legal age on to death.

Attitudes toward feminism: the degree of an individual's beliefs in equal personal, economic, and legal rights between the sexes.

Depression: disordered cognitive processes consisting of negative views of (a) self, (b) the world, and (c) the future. These negative cognitions lead to emotional, motivational, behavioral, and vegetative phenomena such as pessimism, sadness, apathy, increased dependency, sleep disturbance, and loss of appetite and libido. These phenomena have private consequences—the affirmation of the individual's negative views—and interpersonal and social consequences—distancing and isolation. Each of these consequences intensifies the other in a vicious cycle.

Feminism: the belief in equal legal, economic, and personal rights for both sexes.
Life cycle: the individual's progression through stages and transitions from birth to death as reflected in the sequence and combination of roles in and relationships to the individual's family, education, career, and community.

Life pattern: the distinctive nature and combination of an individual's roles and relationships.

Mastery: the feelings of success which are experienced as control over one's internal reactions and relevant external events, and whereby the success is attributed to one's own behaviors.

Internal or self-attribution: the extent to which an individual perceives his/her performance as resulting from his/her own efforts, skills, or abilities.

External attribution of performance: the extent to which an individual perceives her/his performance as resulting from external factors such as fate, other individuals, or environmental conditions.

Provoking agent: see Stressor.

Relationship: the verbal and nonverbal process of interaction between two or more individuals.

Type of relationship with significant person: the perceptions of the individual concerning her/himself and her/his partner in terms of degree of dominance versus submission.

Dominant relationship with submissive person: the individual's perceptions of him/herself as dominant in his/her relationship with his/her partner whom s/he perceives as submissive.
Egalitarian relationship with significant person: the individual's perceptions of her/himself as equal to her/his partner, seen as neither submissive nor dominant.

Submissive relationship with dominant person: the individual's perceptions of her/himself as submissive in her/his relationship with her/his partner whom s/he perceives as dominant.

Role: the set of behaviors and attitudes an individual is expected to demonstrate, associated with the individual's position in society.

Role-combination: the individual's relative degrees of commitment to various roles, reflected in the individual's attitudes and behaviors at a given point in time.

Sexism: the prejudice against one sex, or the belief in unequal legal, economic, and personal rights for both sexes.

Significant person: the person in an individual's life who is very important to the individual in her/his present life and with whom the individual has regular contact.

Stressor: objective major life events of undesirable quality which interrupt the usual activities of the individual.

Vulnerability factor: "the force with which a stress impacts on the distress of an individual" (Kessler, 1979, p. 101). Vulnerability factors increase the likelihood that stressors will result in depression.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter presents a review of research related to the hypotheses under study. Due to the vast amount of literature on depression, achievement orientation, occupational roles, and sex-role attitudes, no attempt was made to offer an exhaustive overview. Instead, in each of these sections, the reader is referred to the excellent summaries already available in these areas. The following format was used for each research hypothesis, or if appropriate, for combinations of research hypotheses: introduction and description of the major variables; review of studies which deal with the variables under study; if applicable, contradictions and remaining questions; and statement of the research hypothesis or a combination of research hypotheses.

The following areas were reviewed: (a) undesirable life events and distress in varying status groups, (b) depression in women of varying occupational and marital status, (c) vulnerability variables in women of varying occupational and marital status, and (d) vulnerability and other variables related to depression in women.

When there was a lack of research on certain variable combinations, studies generally related to the variables were reviewed. The sections on the vulnerability variables were more lengthy, since four
variables were examined separately in their relation to occupational and marital status in women: (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance-submission in relationship, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism. When reviewing the vulnerability variables, an attempt was made to relate these variables to the depressogenic socialization of women. A summary of the relationship between vulnerability variables and depression, and the interrelation of vulnerability variables follows. A review of other variables related to depression in women concludes Chapter II.

Undesirable Life Events and Distress in Varying Status Groups

Due to the lack of studies which focus specifically on differences of undesirable life events in women of varying occupational and marital status, the following areas were reviewed: (a) the impact of stress on distress; (b) status group differences in life events and in distress; (c) problem areas in the measurement of stress; (d) stress, vulnerability variables, and distress; and (e) overview of findings on relations between life stress, class and sex differences, vulnerability factors, and distress.

The Impact of Stress on Distress

Research over the last decade has shown that stress may be hazardous to people's physical and mental well-being (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974; Gunderson & Rahe, 1974). However, an understanding of what stress actually is, how it affects one's health, and what
variables might intervene, is still missing. Researchers differ in their definitions of stress in whether or not they view stress as objective events versus subjectively experienced events, or both; whether they view only negative life changes, or both positive and negative life changes as stress; and whether they consider controllable or uncontrollable events, or both, as stressful (Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974).

Most of the literature on stress is based on the assumption that stress impacts psychological and physiological distress (Kessler, 1979). Holmes and Masuda (1974) presented relevant research findings on how life-change, both positive and negative, enhances the likelihood of the occurrence of disease. Disease-occurrence was defined as change in health status which included psychiatric, medical, or surgical disorders. Life change was measured with the 43-item Schedule of Recent Experience. The magnitude of life change was found to be related to the onset of the illness, and correlated positively with the experienced seriousness of the illness.

Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend (1974) presented a collection of stress research in their book, Stressful Life Events: Their Nature and Effects. Various physical symptoms and illnesses were found to be related to stressful life changes. The effects of stress on mental health were summarized by Hudgens (1974):

Investigators have demonstrated a causal connection between stressful life events and subsequent worsening of conditions already underway, between life events and subsequent admission of [sic] psychiatric hospitals or clinics, and in a substantial minority of bereaved persons, between bereavement and depression of moderate degree for which psychiatric care was rarely sought. It does not
seem to me that investigators have yet convincingly demonstrated that life stress can cause madness in a person previously of sound mind, nor can it cause severe depression sustained for many months and attended by multiple disturbance of physical and mental function. (p. 120)

Makosky (in press) summarized some of the conclusions regarding the effects of stress on mental health:

By and large, negative events are more stressful than positive events (Paykel, 1974a); the same events are more stressful when they are recent than when they happened longer ago (Horowitz, Shaefer & Cooney, 1974); events in general tend to cluster in the three weeks just prior to the onset of schizophrenia or depression, but the clustering of moderately or markedly threatening events before the onset of depression extends over a period of at least 38 weeks (Brown, 1974); and, events with longterm implications of threat are more stressful than those without such implications (Brown, 1974). (p. 6)

For more extensive reviews of the effects of stress on health, the reader is referred to the works of Dohrenwend and Dohrenwend (1974), Gunderson and Rahe (1974), and to the critical review of stress and mental health in women by Makosky (in press).

Status Group Differences in Life Events and Distress

Most studies show some relation between stress and psychological symptoms. However, some confusion exists regarding the question of which groups differ in life events, and how life events are related to distress. Dohrenwend (1973a) examined relations between social class, sexual status, racial status, exposure to stressful life events, and psychological distress. Her sample consisted of 124 heads of families--women and men, single and married--from the general population of Washington Heights, Manhattan, New York. She reported that life change scores were positively related to psychological
symptom scores, and that life change scores were inversely related to
higher social class. Women reported higher life change scores than
did men, on both controllable and uncontrollable life events. This
finding was interpreted as indicative that women do not tend to
"create" stressful life events. Women also scored higher on the
Langner 22-item scale of psychiatric symptoms. Lower class members
reported relatively high life changes which produced a relatively
high level of distress. Especially the combination of lower class
with Black or Puerto Rican ethnic status was related to high levels
of life changes and reported psychological symptoms.

Using a sample from the general population, Markush and Favero
(1974) found, as did Dohrenwend (1973a), that high life change scores
were related to high depressed mood and psychophysiological symptom
scores. Also, women had higher depressed mood scores and higher
psychophysiological symptom scores than men. However, in contrast to
Dohrenwend's (1973a) results, no differences were found between men
and women in life change scores. Demographically comparable Blacks
and Whites also did not differ in life change scores. The strength
of association of life change scores and symptom scores varied
strongly across demographic subgroups. Thus, contrary to Dohrenwend's
(1973a) suggestion, stressful life events per se did not account for
the high rate of psychological symptoms in the lower class.

Paykel (1974b) compared a sample of 185 depressed patients with
a control sample matched on sex, age (in decades), marital status,
race, and social class. Onset of depression was defined symptomati-
cally, without reference to life events. A semi-structured interview
to measure life events was used after improvement to decrease distortion in reporting due to depression. Paykel (1974b) found that the depressed group reported three times as many life events as did the control group. Significant differences between the two groups were found for the variables of increased arguments with spouse, marital separation, changing to a new type of work or starting work, death of an immediate family member, serious personal physical illness, and substantial change in work conditions. When dividing the life changes by their value dimension into desirable versus undesirable life events, depressed subjects reported much more frequent undesirable life changes than did the control subjects. No significant differences were found between the samples in desirable life changes. Paykel (1974b) concluded that the occurrence of undesirable life changes and psychiatric disorders were related. Whether a disorder developed after exposure to undesirable life events, however, appeared to depend on interactions of life events with predisposing personal vulnerability factors.

Problem Areas in the Measurement of Stress

Measurement scales on stressful life events differ widely (Dohrenwend, 1974), leading to difficulties in interpreting the results of various studies. People's ratings on the magnitude of life events vary as a function of cultural background (Askenasy, Dohrenwend, & Dohrenwend, 1977). Askenasy and associates (1977) extended the 43-item Schedule of Recent Experience (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) to a 102-item life events scale and subdivided the items into desirable,
undesirable, and neutral life changes. In a systematic random New York City sample, stratified by social class, ethnic background, and sex, they found sharp differences on ratings of severity of life events between groups of varying educational and ethnic background.

Makosky (in press) pointed to several problem areas in the measurement of stress in women's lives. Most presently available stress scales, such as the Schedule of Recent Experience (Holmes & Rahe, 1967), ask the subjects to list life changes which they have experienced themselves. However, women often experience stress in their own lives which is caused by life events in their spouse's or friends' lives (Dohrenwend, Note 4; Makosky, in press), thus leading to an underestimate of the actual amount of stress in women's lives.

None of the stress scales include items concerning long-term societal changes such as the effects of the women's movement, which may have wide ranging impact on women's lives and their experiences of stress. In the development of mean rating scores, the instructions in the scales ask the subject to indicate how the "average person" would feel when experiencing various life events. Previous research (Broverman et al., 1972) has shown that the "average person" is equated with "man" and not with "woman" in most people's minds. In addition, some events, such as divorce or separation, or birth of a child, may be more stressful for women than for men, and mean adjustment scores of stress scales may thus be inaccurate for women. Makosky (in press) underscored the importance of exploring variables such as coping mechanisms and social support systems. Rather than focusing exclusively on the effects of life changes on psychological
well-being, she suggested the inclusion and quantification of stressful long-term life conditions, such as age, sex, marital status, race, work status, social class, parental status, residential location, minority status, and social isolation, which have been shown to be related to depression (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Langner & Michael, 1963, Radloff, 1975).

Brown (1974) also criticized the use of the Schedule of Recent Experiences (Holmes & Rahe, 1967) due to three possible sources of invalidity: (a) the subject may report more disturbing life events to make sense of the illness—direct contamination; (b) some personality traits, such as anxiety, may increase the report of life events—indirect contamination; and (c) the report of life events may be accurate, but other factors may lead to a higher likelihood of experiencing distress in response to life events—spuriousness. Brown, Ní Bhrolcháin, and Harris (1975) therefore developed a procedure to control the effects of personal meaning of life events. They studied the subjects' biographical contexts and life events and used "commonsense judgements of investigators" to estimate the severity of threatening life events for individuals. Thus, they attempted to reduce the sources of invalidity in the reporting of life events.

The purpose of Brown and associates' (1975) study was to examine whether women differ in life stress and depression as a function of their social status. Support was found for the etiological role of severe life events occurring the year before the first onset of depression as well as the role of long-term difficulties occurring at the same time. Working class women were found to be more vulnerable.
to depression than other women because they tended to experience more frequently events which contributed to psychiatric disorders. Four vulnerability variables were found: (a) loss of mother in childhood, (b) three or more children aged under 14 living at home, (c) lack of an intimate confiding relationship with husband, and (d) lack of a full-time or part-time job. Based on these four variables, Brown and associates (1975) developed a 4-point vulnerability scale. Vulnerability scores as well as long-term difficulties in housing, money, children, and health, were related to depression. However, most of the differences in depression between working class women and other women were due to the presence of one or more of the vulnerability variables rather than due to the women's experience of more severe life events (Brown & Harris, 1978).

Stress, Vulnerability Variables, and Distress

In the previously cited studies by Brown and associates (1975), Brown and Harris (1978), Makosky (in press), and Paykel (1974b), the importance of examining vulnerability variables in addition to stress and distress was mentioned. Rahe (1974) also underscored that the effects of recent life changes on an individual's illness reports are mediated by other factors. He suggested that psychological defenses, physiological reactions, coping strategies, and illness behaviors may explain why similar life events result in differing reports of illness. Kessler (1979) explored the assumption that "the systematic existence of impact differentials helps explain ... relationships between social statuses and psychological distress" (p. 100). He
advocated an approach consisting of:

(1) the use of an impact coefficient to represent vulnerability, and (2) the comparison of these coefficients between contrast groups to represent differential vulnerability. . . research efforts should be directed toward uncovering the sectors of people in society who are more vulnerable than others and toward understanding the causes of this differential vulnerability. (p. 105)

Radloff and Rae (1979) examined sex differences in precipitating factors in depression. Using data from a large mental health survey, they found that women scored more in the direction of precipitating factors associated with depression on education, income, occupation, number of people supervised on the job, general and specific leisure activities, and current and recent illness. Men scored more in the direction of depression on age, bed rest, religious activities, and handicap (p. 176). However, overall, there were more similarities between the sexes than differences in that most conditions associated with depression for women were also associated with depression for men. When women and men were matched on the precipitating factors, women still scored higher on depression than did men. The authors suggested that learned susceptibilities may contribute to depression and may explain the higher frequency of depression in women.

Overview of Findings on Relations Between Life Stress, Class and Sex Differences, Vulnerability Factors, and Distress

Based on the above reviewed literature, the following relations between life stress, class and sex differences, vulnerability factors, and distress may be seen as plausible:
1. Life change scores are related to psychological and physiological symptom scores (Dohrenwend, 1973a; Dohrenwend & Dohrenwend, 1974; Gunderson & Rahe, 1974; Holmes & Rahe, 1967; Markush & Favero, 1974).

2. Lower class people may have more life changes than people in other classes (Askenasy et al., 1977; Brown & Harris, 1978; Dohrenwend, 1973a; Markush & Favero, 1974).

3. Results are contradictory as to whether or not women report higher life changes than men; Dohrenwend (1973a) and Radloff and Rae (1979) found that women scored higher on life changes, but Markush and Favero (1974) found no differences between men and women.


5. There is disagreement as to whether people of varying racial background differ in depression. Dohrenwend (1973a) found that Blacks and Puerto Ricans were more depressed than were Whites, but Markush and Favero (1974) found no difference between Blacks and Whites in degree of depression.

6. Researchers differ in their suggestions about how to improve the measurement of stress. Brown and associates (1975) suggested consensus among investigators, and Makosky (Note 5) developed a Life Conditions Measure to account for long-term stressful circumstances.

7. Vulnerability variables are important mediators between life events and the experience of distress (Brown & Harris, 1978; Kessler,
1979; Makosky, in press; Markush & Favero, 1974; Paykel, 1974a, 1974b; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, 1979; Rahe, 1974).

Other than the work by Brown and Harris (1978), there are few studies on differences in stressful life events in women across occupational and marital status groups. However, as undesirable life events have been found to be related to depression (Paykel, 1974b), it is important to control for these events when examining the effects of occupational and marital status on depression in women separately. If, however, these groups do not differ in undesirable life events, no control of undesirable life events would be necessary. Therefore, the following two research hypotheses were derived:

Research Hypothesis 1: The four occupational status groups—(a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) semi/unskilled workers, and (d) homemakers—will not differ in undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months.

Research Hypothesis 2: The three marital status groups—(a) married women, (b) never-married women, and (c) divorced/separated women—will not differ in undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months.

If these null hypotheses can be retained with confidence, and if differences in depression are found among women of varying occupational and marital status, then the effects of occupational and marital roles on depression in women can be examined.
Depression in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status

In this section, studies are reviewed which explore the effects of varying occupational and marital status on depression in women. The following areas were examined: (a) definition of depression, (b) statistics on women's changing roles, (c) prevalence of depression in women, (d) theoretical explanations regarding the prevalence of depression in women, (e) occupational status and depression in women, (f) marital status and depression in women, and (g) effects of occupational and marital status on depression in women and summary. The last section (g) serves as the summary of related literature and as rationales for the three derived hypotheses regarding occupational and marital status as impacting depression in women.

Definition of Depression

Depression is a mental health problem of epidemic proportions and occurs especially frequently in the female population (Arieti, 1979; Becker, 1977; Weissman & Klerman, 1977). Depression covers a spectrum of meanings: a mood or feeling state, a syndrome, a character style, and a group of illnesses. The most up-to-date definition of depression was stated in the third edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III):

Major Depressive Episode

The essential feature is either a dysphoric mood, usually depression, or loss of interest or pleasure in all or almost all usual activities and pastimes. This disturbance is prominent, relatively persistent, and associated with other symptoms of the depressive syndrome.
These symptoms include appetite disturbance, change in weight, sleep disturbance, psychomotor agitation or retardation, decreased energy, feelings of worthlessness or guilt, difficulty concentrating or thinking, and thoughts of death or suicide or suicidal attempts. (Spitzer, 1980, p. 210)

Depression was operationally defined as the score on a self-report depression scale, the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) Scale (Radloff, 1977). This scale was selected because it measures a variety of depressive symptoms. When comparing the items of this scale with the definition of depression in the DSM-III—major depressive episode, all but the symptom of decreased libido are included. Questionnaire items in other self-report scales on depression which refer to sexual activities, however, were found to be of least reliability and were usually left blank in survey questionnaires (Vande Creek, Note 6).

For excellent, more comprehensive overviews of theories and definitions of depression, the reader is referred to works by Akiskal and McKinney (1975), Arieti and Bemporad (1978), Beck (1967, 1976), Becker (1974, 1977), and Mendels (1970).

Statistics on Women's Changing Roles

The traditional family constellation, with the father as breadwinner and the mother as homemaker, is changing. At the same time, marriage and the roles of wife and mother are still typical for most women. Rohrbaugh (1979) stated that:

Some 94 percent of the women in the United States marry at an average age of twenty years. Although as many as one in three marriages may end in divorce, three-quarters of divorcees remarry; their unmarried status is only temporary.
And most women combine marriage with its traditional complement, motherhood. Although the size of most families is smaller today (averaging 1.9 children in 1974), 83 percent of women are mothers. (p. 175)

The change in the traditional patterns consists mainly of an increase in women's employment. In 1960, 37.1% of all American women were working, compared with 42.8% in 1970 (Mostow & Newberry, 1975). Rivers, Barnett, and Baruch (1979) pointed out that 90% of all women in the United States work outside the home at some point of their lives (p. 16). Also, over 50% of mothers with school-age children are employed. The average woman today is 32 years of age when her youngest child is in school. Factors which in part account for the increase of women in the labor market are that women marry later, have fewer children, and have more education. In addition, 40% of all marriages end in divorce, and most women outlive their husbands by about 7 years (Rivers et al., 1979, p. 31).

In a report on the Economic Responsibilities of Working Women, the U.S. Department of Labor (1979) stated that, in 1978, 42 million women were in the labor force, and that almost 39.9 million women were employed full or part time. It was pointed out that:

Women work for the same reasons men do—most importantly, to provide for the welfare of themselves, their families, or others. Over 40 percent of the women in the labor force in 1978 had never married, or were widowed, divorced, or separated. (p. 1)

The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor (1979) reported the following statistics from data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Of the women in the labor force in March 1978,
25% were never-married;
19% were widowed, divorced, or separated;
10% were married, with husband's income in 1977 under $7,000;
8% were married, with husband's income in 1977 between $7,000-$9,999;
15% were married, with husband's income in 1977 between $10,000-$14,999;
23% were married, with husband's income in 1977 $15,000 and over.

The first four groups of women were likely to work because of economic need. Thus, about two-thirds of the women in the labor force worked mainly to support themselves and their families.

Over one of 10 women in the labor force were heads of household; many of these women were living below poverty level. Female-headed poor families in 1978 represented 49% of all poor families.

Fully employed women continue to earn less than fully employed men. In a report of the U.S. Department of Labor (1976) on Women Workers Today, for full-time workers employed in 1974, the women's median income per year was less than 60% (or three-fifths) of that of men—$6,772 versus $11,835 (p. 8). More recent statistics, compiled by the Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor (1979) from data published by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, showed that in comparable low-level jobs, a salary of $7,512 for a man compared to $4,394 for a woman, and in comparable higher level jobs, a salary of $15,230 compared to that of $8,385. Thus, on the average, women's salaries were still 60% below men's salaries.

Quinn (1979) pointed out that 63% of the workers earning between $3,000 and $5,000 per year are women, but only 5% of workers earning
over $15,000 are women. Women with a college degree earn almost 40% less than do men. Occupations in science reveal a similar picture. The Scientific Manpower Commission recently found that, except for beginning engineers and industrial chemists, the salaries of women in science are lower than those of men with comparable training and experience at every age, every degree level, in every field and with every type of employment. (Quinn, 1979, p. 73)

A reason for this is that fewer women than men are employed in high paying occupations. For example, women are underrepresented as managers (23%) and as skilled craft workers (6%). Women are overrepresented as service workers (63%), retail sales workers (64%), clerical workers (80%), and 98% of private household workers are women. For professionals overall, there is no sex difference in numbers as 40% of professional workers are women. However, these women are most likely to be teachers or health workers (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, 1979; from 1978 annual averages data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics). Quinn (1979) stated that about 75% of working women are in low-level clerical and service occupations. Occupations that are more than 90% female include bank teller, typist, secretary, telephone operator, bookkeeper, and nurse. Of the 16% of all employed women who are classified as professionals, nearly two-thirds are teachers and nurses. Women in management are also in lower positions than are men.

Many of today's female "executives" are, functionally, low-level personnel with good titles. . . . Marcia Greenberger, of the Center for Law and Social Policy, points out that segregation of most women into "female jobs"--with negligible prestige, few learning opportunities and little upward mobility--is today's sturdiest barrier to equal opportunity. (Quinn, 1979, p. 73)
Thus, women may fare better in terms of pay and advancement possibilities in traditionally men's jobs, despite the supposed preference of women for traditional "female" jobs and the difficulties for women to enter male-dominated areas of occupation.

Prevalence of Depression in Women

According to survey data from the National Institute of Mental Health, approximately one in five Americans, or 40 million, suffer from at least moderate depression (Fields, 1980). Silverman (1968) concluded "that depression is more common in women than in men, whether it is the feeling of depression, neurotic depression, or depression psychosis" (p. 73). Guttentag and Salasin (1976), Radloff (1975), and Seligman (1974) estimated that depression is three times more common in women than in men, while Arieti (1979) quoted the frequency of depression in women as five times greater than depression in men. Logan and Kaschak (1980), Ilfeld (Note 7), and Kaplan (1977) reported higher depression frequency in women than men at most ages. According to Gove (1980a), "the most complete statistics on treatment in institutional settings are those for 1971 presented in Kramer (1977)" (p. 350). When analyzing Kramer's (1977) data, Gove concluded that:

Women emerge as having higher rates of treatment for mental illness in state and county hospitals, general hospitals, community mental health centers (inpatient and outpatient), and other outpatient psychiatric services, as well as for all settings combined. Thus the most recent data on treatment in institutional settings are consistent with the earlier data presented in Gove and Tudor (1973). (Gove, 1980a, p. 350)
When examining the question whether women report higher rates of mental illness due to response bias, Gove and associates (in Gove, 1980a) found that controlling for response bias did not affect the reports of women or men, and in one study, controls for response bias led to an increase in women's depression rates. Therefore, the sex differences in mental illness and depression were not due to response biases. When reviewing studies of help-seeking behavior of men and women, Clancy and Gove (1974) found no differences among the sexes and concluded therefore that the higher rates of mental illness in women were real, and not an artifact. Gove (1972, 1980a) suggested that this higher incidence is not due to biological but to social factors, as only married women— and not never-married, divorced, or widowed women— had higher illness rates than men.

It appears that, at least in terms of mental illness, being married is considerably more advantageous to men than it is to women, while being single is, if anything, slightly more advantageous to men than to women. (Gove, 1972, cited in Kaplan & Bean, 1976, p. 291)

Weissman and Klerman (1977) reported that in community surveys on depression in the United States and elsewhere, women also showed higher incidences of depression over all time periods.

Theoretical Explanations Regarding the Prevalence of Depression in Women

In Sex Differences and the Epidemiology of Depression, Weissman and Klerman (1977) concluded "that the sex differences in depression in Western society, are, in fact, real and not an artifact of reporting or health care behavior" (p. 109). The authors recognized the
complexities of depression and possible genetic or endocrine factors in the development of depression in women. They pointed out though, as "marriage has a protective effect for males but a detrimental effect for women" (p. 109), relationships between social roles and depression have been affirmed (Gove, 1972, 1980a; Radloff, 1975, Note 8). Weissman and Klerman (1977) suggested that:

Further understanding of social stress and its interactions with components of the female vulnerability in the traditional role is a promising area of research. This research would need to take into account intervening variables such as women's employment and the quality of the marriage. (p. 109)

Sociologists, psychologists, feminists, and other researchers have described the disadvantaged status of women in Western cultures which contributes to women's actual and internalized helplessness and subsequent clinical depression. Weissman (1980) summarized two frequently quoted, plausible pathways in the etiology of depression in women:

The first pathway, called the "social-status hypothesis", is widely accepted in the recent discussions on social discrimination against women. Many women find their situation depressing because real social discrimination makes it difficult for them to achieve mastery by direct action and self-assertion, further contributing to their psychological distress. Applied to depression, it is hypothesized that these inequities lead to legal and economic helplessness, dependency on others, chronic low self-esteem, low aspirations, and, ultimately, clinical depression.

The second pathway, called the "learned-helplessness hypothesis", which is derived from the work of Seligman (1974), proposes that socially conditioned, stereotypical images produce in women a cognitive set against assertion, which is reinforced by social explanation. In this hypothesis, the classic "femininity" values are redefined as a variant of the learned helplessness that is characteristic of depression. Young girls learn to be helpless during
their socialization and thus develop a limited response repertoire when under stress. These self-images and expectations are internalized in childhood so that the young girl comes to believe that the stereotype of femininity is expected and normal. (p. 102)

Other models of depression are applicable to an understanding of the prevalence of depression in women. The cognitive model (Beck, 1967, 1976) explains depression as resulting from negative cognitions toward the self, the future, and the world, leading to emotional, motivational, and behavioral manifestations of depression.

Negative conceptions are learned. Beck and Greenberg (1974) suggested that:

Women may be more definitively bound by internalized cultural expectations than by specific obstacles to their happiness and success (p. 1974). . . . Women are in fact no more predisposed to suffer from depression than are men. What distinguishes male from female depression is simply that the events which typically "trigger" depressions tend to be sex-typed. (p. 129)

The authors emphasized the importance for women to unlearn cultural stereotypes about women in order to prevent depression.

Similar suggestions for women to learn to free themselves from their depressogenic socialization were made by Rivers and associates (1979). They pointed out that women need to learn to put themselves as at least equal to men in order to grow up competent. This change of attitude is a slow one and calls for a supportive context for maintenance of change. The learning to take care of oneself requires "the opportunity to practice [in the 'real world'] and the lifelong belief that one has the right to do so" (Miller, 1976, p. 35). Active participation in the women's movement, in fighting for equal personal, legal, and economic rights for both sexes, and participation in
supportive women's consciousness-raising groups may be ways for many women to find and create such a growth-producing context.

As the "learned helplessness" model is a frequently quoted explanation for the preponderance of depression in women, a more thorough examination of its merits and shortcomings is in order. Seligman's model (1975) is based on the notion that "it is the expectation, not the objective conditions of controllability, that is the crucial determinant of helplessness" (p. 49). Thus, the model is a cognitive one. An interesting side aspect is that Seligman suggested a continuum of susceptibility to the belief in helplessness which may underlie the endogenous-reactive continuum for depression. The helplessness model is contrary to Beck's (1967) contention that depressed individuals view themselves as responsible in causing negative events.

Rizley (1978) conducted two experiments to test the contrary postulates of these two models. In the first study, Rizley applied the cognitive model of motivation (Weiner, Frieze, Kukla, Reed, Rest, & Rosenbaum, 1971), which postulates that:

Individuals utilize four elements of ascription both to postdict (interpret) and to predict the outcome (O) of an achievement-related event. The four causal elements are ability (A), effort (E), task difficulty (T), and luck (L): \( O = f(A, E, T, L) \). (Rizley, 1978, p. 34)

Results indicated that:

As predicted by Beck's (1967) model, depressed subjects rated internal factors (ability and effort) more important causal determinants of an evaluatively negative event (failure) but less important determinants of an evaluatively positive event (success) than did nondepressed subjects. . . . Depressed subjects did not view their behavior and consequent events as causally unrelated, nor did they self-attribution any less control over, or causal responsibility for, reinforcement than did nondepressed subjects. (Rizley, 1978, p. 37)
This bias exhibited by the depressed subjects in the attribution of causality "should heighten their experience of negative affect following failure and decrease their experience of positive affect following success" (Rizley, 1978, p. 40), thus resulting in a truly depressogenic way of thinking.

This depressogenic way of thinking is typical for women. In their review of the literature on attribution, Frieze, Fisher, McHugh, and Valle (Note 9, cited in Radloff & Monroe, 1978) found that women tend to attribute success to luck or effort, and failure to lack of ability. Thus, women see failure as personal and stable, and success as external or unstable. Men, on the other hand, see success as function of ability, and failure as resulting from bad luck or little effort.

The design of Rizley's (1978) second study was based on the findings by Schopler and Layton (1972, 1973):

that the self-attribution of interpersonal influence is a direct function of the degree to which the target person's behavior following an intervention is inconsistent with his or her behavior prior to the intervention. (Rizley, 1978, p. 41)

Results indicated that depressed subjects did attribute more interpersonal influence to themselves and, marginally, more responsibility for another person's behavior change than did nondepressed subjects. This finding may well be a variable in the high frequency of depression in women. As pointed out by Alper (1978), women learn to view themselves as especially responsible in interpersonal contexts. Miller (1976) illustrated women's beliefs that they should make others successful and happy, and women's tendencies to blame
themselves when this goal proves unattainable. Becker (1977) suggested that "depressives may be like externals in feeling a lack of control over response consequences but like internals in assuming personal responsibility for adverse outcomes" (p. 155). These tendencies again may be stronger in women due to traditional female socialization.

The findings of the two above-mentioned studies by Rizley (1978) were generally supportive of Beck's (1967) model, though they did not support the postulate that depressed individuals underestimate their causal responsibility for success. Rizley (1978) therefore suggested a minor revision of Beck's model:

The overattribution of causality to the self by depressed subjects for both evaluatively positive and evaluatively negative events may simply reflect the operation of a truly egocentric cognitive schema of causality in interpersonal (as opposed to impersonal) situations . . . the heightened self-attribution of interpersonal causality . . . may have the important consequence of increasing affective reactions in interpersonal situations. This takes on added significance since depressed individuals elicit more negative and fewer positive consequences from others than do nondepressed individuals. . . . The depressed individual's heightened self-attribution of interpersonal influence may amplify negative affects, and over an extended period of time this could have clinically significant depressogenic effects. (p. 46)

This "truly egocentric cognitive schema of causality in interpersonal (as opposed to impersonal) situations" (Rizley, 1978, p. 46) was observed by Freud in his description of the insufficient superego of women which was never "so inexorable, so impersonal, so independent of its emotional origins as we require it to be in men" (1925/1961, p. 257, cited in Gilligan, 1979, p. 432). Freud concluded that "women have less sense of justice than men, that they are less ready
to submit to the great exigencies of life, that they are more often influenced in their judgments by feelings of affection and hostility" (pp. 257-258, cited in Gilligan, 1979, pp. 432-433). Chodorow (1974, 1978) attributed these sex differences to "the fact that women, universally, are largely responsible for early child care and for (at least) later female socialization" (1974, p. 43). As a result:

In any given society, feminine personality comes to define itself in relation and connection to other people more than masculine personality does. (In psychoanalytic terms, women are less individuated than men; they have more flexible ego boundaries) (1974, p. 44; cited in Gilligan, 1979, p. 433)

Sadly enough, the "sensitivity and care for the feelings of others that girls develop ... have little market value and can even impede professional success" (Gilligan, 1979, p. 435). Gilligan (1979) documented the failure of male life-cycle theorists to take into account women's experience. She argued that:

This bias has promoted a concern with autonomy and achievement at the expense of attachment and intimacy ... [and] suggests that systematic attention to women's lives, in both theory and research, will allow an integration of these concerns into a more balanced conception of human development. (p. 431)

Abramson, Seligman, and Teasdale (1978) reformulated and critiqued the learned helplessness model (Seligman, 1975). They listed the following inadequacies of the "old" model: (a) the expectation of uncontrollability is not sufficient for depressed affect; (b) the old model does not explain the depressive individual's lowered self-esteem; (c) depressed individuals believe that they cause their own failures; and (d) generality and chronicity of depression vary greatly from individual to individual (pp. 65-67). Abramson and associates
restated the model of depression as follows:

1. Depression consists of four classes of deficits: motivational, cognitive, self-esteem, and affective.

2. When highly desired outcomes are believed improbable or highly aversive outcomes are believed probable, and the individual expects that no response in his [sic] repertoire will change their likelihood, (helplessness) depression results.

3. The generality of the depressive deficits will depend on the globality of the attribution for helplessness, the chronicity of the depression deficits will depend on the stability of the attribution for helplessness, and whether self-esteem is lowered will depend on the internality of the attribution for helplessness.

4. The intensity of the deficits depends on the strength, or certainty, of the expectation of uncontrollability and, in the case of the affective and self-esteem deficits, on the importance of the outcome. (Abramson et al., 1978, p. 68)

Therapeutic implications of the reformulated model are as follows:

Depression is most far-reaching when (a) the estimated probability of a positive outcome is low or the estimated probability of an aversive outcome is high, (b) the outcome is highly positive or aversive, (c) the outcome is expected to be uncontrollable, (d) the attribution for this uncontrollability is to a global, stable, internal factor. (Abramson et al., 1978, p. 69-70)

People who are especially vulnerable to depression then attribute failure to global, stable, and internal factors. Abramson and associates (1978) noted, that in light of women's preponderance in depression:

It may be important that boys and girls have been found to differ in attributional styles, with girls attributing helplessness to lack of ability (global, stable) and boys to lack of effort (specific, unstable; Dweck, 1976). (Abramson et al., 1978, p. 68)

Radloff and Rae (1979) developed a sequential and cyclical model of depression which is influenced by reinforcement theories,
motivation theories, the learned helplessness model, and the cognitive model. They suggested that negative cognitions of depressed individuals are not symptoms of depression, rather that they are latent susceptibility [or vulnerability] factors which become activated by precipitating factors such as goal-oriented problem-situations. Subsequent failure expectations effect a decrease in the probability of goal-directed behaviors, which in turn reduce the likelihood of [internal and external; cf. Trembley, 1979] reinforcers, "leaving the individual with a deficit in rewards and/or excess of punishments, which results in depressed affect" (p. 170).

Sequential and cyclical model of depression (Radloff & Rae, Draft, in press).

Radloff and Monroe (1978) presented evidence that women are socialized to learn cognitive susceptibility factors to depression. In addition, they suggested that women tend to experience more precipitating factors than do men.

It is possible that women in varying occupational and marital role combinations differ in their learning histories of cognitive susceptibility factors, and in their experience of precipitating events.
According to traditional theories and general public opinion, women's sense of well-being is based on their fulfillment of their roles as wives and mothers. Results of more recent research studies, however, show that employment may actually increase women's psychological health (Rivers et al., 1979). The protective effect of employment was found especially for highly educated and gifted women.

Birnbaum (1975) studied life patterns and self-esteem in gifted family-oriented and career-committed women. Her sample consisted of 29 homemakers, 25 married professionals with children, and 27 single professionals. Homemakers were found to report the lowest self-esteem and sense of personal competence, even in child care, to express concern over self-identity issues, and to feel lonely. Married or single professionals felt positive about themselves, were rarely lonely, saw themselves as competent and attractive, and only worried about having too little time. Thus, for these bright college-educated women, work outside the home clearly enhanced their sense of self-esteem. Sears and Barbee (1977) examined career and life satisfaction among Terman's gifted women, who now are in their sixties, and found that women with single status and paid employment reported highest levels of satisfaction. Welch and Booth (1977, cited in Rohrbauch, 1979) stated that women employed full time were psychologically healthier than were full-time homemakers, regardless of whether the homemakers had been employed in the past.
In some studies of working-class women, employment was positively related to well-being. In their sample of working-class women in London, Brown et al. (1975) found that employment was one of the factors which protected women against the experience of depression, in that only 14% of the employed women showed depressive symptomatology compared with 79% of the unemployed women. Ferree (1976a) suggested that paid employment helps to increase one's self-esteem and provides a sense of accomplishment. Her sample consisted of 135 married, predominantly working-class women in the Boston area, with at least one child in the first or second grade, but without preschoolers. Working-class women who were full-time homemakers were less satisfied with their lives than women with paid jobs.

Under direction of the late Marcia Guttentag, and presently under direction of Deborah Belle, a 4-year investigation on Lives in Stress: A Context for Depression was conducted at Harvard University (Belle, 1980). Forty-three low-income mothers in the Boston area were interviewed in depth. The numbers of white and black women interviewed were about even, and the race of the interviewee was matched with that of the interviewer. Economic power, or employment, was found to be important to a woman's sense of self and sense of competence. Tebbets (1980) found for this sample (Belle, 1980), that higher occupational prestige was related to lower depression and more internal control. Mostow and Newberry (1975) explored the influence of employment on depressed women and suggested that a woman in treatment for depression should be encouraged to continue her job due to the psychological benefits of employment, even when dealing with
working-class women. Ilfeld (Note 7) surveyed 2,299 households in Chicago in 1977 and found significantly higher symptomatology in women than in men. However, women employed in high-level occupations did not differ from men in symptomatology. Of the homemakers in his sample, 52% described marriage as restricting, demanding, and burdensome, while only 19% of the married career women described it so. Ilfeld concluded: "From our findings comes a very practical implication for lowering women's symptomatology, namely, encouraging and enabling them to find jobs, especially of higher status" (Ilfeld, Note 7, cited in Rivers et al., 1979, p. 280).

Baruch and Barnett (Note 10) compared employed middle-class women with preschoolers with those women at home. They found no overall differences in the level of self-esteem or satisfaction. However, the women at home relied mainly on their husband's approval as source of their self-esteem, whereas the employed women relied on both satisfaction with work and with their families. Rivers and associates (1979) recommended that (a) women avoid chronic economic dependence, (b) women at home need not fall into the "feminine" traps of dependence and passivity, (c) women at home with young children understand that stress, isolation, and anxiety are typical in their situation and not blame themselves, and (d) women at home have a vested interest in joining with other housewives to form networks that can offer them respites from the demands of child care (cf. pp. 265-266).

Pearlin (1975) reported some conflicting evidence regarding the benefits of outside employment for women. The study was based on the view of sex differences in mental health as reflective of differing
social experiences of men and women. His research group focused on long-term stressful conditions such as economic, occupational, family, and parental roles. Data were collected with interview schedules from a "carefully selected cluster sample of 2,300 people living in the Chicago Urbanized Area" (p. 193) between the ages of 18 and 65 years. Women scored higher in depression than did men. This finding was not due to denial of depression on part of the men, as there were no sex differences on the 9-item denial scale and as high denial was somewhat related to higher depression. When considering differences in employment as a possible source of depression, he found "that there is no difference between employed women and full-time homemakers with regard to depression" (p. 196). Pearlin concluded that "it is not simply having a role that matters: what is important are the experiences one has while in the role" (p. 201). He suggested that conflicts in combining homemaking and employment might explain part of the sex difference in depression.

Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) conducted the 1971 Quality of Life Survey in Ann Arbor, Michigan, which involved interviews with a national probability sample of 2,164 persons, 18 years of age or older, living in households in the United States. There were no differences between housewives and employed wives in their sense of well-being, and the researchers found "little reason to believe that on the average employment outside the home either enhances or diminishes a marriage" (p. 425). Housewives and employed wives were found to be more positive about their lives than were single working women. However, housewives with a college degree found their lives less
rewarding than other housewives, and especially less rewarding than employed women with a college degree. The only difference between housewives and working wives was that housewives tended to describe their life as very "easy." The two groups were similar in their sense of well-being. However, housewives were less positive with increasing educational level, especially in regard to marital agreement, companionship, and understanding.

Existing research thus does not provide a clear answer whether full-time homemakers—without role conflicts but possibly with a repetitive dreary routine—or employed women—with the advantages of paid work and the negative effects of role strain and overload—differ in their satisfaction with life. As Wright (1978) noted, there is relatively little research on the comparative satisfactions of these two groups; he found, generally, no consistent or significant differences between homemakers and employed women in life satisfaction.

Marital Status and Depression in Women

That depression is a crucial problem for many women is a common finding in the literature. Bernard (1972) reviewed the mental health of women and concluded that the roles of wife and mother, combined with economic dependence, are hazardous to the health of women. In fact, she called the mental health of housewives "Public Health Problem Number One." Marital status has been shown to be related to depression: rates of mental illness are higher among married women than among married men, but no sex differences are found in illness
rates for the divorced and widowed; unmarried women had lower illness
rates than unmarried men (Gove, 1972). However, studies have shown
that married adults of both sexes have lower rates of mental illness
than have unmarried adults (Rohrbaugh, 1979). Radloff and Rae (1979)
also found that marital status was an important variable affecting
the sex difference in depression: "among the divorced/separated re­
spondents the women were more depressed than the men, but among the
widowed and never married respondents, the men were more depressed"
(p. 178). Radloff (1975) concluded, in accordance with Gove (1972)
and Bernard (1972), that marriage is better for men than for women,
as married women were found to be consistently more depressed than
married men.

In this study, three types of marital status are considered:
(a) married, (b) never-married or single, and (c) divorced/separated.
By definition, both never-married and divorced/separated women live
without a husband. Otherwise, a wide variety of life styles is pos­
sible. Traditionally, being single has been equated with being
miserable, a "wall flower." Today, some women choose not to marry
but to devote their time to their career. Some single women who
choose not to marry decide to have a child and to raise it on their
own. Bequaert (1976) studied the life styles of single women and
found that most of these women had chosen to remain single; they expe­
rrienced their work as major source of satisfaction and were only occa­
sionally lonely. In a previously mentioned study (Birnbaum, 1975),
single professional women were as satisfied as were married profes­
sional women with their general life, had similarly high self-esteem,
and felt competent and attractive.

Singlehood *per se* does not necessarily pose problems for women. White (1974) conducted in-depth interviews with 13 never-married, childless, college educated women of 29 years of age and reported that these women had developed a high level of self-esteem despite negative social sanctions against unmarried women in their age group. Havlick (1975) described the life styles of 80 single women over age 30 and found that women who refused to accept social criticism regarding their single status, and who, in some cases, openly rejected traditional views of women's roles, reported a positive adjustment to their singlehood.

Brown and Harris (1978) explored different kinds of singlehood in women. They reported especially low rates of psychiatric disorders in never-married women, whereas widowed, divorced, and separated women had high rates. Gordon, Reister, Huff, and Strieby (Note 11) examined depression in 450 single women and found that marital status did not contribute to the variance in depression, but that "opposite sex social support" as the strongest predictor accounted for 11% of the total variance in depression. Travis (1976) conducted in-depth interviews in 1970 and in 1971 with 80 women, ranging from 18 to 30 years of age, with a mean age of 23.8 years. When compared to married women, these young single women tended to idealize traditional roles of wife and mother. Particularly inexperienced women, as opposed to more knowledgeable women, viewed marriage and children as most important parts of a woman's life, expressed less career commitment, and indicated willingness to change their career plans to
to accommodate children.

The importance of a positive identity for single women for psychological well-being was underscored by Adams (1978) in her work, *Single Blessedness*. Adams attacked the commonly held notion that there must be something wrong with a person who chooses not to marry, and pointed to the need for the single woman to establish a social context in which she can view herself as fitting and belonging.

Thus, the literature indicated that singlehood *per se* may contribute little to a woman's depression. Instead, questions whether singlehood is out of choice or out of force, whether the context of a woman's life is supportive, and whether the woman views herself as deviant, are more essential.

Divorce or separation is for most people a traumatic stressful period in their lives. Especially for women, marriage has been a traditional career, and outside employment for women has been viewed frequently as a necessary evil rather than as a challenging and satisfying life task. Thus, for many women, divorce means giving up one's long-standing identity and familiar roles. Divorce often disrupts one's network of friends, and the divorcée feels like the fifth wheel. Due to frequent lack or inadequacy of child support payments, many divorced mothers have to work due to economic necessity. Of course, not all separating people feel distressed; some may even experience periods of euphoria, which, however, may stem more from denial than actual relief. Once a divorced person becomes established in her/his new life style, s/he may view the divorce as a growth enhancing experience (Rohrbaugh, 1979).
Single people tend to manage more difficulties than married people. Pearlin and Johnson (1977) found that unmarried (never-married or divorced/separated people) were more exposed to stressful conditions such as economic hardship, social isolation, and parental responsibilities, and were therefore more vulnerable to depression. Homemakers with young children were found to be especially depressed. Married people overall were found to be less vulnerable to depression than unmarried people.

Campbell and associates (1976) found that young single women reported higher psychological stress than did young single men, but young married women without children reported lower psychological stress than did young married men. However, young mothers experienced high levels of stress, and 19% admitted to worry about a nervous breakdown compared to only 7% of the young married women without children (pp. 405-409). Widows, despite low income and loss of spouse, had a higher sense of well-being than the divorced women. When compared to most other groups, divorced women described their general well-being in very negative terms. Wright (1978) summarized the results of The Quality of American Life survey (Campbell et al., 1976) on the effects of marital status on well-being in women:

In general and irrespective of labor-force status, married women are happier and more satisfied with their lives than unmarried women, especially divorced, separated, and widowed women. ... 40.5 percent of the married women characterized their lives as very happy. ... Among the divorced and separated, the comparable proportion was 15.7 percent, and among the widowed, 17.3 percent. Likewise, the proportions "not too happy" were 4.9 percent (married), 21.4 percent (divorced and separated), and 17.9 percent (widowed). These differences, incidentally, are far more substantial than any difference associated with labor-force
participation, which perhaps gives some preliminary indication of the relative importance of "traditional" and "nontraditional" sources of satisfaction among women. (p. 304)

Effects of Occupational and Marital Status on Depression in Women

Radloff (1975) examined the effects of occupation and marital status on depression. Her data base consisted of a survey in Kansas City, Missouri (1971-72), of 876 randomly selected subjects, and a survey in Washington County, Maryland (1971-73), of 1,639 subjects. Due to differences among Whites and Nonwhites on some variables, and due to the small sample size of Nonwhites, Nonwhites were excluded from the study. Married and divorced/separated women were found to be more depressed than comparable men, but this was not true for the never-married and widowed. Both working wives and homemakers were more depressed than working husbands. Average depression scores of working wives were somewhat lower (though not significant) than scores of homemakers. Working or retired women scored higher in depression than comparable men, but unemployed men scored higher than did unemployed women. Homemakers with better education were less depressed than homemakers with little education.

Staines and Pleck (1978) also stated in their research review "that the decrement in marital adjustment of dual [employed] wives relative to housewives is greater among less educated than among better educated wives" (p. 92). However, Campbell and associates (1976) reported that educated housewives scored lower in general well-being than less educated housewives and employed women. In Radloff's (1975)
study, the suggestion that work per se may protect women from depres-
sion was only slightly supported in that average depression scores of
working wives were somewhat lower (though not significant) than
scores of homemakers. Never-married women with high education, high
income, high status occupations reported lower levels of depression
than women in other groups, whereas poorly educated women working at
low status jobs, married, with children at home, were most depressed.

Staines and Pleck (1978) studied the effects of married women's
employment status on marital adjustment and concluded that employed
wives, i.e., women with dual roles, showed less marital adjustment
than did housewives: they wished they had married someone else, and
had thought about getting a divorce. These findings applied only to
mothers of preschool children and to wives with less than a high
school diploma. Segré (1977) explored the effects of full-time em-
ployment, part-time employment, and full-time homemaking on self-
concept and depression in middle-class women and found no differences
among the three groups in overall satisfaction.

Hall and Gordon (1973), in a sample of 109 women, also found
that employed women experienced greater role conflicts than did house-
wives and part-time workers. However, full-time workers were more
satisfied with their lives in general than were both housewives and
part-time workers.

A possible reason for the higher rates of marital discord in
working women than in homemakers are their husbands' attitudes toward
their wives' employment. Burke and Weir (1976), in a survey of 189
husband and wife pairs, found working wives to be more satisfied and
to perform more effectively than the homemakers. Husbands of working wives, however, were found to be less satisfied, experienced more stress, and performed less effectively than did husbands of homemakers.

The findings that marriages of full-time employed women were less satisfying than those of part-time and full-time homemakers (Hall & Gordon, 1973; Segré, 1977; Staines & Pleck, 1978) were contrary to findings in national surveys (Campbell et al., 1976; Wright, 1978), which reflected no differences in marital satisfaction between working wives and housewives.

Especially in women with a college education, homemaking as an only role did not appear to be a satisfying lifestyle. Stewart (Note 12) examined the life satisfaction of 90 women 10 years after college graduation and found that high role combination (employment and roles of wife and mother) did not result in psychological distress, but in a sense of personal fulfillment.

When examining the combined effects of work and marital status on depression or sense of well-being in women, it becomes apparent that levels of employment need to be considered separately. For many working-class women, employment is a financial necessity, and may be an unwanted and stress-producing factor. For professionals or women with a college education, however, lack of outside employment may increase the women's sense of frustration with being "just a housewife," though the results of recent studies are not without contradictions.

Guttentag and Salasin (1976) underscored the role of powerlessness and life strains of low-income employed women in the development
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of depression:

Women are more depressed than men. Young, poor women who head single-parent families and young married mothers who work in low-level jobs show the greatest recent rise in the national rate of depressive symptoms—both treated and untreated. Why is that true? The life stresses these women experience are very great. But stresses alone are not enough to account for depression. These women are also trapped—they are powerless, helpless to change any of the major stresses under which they live. Stress and powerlessness apparently are the deadly combination.

But why the increase in recent years? Women have entered the labor force at ever-increasing rates since the end of World War II. ... Yet, for the low-income working woman, there has been little change in traditional family role demands. At the same time, there are few sources of support for these women, as compared with those for men, either at work or in the home. (p. 153)

Based on a socio-psychological explanation for depression, Guttentag and Salasin (1976)

expect to find the highest rates of depression among that group of people which has the greatest number of stresses, or life demands, with which they must cope, and at the same time the fewest actual possibilities for mastery over them. (p. 173) ... although the family role demands for middle-income women have changed in a slightly less sexist direction—they can turn to their husbands for help as well as advice—the same has not been true for the low-income married mother. She is caught within the traditional sexist family role requirements. Her entry into the labor force, in a low-level job, has meant that she must fulfill all of the traditional family role requirements and, in addition, she works at a poorly paid and unsatisfactory job. Although her husband can turn to her for aid with problems, she has few sources of aid. No wonder she feels trapped and powerless. The situation for the divorced or separated low-income mother is even worse. (p. 174)

When considering Guttentag's and Salasin's above arguments, it becomes clear that the question is not "are working wives less depressed than homemakers?" Instead, a more appropriate question would be "do women of varying occupational status—including homemakers—
differ in degree of depression?"

Therefore, based on likely differences of satisfactions and frustrations in varying occupations, and their effects on women's experience of depression, the following hypothesis was stated:

Research Hypothesis 3: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status groups, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, in degree of depression.

When reviewing studies on the effects of marital status on depression in women, conflicting evidence is reported regarding differences between never-married women and married women (Becker, 1974; Bernard, 1972; Birnbaum, 1975; Campbell et al., 1976; Pearlin & Johnson, 1977; Travis, 1976; Wright, 1978; Gordon et al., Note 11). Most researchers agree that divorced and separated women report higher levels of dissatisfaction and depression than other marital status groups, such as the never-married, the married, or the widowed women. However, as Rohrbough (1979) and Gordon and associates (Note 11) pointed out, divorce may be experienced as growth-enhancing once divorced women are established and adjusted to their changed lifestyles. Based on the available literature, no clear rank order of the effects of marital status on depression in women was possible. However, some effects of marital status on depression were apparent, especially the potentially negative effects of divorce and separation on women who were previously economically dependent upon their husbands. Therefore, the following hypothesis was derived:
Research Hypothesis 4: The three marital status groups—(a) married women, (b) never-married women, and (c) divorced/separated women—will differ in degree of depression.

A woman's past work experience may well make a difference in coping with divorce or separation. Guttentag and Salasin (1976) underscored the especially negative effects of divorce and separation on working-class women who have only access to low-income and unsatisfactory jobs (p. 174). This point was supported by the finding that female-headed poor families in 1978 represented 49% of all poor families. Professional married women, however, may experience the absence of an occupation as dissatisfying (Birnbaum, 1975). Thus, a woman's sense of well-being or experience of depression may well be a function of both marital and occupational status. Therefore, the following hypothesis was derived:

Research Hypothesis 5: Depression in women will vary as a function of occupational and marital status.

Vulnerability Variables in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Statuses

In this section, studies are reviewed on the suggested vulnerability variables of achieving styles, dominance versus submission in relationship, mastery versus powerlessness orientation, and attitudes toward women's roles, in relation to women's occupational status.
Achieving style was defined as the characteristic way in which an individual approaches achieving situations, whether directly or through relationships with others (cf. Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies, & Handley-Isaksen, in press).

Achieving style was operationally defined in this study as score on the Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI) (Handley-Isaksen, Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies, Kofodimos, Brunner, & Reynolds, Note 13).

As no attempt is made in this study to review the increasing literature on women and achievement, the reader is referred to summaries (cf. Lipman-Blumen et al., in press; Mednick, Tangri, & Hoffman, 1975; Stein & Bailey, 1976).

The literature on achievement stems to a large extent from the work of McClelland, Atkinson, and Lowell (1953). These researchers developed the concept "need for achievement (nAch)" based on Murray's (1938) extensive taxonomy of needs. In his studies of men, McClelland (1961) identified two major components of achievement motivation: the motive to approach success ("hope of success"), and the motive to avoid failure ("fear of failure"). Horner (1968, 1972) pioneered the work on achievement motivation in women and suggested the component of "fear of success." She explained that "when success is likely or possible, threatened by the negative consequences they expect to follow success, young women become anxious and their positive achievement strivings become thwarted" (1972, cited in Gilligan,
1979, p. 439). Sassen (in press, cited in Gilligan, 1979) reanalyzed Horner's data and pointed out "that Horner found success anxiety to be present in women only when achievement was directly competitive, that is, where one person's success was at the expense of another's failure" (p. 439). Gilligan (1979) suggested to "begin to ask not why women have conflicts about succeeding but why men show such readiness to adopt and celebrate a rather narrow vision of success" (pp. 439-440). In their review on individual and interpersonal achievement, Donelson and Gullahorn (1977) pointed to the effects of sex-role stereotypical socialization on women's achievement motivation. Women learn "to achieve in ways they consider personally relevant, such as affiliation, and . . . other expressions of their achievement behavior have been inhibited" (p. 171).

Women differ in the degree to which they are encouraged to achieve in their careers. Stake and Levitz (1979) examined career goals of college women and men and their perceived achievement-related encouragement. They found support for their "hypothesis that women who set high career goals receive more specific encouragement from significant others than men who set equally high goals and women who set more traditional goals" (p. 156). "Career women in this study believed that they had received cues from significant others that they could and should pursue an ambitious career" (p. 157). Almquist and Angrist (1970) found that career-oriented nontraditional women had more highly educated and working mothers, a broader variety of occupational role models, and more work experience before graduation than did more traditionally oriented women. Lemkau (1979) reviewed
the psychological and sociological literature on women in male-dominated occupations from 1930-1976, and discussed her review with reference to the women's personality and background characteristics. She found that these women had high "competency" traits, but did not differ from other women on "warmth and expressiveness" traits. Background characteristics such as high parental education, maternal employment, frequent foreign ancestry, firstborn status, and high family stability were factors conducive to the development of nontraditional career choices in women.

Cognitive approaches to the explanation of motivation emphasized learned expectations and social comparisons as important factors in the activation of behavior (Abramson, et al., 1978; Bandura, 1977). In the more recent literature on achievement orientations or achieving styles, both the interpersonal and the impersonal components of achievement have received increasing attention. Studies on leadership styles have shown that a combination of task- and people-orientation facilitates the attainment of group goals. Small group research revealed the importance of both instrumental and expressive functions for successful task completion. Research on sex roles and sex differences has examined the "task orientation" of men and the "person orientation" of women.

Lipman-Blumen (1972) reported that "women with a traditional sex-role ideology tended to meet their achievement needs through their husband's accomplishments. They thereby seemed to short-circuit their own educational and occupational needs" (cited in Lipman-Blumen et al., in press, p. 8). Horner (1968) suggested a "motive to avoid success"
in women, which Lipman-Blumen and associates reinterpreted as an example of "vicarious achievement" behavior. Further studies by these researchers suggested "that relationality, rather than vicariousness per se, was a broader and more useful conceptualization of the domain" (Lipman-Blumen et al., in press, p. 11). Lipman-Blumen and associates developed a model of direct and relational achieving styles. This model assumes that (a) motives exist and take the form of underlying tensions, (b) the means of approaching or accomplishing goals are important factors, (c) individuals develop characteristic styles for achieving goals, (d) individuals select roles consonant with their preferred achieving styles, (e) roles create "structural propensities" for certain achieving styles, (f) achieving styles have dimensions such as flexibility, range, and intensity, (g) environmental factors may strongly influence the choice of achieving styles, (h) individuals may redefine situations to match their preferred achieving styles, (i) different achieving styles are not mutually exclusive or independent, and (j) achieving styles result from early learning and resocialization possibilities exist (cf. Lipman-Blumen et al., in press, pp. 15-17). This model differs from other models in that it incorporates the important domain of relational achieving styles, allows for more emphasis on styles, roles, and structure rather than focusing exclusively on motives or needs, and is a step closer to directly observable behaviors.

In their review of the effects of traditional sex-role socialization on achieving styles, Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt (1978) pointed out that "affiliation is a means of achieving mastery for girls,
(whereas) boys . . . are more likely to be pressured into individualistic effectance and competence (White, 1963) through direct mastery of the environment" (p. 138).

Many female-dominated occupations call for vicarious or relational achieving styles. And women who show high "competency" traits do not differ in "warmth and expressiveness" traits from women who show low "competency" traits (Lemkau, 1979). Therefore, no directional differences in relational achieving styles were hypothesized in this study for the groups of professionals, clerical/sales workers, semi/unskilled workers, and homemakers (see Research Hypothesis 7, p. 72 of this dissertation). However, it was expected that these four occupational roles would call for differing degrees of direct achieving styles: homemakers would probably report lowest direct achieving styles due to their likely focus on predominantly relational roles; semi/unskilled workers would report somewhat higher degrees of direct achieving styles than the homemakers due to their employment outside of the home; clerical/sales workers would report even higher direct achieving styles than the semi/unskilled workers due to more training and educational experiences; and professionals would report highest degrees of direct achieving styles due to the strongest focus on education and career relative to the other three groups. As the variable "total achieving style" consists of the sum of relational and direct achieving styles, the same rank order was hypothesized for total achieving style, as was for direct achieving style, for the four occupational status groups.
Research Hypothesis 6: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status groups, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, in total and in direct achieving style.

Dominance-Submission in Relationship in Women of Varying Occupational Status

The type of relationship with one's significant person was defined as the perceptions of the individual concerning her/himself and her/his partner in terms of degree of dominance versus submission in the relationship. A significant person was defined as the person who is very important to the individual in her/his present life and with whom s/he has regular contact.

Perceived dominance of self was operationally defined in the present study as score of the subject's self-perceptions on the Lu Dominance-Submission Scale (Lu, 1950; revised in this dissertation).

As Miller (1976) pointed out, dominant others exist only in relation to subordinate others. In order to understand dominance, one needs to understand how subordinates contribute to being dominated. This is a difficult task as subordinates tend not to tell their dominants what impact the dominants have on them; instead, they focus on understanding the dominants, and on pleasing them. Subordinates often believe that they need the dominant in order to be safe, that they are worth less than the dominants, and that the dominants therefore have to fulfill their safety and other needs.
The traditional socialization process encourages submissive and compliant behaviors in girls which are carried over well into adulthood. Douvan and Adelson (1966) studied 3,500 adolescents and found strong sex differences in their separation processes from the parents. Boys tended to challenge and confront authorities such as parents and teachers, whereas girls accepted rules and regulations easily, were compliant, obedient, passive, and continued to rely on the support and control of their parents.

Recent examples of subordination of women—as adults—to men are Andelin's (1974) *Fascinating Womanhood*, and Morgan's (1975) *The Total Woman*. These books were analyzed by Rogers (1978) as "a response to anxiety generated by awareness of the potential for experiencing the self as a separate, responsible person" (p. 202). Increased role flexibility has led to anxiety for many women who are not prepared to make their own choices due to traditional sex role socialization.

By defining roles more rigidly, anxiety is reduced to more tolerable levels. Andelin's book, in particular, suggests the living out of sex roles in caricature, as indicated by the following points:

1. The woman's role is to know and to analyze all her husband's needs, to anticipate them, and to adapt herself to them totally.

2. Meeting her own needs is to be done by appealing to her helplessness, her dependency, and through behaving in a charming, childlike manner.

3. Any separate, serious interests other than those rigidly defined as suitable for a wife/mother and not in conflict with any of her husband's expectations are un-feminine, unattractive, as well as threatening to the man's masculinity. (Rogers, 1978, pp. 204-205)
The consequence of such submissiveness training is that it leads women away even further from self-exploration and self-understanding, that it encourages a regressive and manipulative approach in relating to men, and ultimately increases the helpless victim position which so many women already experience in most societies.

In contrast to a fascination with Andelin's (1974) distortion of womanhood, there are fascinating and disturbing parallels between Andelin's (1974) and Morgan's (1975) assumptions about "true womanhood" and the descriptions of the depressive individual by Arieti and Bemporad (1978). Bemporad (1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) listed the following aspects of the depressive: (a) dependency on a dominant other, (b) fear of autonomous gratification, (c) the establishment of a bargain relationship in which the individual abstains from autonomous gratification in exchange for nurturance from the dominant other, and (d) an inability to alter one's environment. Rado (1927, cited in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) described depression-prone individuals as having "a sense of security and comfort only when they feel themselves loved, esteemed, and encouraged . . . the self-esteem largely depends on whether they do or do not meet with approbation and recognition" (p. 25).

Arieti (1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) summarized the psychodynamic reasons for the prevalence of depression in women:

the experience of having sustained a loss or been threatened by loss, with the consequent adoption of submissiveness to a dominant other; the pattern of living for the sake of the dominant other, or for obtaining approval and gratification from the dominant other; the pattern of dependency; the pattern of living in which romantic love is a dominant goal. (p. 365)
In a patriarchal society a woman often represses the sorrow, the anger, and the frustration which accompany her subordinate way of living. The repression, however, in the best circumstances leads to neurotic defenses; in the worst, to facilitating serious mental disorders, especially depression. Although it is true that the very beginning of a pattern of female dependency can be traced back to the first two or three years of life, it is also true that this pattern would not persist and become ingrained in many cases if society at large did not promote it. (p. 366)

Predepressive personalities frequently adopt a pattern of placation similar to the compliant or "moving-toward-people" personality as described by Horney (1945, 1950), with characteristics such as religiosity, loyalty, devotion, cleanliness, and strong need for affirmation through others. They tend to demand and expect gratification from others not aggressively but indirectly since they either feel guilty about their own needs or try to make others feel guilty.

Arieti (1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) pointed to the vicious cycle of dependency and ambivalence in female socialization, the cultural ideals of romantic love, the subsequent dependency, ambivalence, idealization and hate toward the dominant other, inability of autonomous gratification and economic independence, and the resulting feelings of entrapment, failure, and self-hate. Bemporad (1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) gave a vivid picture of how depressed individuals bestow others with magical grandiose powers and then try to live in the good graces of the dominant other on the pedestal. At the same time, the depressed individual acts out a lifescr ipt of distortions about herself such as incapability of autonomous gratification, lack of creative potential, and unrealistic beliefs about concern from others for her day-to-day behavior. These distortions of
the adult depressed individual may well reflect actual childhood ex­
periences in which she was under constant supervision and the focus
of attention.

Clinical examples and descriptions of the dynamics between domi­
nant other and subordinate are given in the works of Arieti (1979),
Arieti and Bemporad (1978), Bernard (1973, 1976), Chesler (1972), and

Winter, Stewart, and McClelland (1977) longitudinally explored
the relationship of husband's power motives and wife's career level
and found that the wives' careers in 1974 were predicted negatively
by their husbands' power motivation, as measured in 1960, and their
husbands' occupation as business executives. The levels of the
wives' careers were predicted positively by the social status of
their families of origin, and their husbands' needs in affiliation
and self-definition, which were correlated with a general freedom
from ascribed roles. The portrait of the power-oriented man, however,
emerged as distrustful and exploitive of women, in sexual fantasy as
well as in occupational reality. These authors speculated "that it
is the power-oriented man's suppression of women which contributes
to his difficulty in maintaining relationships with women" (p. 164).
However, the stronger the husband's motivation was to be sociable and
cooperative, the more career-involved was his wife. As Rohrbaugh
(1979) pointed out, "the wife's employment may reflect the marital
relationship as much as it changes that relationship" (p. 187). Lu
(1952) investigated the dominant-equalitarian-submissive role in mar­
riage and the marital adjustment of couples and found that couples in
which the individuals perceived neither themselves nor their partners as dominant, i.e., who had an equalitarian relationship or democratic partnership, reported good marital adjustment. However, perceived dominance of either self or partner was related to poor marital adjustment.

Most women feel uncomfortable with their power. High achieving women tend to marry high achieving men and want to view their partners as at least as smart and competent as they view themselves. It is acceptable for them to be successful as long as they view their partner a little bit more so (Horner, 1970, cited in Rohrbauch, 1979, p. 186). In Birnbaum's (1975) study on life patterns and self-esteem in gifted family-oriented and career-committed women, the results left:

no question but that the married professional either is married to a remarkable man or chooses to see him that way. These husbands are described as brilliant, creative, sensitive men who can do anything. . . . Thus, while the married professional is certainly psychologically freer than most women to seek personal distinction, it seems that she is free to do her very best only because she is convinced that her husband can do still better. (pp. 412-413)

Walstedt (1977) explored the "altruistic other orientation" in a sample of 106 middle-class women aged 34 or older and found support for her hypothesis that women who do not accept the altruistic other orientation are more likely to be self-supporting in their middle years and to attain more academic degrees than women who accept the altruistic other orientation.

When examining dominance/submission of women who differ in their career-orientation, it is likely that these women would differ in the
extent to which they would perceive their partner as dominant, either because they in fact relate to a nondominant partner, or because they view him/her as nondominant. However, as most women tend to be reluctant to describe themselves as relatively dominant, no group differences in their self-perceptions in degree of dominance would be expected. The concept of perceived dominance in relationship was defined as the difference between perceptions of oneself as dominant and one's partner as dominant. This definition has the inherent difficulty--similar to the concept of androgyny--that an individual with low self-perceptions and partner-perceptions would not differ from an individual who describes herself and her partner as very dominant. In addition, as no specific rank-ordered differences were hypothesized for self-perceptions in dominance among the four occupational status groups, no specific differences were hypothesized for the relative dominance in relationship. In the previous section on achieving styles, no differences were hypothesized for relational achieving style among the four occupational status groups. For reasons of efficiency, the assumed relationships among the following three dependent variables: (a) relational achieving style, (b) perceived dominance of self, and (c) perceived relative dominance in relationship, and the classification variable of occupational status, are summarized in Research Hypothesis 7.

Research Hypothesis 7: The four occupational status groups--(a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals--will differ in relational achieving style, perceived dominance of self, and perceived relative dominance in
relationship.

For the concept perceived dominance of partner, specific rank-ordered differences were hypothesized for the four occupational status groups. Due to their comparatively strong focus on, and achievement in a career, professionals were hypothesized to view their partners as least dominant, followed by clerical/sales workers with a fair amount of career-orientation and sense of independence. Homemakers were assumed to view their partners as fairly dominant due to their own economic dependency. Semi/unskilled workers were expected to view their partners as most dominant: These women work at low-income and low-status jobs, and are caught in the traditional sex-role requirements, without access to help or support from their partners (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976).

Research Hypothesis 8: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status groups, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, in perceived dominance of partner.

Mastery/Powerlessness in Women of Varying Occupational Status

Mastery was defined as the feelings of success which are experienced as control over one's internal reactions and relevant external events, and whereby the success is attributed to one's own behaviors. Mastery was operationally defined as score on the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale (Frank, Hoehn-Saric, Imber, Liberman, & Stone, 1978).
Mastery, competence, and power are related concepts. As there is little research which deals explicitly with mastery and women in varying occupations, studies on differences in competence and power between various occupational groups are included in this review.

Competence is "the ability to interact efficiently with the 'real world'" (Barnett & Baruch, 1978, p. V). Barnett and Baruch (1978) "call competent those people who do well what they set out to do, effectively organizing human and material resources to achieve, create, or produce a socially valued service" (p. 13). The concept of competence is based on White's (1959) "effectance motivation"; White "argued that human beings are characterized by a basic motivation to be competent, to interact effectively with the environment" (Barnett & Baruch, 1978, p. 14). Smith (1968) described "the competent self" as the attitude toward the self "that orients one to make the most of one's opportunities in the world" (p. 281). Barnett and Baruch (1978) underscored two components of this concept: "(a) a favorable self-evaluation, or self-respect; and (b) a sense of potency, activity, and efficacy" (p. 17). Smith (1968) suggested three prerequisites for a sense of competence of self: opportunity, respect, and power. Barnett and Baruch (1978) applied these three prerequisites to women's situation and argued that opportunities for women are limited, that "respect is ensured neither by living out the traditional role of wife and mother nor by declining to do so" (p. 19), and that "being powerful and being feminine have been in our society well-nigh mutually exclusive" (p. 19).
Power is "the capacity to implement" (Miller, 1976, p. 116). Traditionally, power has been conceptualized as advancing oneself at the expense of others. For example, McGrath (Note 14) defined interpersonal power as "the ability to get someone to do or feel something they wouldn't have done spontaneously." However, Miller (1976) pointed out that more fully developed individuals will be less needy of limiting or restricting others. Unger (1976) examined the development and implications of "male is greater than female; the socialization of status inequality." She defined social power "as the relative effectiveness of attempts to influence others" (p. 3). Unger (1976) pointed out that sex-role stereotyping is in fact power-stereotyping.

Power bases tend to differ for men and women. Johnson (Note 15, cited in Unger, 1976) found sex-stereotyping of men and women in their ascription to power bases: Men and women believe that "male" power bases are:

legitimate power (based upon some authorized or contractual relationship), expert power (based upon possession of some needed skill or competency which is not possessed by another), and informational power (based upon possession of some data needed by another). . . . In contrast, referent power (based on the need to belong to a group and to further its goals) and helpless power or the power of dependency (based upon the social norm of helping those who cannot help themselves) are characterized as female. When given a choice of which form of power to use, males chose legitimate power significantly more often than females, and females chose helpless power significantly more often than males. (p. 3)

Most of the traditionally considered bases of social power are open mainly to men: reward, coercion, expert, legitimate, and informational power (Raven, 1965; Raven & Kruglanski, 1970, cited in
Females in contrast use referent power based on their likableness, or "legitimate helplessness" (Raven & Kruglanski, 1970, cited in Frieze et al., 1978, p. 314). These passive types of influence involve dependency—which is a sex-role stereotype of women. Indirect information or "power behind the throne," nagging and sexuality are other forms of power used by women. Johnson (1978) concluded that women's restriction, based on sex-role stereotypical socialization to personal, helpless, and indirect modes of power is likely to keep women in dependent positions, and to contribute to the image of women as incompetent. The possible short-term advantage for women to appear weak and helpless thus has severe long-term disadvantages. The typical lack of direct sources of power is likely to contribute to feelings of dependency, helplessness, and lack of independent mastery in women.

Arieti (1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) reconsidered the theory which from time to time has appeared in classic psychoanalytic literature, that a castration complex can explain the greater occurrence of depression in women. I think it is easier to affirm that depressed women are more likely to mourn not for the castration of their penis, which would be pure fantasy on their part, but because they really have been castrated—although in a metaphorical sense. The symbolic penis of which they have been deprived is the male role in the world, including all opportunities connected with that role, from becoming president of the United States to being the director of a small bank. . . . Being denied the possibility of growth in many areas, some women have found it easy to regain power through functions which wrongly have been considered to pertain more to femininity than masculinity: sex appeal, the art of seduction, love. (pp. 368-369)

In 1967, Horney revised the concept of female penis envy to the recognition that female envy is based on the reality of male
possession of actual power. Chesler (1972) similarly noted that women are not in mourning for a nonexistent penis, rather for what they never had: a positive conception of their own possibilities. Chesler explained depression as an intensification of traits which socialization produces in women: passivity, dependence, self-depreciation, self-sacrifice, naivete, fearfulness, and failure.

Bart (1970, cited in Cox, 1976) found among the most depressed women those who had fully conformed to traditional roles of mother and wife, i.e., had focused their mastery, power, and competence in the traditionally prescribed female roles. The tragedy in the lives of these women is that they did what they were told to do and ended up depressed. Bart listed the following characteristics of depressed middle-aged women:

- a history of martyrdom with no payoff . . . to make up for the years of sacrifice; inability to handle aggressive feelings; rigidity; a need to be useful in order to feel worthwhile; obsessive, compulsive supermother and superhousewife behavior, and generally conventional attitudes. (Bart, 1970, cited in Cox, 1976, pp. 351-352)

Barnett and Baruch (1978) pointed to the development of competence: "through the life cycle, the development of competence is shaped by what people who are significant in one's life expect, reward, punish, and value" (p. 15). The areas in which women are encouraged to show competence, mastery, and power tend to be areas which are not valued highly in society in terms of status and economic benefits. In societies where children are not valued as a resource,

The woman whose life is focused on them may exist in a void with respect to feedback about success and failure.
... under such conditions, a mother's competent performance is not linked to the life of the society ... the increasing incidence of depression in women, especially those with young children (Radloff, 1975), may be a consequence. (Barnett & Baruch, 1978, p. 15)

Studies have shown the negative effects of traditional sex-role socialization on the development of power in girls, and the resulting limitations in girls' vocational preferences.

In a study of first and second graders on vocational preference and power, Looft (1971) reported that:

Girls, especially, learn early that certain adult statuses are open to them and that these are few in number, reflecting a recognition of traditional sex-role expectations; none expressed a desire to be a politician, a lawyer, a scientist. A few girls said they would be mothers, but no boy said he would be a father. The fact of early sex-role vocational learning was perhaps captured most poignantly by the single girl who initially expressed a desire to be a doctor; when questioned further, she commented: "I'll probably have to be something else--maybe a store lady." (p. 366)

Barnett (Note 16, cited in Unger, 1976) studied sex differences and age trends in the relationship between occupational preference and occupational prestige. She found that:

At every age, nine through seventeen, the correlation between the prestige of an occupation (and its power) and preference for that occupation is higher for males than for females. ... In fact, the correlation between occupational prestige and preference is virtually zero for females. These sex differences increase with age and reach their highest level between the ages of fifteen and seventeen. (p. 5)

Zander and Van Egmond (1958) examined intelligence and social power in second and fifth grade students and reported that:

Girls who were high in power and intelligence were little different from those who were low in either of these qualities because, we believe, high social power and intelligence were not needed in order to be the nurturant,
obedient or responsible persons required by society. Girls could fulfill these expectations regardless of the amount of power or intelligence they possessed. (p. 266)

In her review of Zander and Van Egmond's (1958) study, Unger (1976) noted

that it is not the sex differences in role that one would like to stress here, but the lack of importance of individual capacities in the fulfillment of the female role . . . the performance of girls or the status which they can achieve is less important than their ascribed status as females. . . . In analogy to a crude racist remark, "A female Ph.D. is still a broad." (p. 6)

Women differ to the extent to which they describe themselves as competent and successful. Background characteristics typical for successful women are: "being foreign born; having immigrant parents; coming from an affluent family; having one or both parents with high occupational and/or educational status; being eldest or only child; and having no brothers" (Barnett & Baruch, 1978, p. 26). Bernard (1972) pointed out that women with higher income are less likely to marry and that "a good job that pays well is a strong competitor to marriage for many women . . . men tend to marry women slightly below them in such measurable items as age, education, and occupation" (p. 129). Hoffman (1960) and Wallston (1973) reported a more equalized sharing of roles and power in the family when wives are employed, especially in higher level occupations. Blood and Wolfe (1960) found that length of a wife's employment is related to her influence in decision-making in the family. Husbands who "relinquish power and . . . take pride in [their wives'] . . . successes . . . are likely to be family oriented rather than dedicated solely to their work" (Bailyn, 1970, cited in Barnett & Baruch, 1978, p. 98).
Liberman (1978) described the development of mastery:

A person usually acquires a sense of mastery through success experiences, although a cognitive framework which links a person's performance to his [sic] self-image is also necessary. In other words, the success experience must be meaningful to the individual. This meaningfulness, or link between performance and self-esteem, is governed by several variables which include the person's background and current situation, task relevance, task difficulty, attribution of performance, and the attitudes of significant others. (p. 36)

In his review of these five "mastery-governing variables," Liberman pointed to the relation of middle- and upper-class status and a positive development of mastery. Lower-class and ghetto environments, however, tend to extinguish a sense of internal control, and to foster a reliance on luck and fate (Strodtbeck, 1958). Task relevance and task difficulty also influence one's sense of mastery: tasks which are considered unimportant by the individual, or as too easy or too difficult yield neither feelings of success or failure. Self-attribution of success is a necessary component of mastery and fosters a maintenance of positive change. And "the opinions and attitudes of significant others can often heighten or diminish the meaningfulness which an individual associates with his [sic] performance" (Liberman, 1978, p. 45).

It is likely that women in varying occupations differ in their experience of mastery, power, and competence. Semi/unskilled workers are likely to have a low sense of mastery: task relevance and task difficulty may be seen as low, may offer few opportunities for a sense of success and self-attribution of accomplishments due to the frequent absence of a "finished product," and the prestige ascribed
to semi/unskilled jobs by society is virtually absent. The same rationale might apply to homemakers, though homemakers fulfill traditionally ascribed female roles and may gain a somewhat higher sense of task-relevance due to socialization messages; however, prestige and economic rewards are lacking. Clerical/sales workers might have a higher sense of mastery: they belong to the "pink collar workers" (Howe, 1977), have gained more education and training than semi/unskilled workers, and may have more a sense of their individual contributions. Professionals are likely to report the highest levels of mastery: extensive education and a stronger commitment to a career, higher prestige and income inherent in the job, and a sense of task relevance and challenge may all be conducive to a high level of mastery and competence.

As similar relations are hypothesized between occupational status and mastery, and between occupational status and attitudes toward feminism, the hypothesis for mastery and occupational status is included in the next section (see Research Hypothesis 9, p. 88 of this dissertation).

Attitudes Toward Feminism in Women of Varying Occupational Status

Attitudes toward feminism were defined as the degree of an individual's beliefs in equal personal, economic, and legal rights between the sexes.

Attitudes toward feminism were operationally defined as the score on the FEM-Scale (Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975).
Attitudes toward feminism and attitudes toward women's roles are, for the purposes of this dissertation, interchangeable concepts: positive attitudes toward feminism reflect nonstereotypical attitudes toward women's roles, and negative attitudes toward feminism reflect traditional stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles. Studies have shown that cultures differ in their sex-characteristic and sex-role stereotypes. Williams, Giles, Edwards, Best, and Daws (1977) compared sex-trait stereotypes in England, Ireland, and the United States. The male stereotype was found markedly higher on needs for autonomy, exhibition, aggression and dominance, and moderately higher on achievement and endurance. The female stereotype was markedly higher on needs for deference, abasement, succurance, and nurturance; and moderately higher on affiliation, intrapersonal, and heterosexuality. (p. 303)

The authors reported less sex role differentiation in Ireland than in England and in the United States. They underscored that "commonly held sex-trait stereotypes are, at most, gross exaggerations of minor differences which serve to obscure the great variability in personal characteristics within each sex group" (p. 308).

In her discussion of conceptions of sex roles, Block (1973, cited in Kaplan & Bean, 1976) suggested that

The present American cultural emphasis on masculine machismo and feminine docility appears to impede the development of mature ego functioning. Because children are socialized early into culturally defined sex-appropriate roles, introspection and self-evaluation, which appear to be essential catalysts for psychological growth, are discouraged. (p. 74)

Block studied sex stereotypes in six countries: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, England, and the United States. When compared with
the five other countries, Block (1973, in Kaplan & Bean, 1976) found that:

Significantly greater emphasis was placed on early and clear sex typing in America; significantly more emphasis was placed on competitive achievement; and significantly less importance was attached to the control of aggression in American males . . . the important implication . . . is that there can be differences, differences that begin to abandon narrow definitions of sex roles held over from harsher and less civilized times. (p. 72)

Just as there are differences between cultures in the degree of sex role stereotyping, there are of course differences among the individuals within a culture. Rychlak and Legerski (1967) underscored the importance of learning appropriate sex role behaviors for healthy adjustment: males, according to this theory, are expected to take an "ascendant-dominant" role, whereas females are expected to take a "retiring-passive" role. Williams (1973, in Kaplan & Bean, 1976) examined this hypothesis by classifying girls between the ages of 15 and 19 according to their primary parental identification with an ascendant-dominant father, an ascendant-dominant mother, a retiring-passive father, and a retiring-passive mother. On the California Personality Inventory (CPI; Gough, 1969), girls reported significantly better personal adjustment who identified with an ascendant-dominant father, and the lowest personal adjustment was reported by girls who identified with a retiring-passive mother, with the other two groups as intermediates. Williams' findings stand in opposite to Rychlak's and Legerski's (1967) claims regarding healthy adjustment and appropriate sex role behaviors. Williams concluded that an identification with a retiring-passive mother for girls was neither
necessary nor desirable for optimum personality functioning.

Trigg and Perlman (1976) identified factors which encouraged women to pursue a nontraditional health science career: low need affiliation, high need achievement, perceiving support in the attitudes of others, particularly mothers, a low need to have children, and perceiving the need to have a family as being compatible with a nontraditional career.

Stake and Levitz (1979) compared encouragements and discouragements for achievement in career women, career men, and traditional women. Career women reported more encouragement from significant others, family members—with the exception of parents—and teachers, than did career men and traditional women. The researchers suggested:

that for women the perception of greater encouragement from significant others in the immediate environment is necessary to compensate for the sex role expectation of nonachievement, and that women who set high goals believe that they are acting in accord with significant others. (p. 157)

Lipman-Blumen (1972) reported that young women whose parents encourage a college education and who have high educational aspirations had a liberal sex role ideology, and tend to postpone marriage. Women with a traditional sex role ideology, however, tend to marry during their college years. Rossi (1967) found career-oriented women to have more liberal attitudes toward women's roles and to be more independent than marriage-oriented women.

Safilios-Rothschild (1979a) conducted an extensive review and critique of the literature on sex role socialization and sex discrimination. She pointed out that women's educational and vocational
choices are influenced by their decisions about marriage and family.

Women not planning permanent careers do not choose professions that require long, arduous training, work continuity, or keeping up with changes, such as law, medicine, or fields that require a Ph.D. (Levine, 1968).

... Women who enter high-prestige masculine occupations usually choose careers over families. (p. 43)

Safilios-Rothschild (1979) underscored the limiting effects of sex-role stereotypes in women's socialization on their vocational options:

The moment girls adopt the feminine stereotypes, their occupational choices are restricted. ... From kindergarten through the sixth grade, girls report that women can work only in certain "feminine" occupations such as nurse, waitress, or librarian, while men are not similarly limited (Schlossberg & Goodman, 1972). (Safilios-Rothschild, 1979, p. 50)

Safilios-Rothschild (1979) concluded that:

There is a high correlation between a woman's sex role ideology and her choice of nonstereotypic occupational fields. ... Women with a modern sex role ideology tend to make nonstereotypic occupational choices. (p. 52)

Rand (1968) studied career-orientations versus homemaking-orientations in "freshmen [sic] women" and found that career-oriented women reported higher "masculine" characteristics than the homemaking-oriented women. Career-oriented women had redefined their roles as including characteristics of both sexes, whereas homemaking-oriented women had limited their roles to the "feminine" stereotypes.

O'Connell (Note 17) examined traditional, neotraditional, and nontraditional life styles women between the ages of 30 and 58 years. Traditional women were full-time homemakers and intended to remain so; neotraditional women returned to paid employment after a period of child rearing, and nontraditional women combined a continuous career with child rearing. She found that nontraditional and
neotraditional women were more likely than traditional women to view women's roles as combining career and marriage, or allowed for a highly individualized role choice.

Medvene and Collins (1974) reported sharp differences between four groups of women in their views of appropriate occupations for women: the women's caucus group \((N = 102)\) rated an occupation most likely as appropriate for women, followed by the female undergraduate students \((N = 110)\), secretarial and clerical personnel \((N = 107)\), and nonworking women in the community \((N = 78)\). No differences were found among the four groups in ratings of appropriateness of high prestige occupations (physician, superintendent of schools) for women. However, the differences increased as the occupational prestige decreased, with sharp differences in the ratings of appropriateness of "ditchdigging" for women. The researchers underscored that the women in their sample overall had far more liberal attitudes toward occupations as appropriate for women than those of most vocational counselors, and urged professionals to free themselves from their own stereotypes regarding occupational segregation between the sexes.

Block and associates (1973) examined personality concomitants and environmental antecedents in sex-role and socialization patterns. They reported an inverse relationship between occupational advancement and femininity, in that 75% of the low-feminine women showed a pattern of upward occupational mobility, compared to only 28%-33% of the high-feminine women (p. 338). Piotrowski (1971) conducted a large-scale survey on the employment of married women and the changing sex roles in Poland in which 500 married women and their husbands
completed a 20-item sex role ideology measure. Items which referred to the "male dominance ideology" were endorsed strongest by men, followed by nonemployed women, and were least endorsed by employed women. Attitudes toward women's roles were more liberal for employed wives than those for nonemployed wives, thus supporting a relationship between role-attitudes and employment in women.

Beckman and Houser (1979) explored the relationship between married women's employment, sex-role attitudes and household behavior. In their review, they suggested that "women who have been employed show lower attitudinal sex-role traditionalism than women who have not been employed" (p. 162). Based on findings from three samples in the Los Angeles area, the authors reported that professionals were less sex-role traditional than nonprofessionals, and that women with more employment experience were less sex-role traditional than women with little or no employment experience. Guttentag and Salasin (1976) argued that low-income married women with young children, despite their employment, are trapped in highly traditional sex-role requirements and can turn less to their husbands for support with family demands than can middle-class, middle-income employed married women.

In the following hypothesis, the above-reviewed sections on mastery/powerlessness and on attitudes toward feminism in women of varying occupational status are considered simultaneously because of similar rationales. Women who are employed as professionals are likely to have integrated in their self-view their career, and will report a high sense of mastery and liberal attitudes toward feminism.
(Beckman & Houser, 1979). To a somewhat lesser degree, clerical/sales workers will report a fair level of mastery and liberal attitudes toward feminism (Beckman & Houser, 1979). Homemakers will report a lower sense of mastery and fairly negative attitudes toward feminism, i.e., fairly stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles (Lipman-Blumen, 1972; Rossi, 1967) due to their lack of involvement outside of the home and their fulfillment of traditional sex roles. Semi/unskilled workers will report the lowest sense of mastery and most negative attitudes toward feminism due to stressful work conditions and continued traditional family role demands without access to support (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976).

Research Hypothesis 9: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status groups, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) semi/unskilled workers, (b) homemakers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, in mastery orientation and in attitudes toward feminism.

Vulnerability Variables in Women of Varying Marital Status

There is a lack of literature regarding differences between married, never-married, and divorced/separated women on the four vulnerability variables of this study: (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance of self and partner in relationship, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism.

Therefore, no specific rank-ordered differences were hypothesized for the three marital status groups on the four vulnerability
variables. Instead, the following hypothesis was explored:

Research Hypothesis 10: The three marital status groups—(a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated, will differ in (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance of self and partner in relationship, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism.

Vulnerability Variables and Other Variables Related to Depression in Women

Vulnerability Variables and Depression in Women

In this study, four vulnerability variables are considered in relation to depression in women: (a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct and total achieving style, (b) perceived dominance of partner in relationship, (c) low mastery orientation, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism.

In the previous review of the literature, "vicarious" or relational achievement orientation was related to low educational and occupational aspirations in women (Lipman-Blumen, 1972). Women's focus on others' development rather than their own (Miller, 1976) and their generally relational orientation (Alper, 1978) may increase emotional and economic dependencies and psychological vulnerability to loss and possibly lead to depression (Arieti & Bemporad, 1978). Relying on a "dominant-other" for need fulfillment (Arieti, 1979) rather than having learned to take care of oneself (Rivers et al., 1979) fosters submissiveness, dependency, and incompetence. Lacking a sense of control over one's circumstances may lead to helplessness.
and depression (Seligman, 1975), especially when failure is attributed to one's lack of ability and success is viewed as a function of luck and chance (Frieze, Note 9, cited in Radloff & Monroe, 1978). Finally, the belief in rigid sex roles of wife and mother may decrease a woman's choices in finding an individual role combination which fits her own needs, interests, and skills. Strict adherence to traditional "feminine" roles was found to be related to lack of psychological well-being and to depression (Bernard, 1972; Marecek, 1978). Therefore, the following hypothesis was derived:

Research Hypothesis II: There will be systematic relations among the four vulnerability factors—(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (b) perceived subservience of self combined with perceived dominance of partner, (c) powerlessness orientation, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism—and depression.

Interrelations of Vulnerability Variables

Women who have stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles tend to achieve mainly vicariously or relationally and not directly (Lipman & Blumen, 1972), may depend on a "dominant-other" for need fulfillment due to lack of own emotional and financial resources (Arieti, 1979), and may have a low sense of mastery and competence (Barnett & Baruch, 1978; Birnbaum, 1975), especially when they are employed in low-status, low-income occupations (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976). Women with liberal attitudes toward women's roles are likely to achieve in their own career (Birnbaum, 1975; Lipman-Blumen, 1972;
Rossi, 1967; Safilios-Rothschild, 1979), have more egalitarian relationships with their partners (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Hoffman, 1960; Wallston, 1973), are likely to experience a sense of competence and mastery (Barnett & Baruch, 1978), and may have developed more direct achieving styles (Lipman-Blumen et al., in press). Therefore, the following hypothesis was derived:

Research Hypothesis 12: There will be systematic relationships among achieving styles, perceived dominance, mastery orientation, and attitudes toward feminism.

Other Variables Related to Depression in Women

Nineteen variables were hypothesized to be related to depression. Following a list of these variables, which indicates the expected directional relations to depression, is a short review of the literature for each of these variables.

The following nine variables were hypothesized to increase a woman's sense of control, and thus to be negatively related to depression: (a) occupational prestige, (b) age, (c) total annual gross family income, (d) total annual gross personal income, (e) educational level, (f) amount of social contact, (g) number of confiding relationships, (h) freedom on the job, and (i) number of people supervised.

The following seven variables were hypothesized to decrease a woman's sense of control, and thus to be positively related to depression, or to actually reflect depression: (a) number of children at home under 6 years of age, (b) number of changes desired,
(c) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months, (d) overall life dissatisfaction, (e) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person—if married, with husband, (f) presence at home of three or more children under age 14, and (g) loss of mother before age 11.

The following three variables were hypothesized to be related to depression: (a) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult, (b) career-homemaker orientation, and (c) ethnic background.

Variables Negatively Related to Depression in Women

Occupational Prestige. In this dissertation, the occupational categories and titles were identical to those from the U.S. Bureau of the Census (1960, 1970). Prestige scores were taken from those used by Temme (1975). As professional workers receive higher prestige scores in this rating than do clerical/sales workers, and as clerical/sales workers receive higher prestige scores than do semi/unskilled workers (operatives and laborers), it was expected that higher occupational prestige scores would be negatively related to depression. The same rationale as given for the relation of occupational status group membership and depression (see pp. 57-58 of this dissertation) applies to the relation of occupational prestige and depression (Tebbets, 1980; Ilfeld, Note 7).

Age. In the recent literature, a negative relation was reported between women's age and depression, in that younger women indicated
higher levels of depression than did older women (Benefari, Beiser, Leighton, & Martens, 1972; Berkman, 1971; Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Markush & Favero, 1974; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, 1979, in press; Weissman & Klerman, 1977).

**Family Income.** Higher family income was found to be related negatively to depression in homemakers and in employed women (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Langner & Michael, 1963; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, 1979, in press).

**Personal Income.** In this study, personal income was defined as the total gross income of the female subject. Manis and Markus (Note 18) reported a positive relationship between a woman's total annual salary and level of self-esteem for a random sample of 1,145 women. It was expected that higher personal income would be related negatively to depression in employed women, in congruence with the above-mentioned findings for family income and depression. A possible exception are the homemakers, as by definition homemakers were not employed.

**Educational Level.** Though Campbell and associates (1976) reported that highly educated homemakers scored lower in well-being than did less educated homemakers, most studies found a negative relationship between higher levels of education and depression for homemakers and for employed women (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Markush & Favero, 1974; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, 1979, in press; Staines & Pleck, 1978).
**Amount of Social Contact.** Amount of social contact was defined as the monthly frequency of getting together with friends and neighbors. Radloff & Rae (in press) reported that higher frequency of getting together with friends and neighbors was related to lower levels of depression in women. Pearlin and Johnson (1977) found that women who had established acquaintances in their neighborhood, whose friends lived close by, and who were involved in voluntary work tended to view themselves as low in depression. Henderson, Byrne, Duncan-Jones, Adcock, Scott, and Steele (1978) reported a weak relationship between lack of social bonds with friends and acquaintances and the development of neurotic disturbances. Miller and Ingham (1976) found that people who had made friends and acquaintances with neighbors and colleagues at work reported lower levels of psychological and physical symptoms. However, Brown and associates (1975) found no relation between degree of social involvement and sense of well-being. Belle (1980) suggested that the number of social contacts may bring with it stress and obligations, and may not necessarily reflect social support. Marshall (Note 19) noted that amount of social contact may be associated with lack of access to certain resources, such as child care facilities, especially for lower-income women.

**Number of Confiding Relationships.** Though Brown and associates (1975) pointed to the importance of having a primary confiding relationship for emotional well-being, they did not find a relationship between number of confiding relationships and lack of depression.
However, Marshall (Note 19) found that women who seek emotional support from other women improved the likelihood of their receiving support and of promoting emotional well-being. "When support for female bonding is combined with facilitating a recognition of women's common experiences, the possibility of improving women's self-esteem and sense of mastery is increased" (p. 43). In a sample of 337 adults in London, Miller and Ingham (1976) found that the absence of friends was associated with higher physical symptoms (backache, headache, dizziness) and higher psychological symptoms (depression, tiredness, anxiety, irritability), especially in women.

**Freedom on the Job.** Freedom on the job was defined as the extent to which a subject views her work, i.e., what she does on the job, as decided by others who work with her. It was expected that work environments would differ for women in the various occupational groups on this variable. It was also expected that higher perceived freedom on the job would be related to a stronger sense of mastery and to lower levels of depression.

**Number of People Supervised.** Radloff and Rae (in press) reported a slight negative relation, though not statistically significant, between number of people supervised and depression scores in women. It was expected that the more people supervised by a woman, the higher her sense of mastery and control would be, and the lower her level of depression.
Variables Positively Related to Depression in Women

Number of Children at Home Under 6 Years of Age. Various studies have found that the higher the number of preschoolers at home, the higher was the level of depression for the mother (Brown & Harris, 1978; Brown et al., 1975; Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Lopota, 1971; Marecek, 1978; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, in press).

Number of Changes Desired. In this study, number of changes desired in one's life were considered in the areas of education, career, marriage, parenting, and "other"—where the subject could indicate her own desired area of change (cf. Manis & Markus, Note 18). It was assumed that number of changes desired would reflect a dissatisfaction with certain areas, and would be related to higher levels of depression.

Dissatisfaction With Social Life Over the Past 6 Months. Higher levels of dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months were expected to be related to, or to reflect, higher levels of depression.

Overall Life Dissatisfaction. The subject was asked to indicate, all in all, how satisfied she would say she is with her life. Higher levels of overall life dissatisfaction were expected to be related to, or to reflect, higher levels of depression.

Absence of a Confiding Relationship With Significant Person. Brown and associates (1975) interviewed 114 female inpatients and
outpatients with the primary diagnosis of depression, and 220 randomly selected women living in the inner London Boroughs. They found in in-depth interviews that one of the major vulnerability factors to depression in women was lack of an intimate, confiding relationship with a husband. Working-class women were found to suffer especially from this lack and reported high levels of depression. Brown and Harris (1978) underscored the importance of a close, confiding relationship with one's partner in protecting against depression.

Presence at Home of Three or More Children Under Age 14. Brown and associates (1975) and Brown and Harris (1978) identified this variable as one of four vulnerability factors to depression in women, which in part explained the greater prevalence of depression in working-class women when compared to other female samples.

Loss of Mother Before Age 11. Loss of mother before age 11 was found to be related to higher incidence of depression in adult women (Brown et al., 1975; Brown & Harris, 1978). However, Radloff and Rae (1979, p. 178) reported no relationship between early loss of parents and depression as an adult.

Nondirectional Variables Related to Depression in Women

Expectation of Source of Support for Economic Needs as an Adult. The subject was asked whether she expected to support herself, whether she expected others to support her, whether she never really thought about it, or other expectations concerning economic support as an
adult (cf. Manis & Markus, Notes 18 & 20). This variable was included to explore possible relationships between expectations of economic support sources as an adult and occupational status, and to examine possible relationships of these expectations to depression as an adult.

**Career-Homemaker Orientation.** Manis and Markus (Note 18), in a sample of 1,145 women who had contacted the Center for Continuing Education of Women at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, during the period of 1964-1973, reported that respondents who were career-oriented, at all age levels, had higher levels of self-esteem than those who were not career-oriented. They suggested that successful career-oriented women were perhaps more content with their lives than other women. Their sample, however, may not be representative of general population surveys. It is expected that career-homemaker orientation is related to depression, especially when considering the subjects' occupational group membership.

**Ethnic Background.** As pointed out in the section on stress, vulnerability variables, and distress (pp. 27-28 in this dissertation), there is disagreement in the literature as to whether people of varying racial background differ in depression. Dohrenwend (1973a) found that Blacks and Puerto Ricans were more depressed than were Whites, but Markush and Favero (1974) found no differences between Blacks and Whites in degree of depression. Radloff (1975), however, suggested that there may be differences on depression and vulnerability variables as a function of ethnic background.
Based on the review of other variables related to depression in women, the following hypothesis was derived:

Research Hypothesis 13: The following variables will be systematically related to depression: (a) occupational prestige, (b) age, (c) total annual gross family income, (d) total annual gross income of subject, (e) educational level, (f) amount of social contact, (g) number of confiding relationships, (h) freedom on the job, (i) number of people supervised, (j) number of children at home under 6 years of age, (k) number of changes desired, (l) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months, (m) overall life dissatisfaction, (n) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person— if married, with husband, (o) presence at home of three or more children under age 14, (p) loss of mother before age 11, (q) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult, (r) career-homemaker orientation, and (s) ethnic background.

Prediction of Depression

Four sets of variables were examined as potential predictors of depression.

1. Occupational group membership.

2. The four vulnerability variables of this dissertation.

3. Three Brown and Harris' (1978) vulnerability factors: loss of mother before age 11, presence at home of three or more children under age 14, and absence of a confiding relationship with significant person— if married, with husband.
4. Sixteen background variables: (a) occupational prestige, (b) age, (c) total annual gross family income, (d) total annual gross income of subject, (e) educational level, (f) amount of social contact, (g) number of confiding relationships, (h) freedom on the job, (i) number of people supervised, (j) number of children at home under 6 years of age, (d) number of changes desired, (l) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months, (m) overall life dissatisfaction, (n) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult, (o) career-homemaker orientation, and (p) ethnic background.

The four predictor sets were developed to allow for a fairly efficient examination of a large number of variables in their prediction of depression. The first predictor set, occupational status, is basic to this project: Depression was expected to vary as a function of occupational status. The second set, the four vulnerability variables of this project, were considered crucial as their relationship to depression has not been examined previously. The third set, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors to depression, form a unit based on the extensive research efforts by these authors. In the third set, in this dissertation, one of the four identified vulnerability factors was eliminated as "lack of outside employment" was already included in detail in the first predictor set. The fourth predictor set consists of the remaining background variables which were found to be related to depression in a variety of other studies. Therefore, the following hypotheses were derived:

Research Hypothesis 14: The four vulnerability variables—
(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving
style, (b) powerlessness orientation, (c) perceived dominance of partner, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism—will predict the degree of depression beyond that predicted by occupational status alone.

Research Hypothesis 15: The Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors—(a) loss of mother before age 11, (b) presence at home of three or more children under age 14, and (c) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person—if married, with husband—will predict the degree of depression beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability variables of this project and occupational status together.

Research Hypothesis 16: The 16 background variables—(a) occupational prestige, (b) age, (c) total annual gross family income, (d) total annual gross income of subject, (e) educational level, (f) amount of social contact, (g) number of confiding relationships, (h) freedom on the job, (i) number of people supervised, (j) number of children at home under 6 years of age, (k) number of changes desired, (l) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months, (m) overall life dissatisfaction, (n) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult, (o) career-homemaker orientation, and (p) ethnic background—will predict the degree of depression beyond that predicted by occupational status, the four vulnerability variables of this project, and the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors together.

An overview of the operational hypotheses, the null hypotheses, and inferential procedures is given in Chapter III, pages 134-138, in
this dissertation. The research hypotheses are summarized specifically on pages 136-138.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

The design and methodology chapter describes (a) population, sampling procedures, and sample characteristics, (b) classification variables, (c) dependent variable and its measurement, (d) control variable and its measurement, (e) predictor variables and their measurement, (f) data collection, (g) operational hypotheses and data analyses, and (h) anticipated results and significance.

Population, Sampling Procedures, and Sample Characteristics

The population consisted of all women who were listed in the 1979 city directory of Kalamazoo, Michigan, and whose last name, address, and telephone number were listed in the 1980 Kalamazoo telephone book. The city directory lists all inhabitants of the city of Kalamazoo and specifies their occupations and addresses. From this directory, a random sample of 936 women was drawn. This number was chosen so that four subjects were selected per three pages throughout the 702-page city directory. Thus, subjects were included regardless of their alphabetical order.

Sampling procedures consisted of two steps: First, a random sample of 936 women was drawn from the city directory by selecting four subjects per three pages. A table of random numbers served to randomly choose one subject from the page. The selection sequence of
subjects who are (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) semi/unskilled workers, and (d) homemakers was randomly determined and used throughout the sampling process. When the random number fell on a male rather than female, or on a subject whose occupational status did not match the predetermined status, an adjacent female whose occupational status fitted the requirements was selected.

Second, the 936 potential subjects were divided into four groups: (a) 234 professionals, (b) 234 clerical/sales workers, (c) 234 semi/unskilled workers, and (d) 234 homemakers. From each of the four groups, 60 subjects were randomly selected using a table of random numbers. A research assistant contacted 60 subjects per group by phone to obtain the subjects' current occupational status and whether they fell in the age range of 25-50. Appendix A gives the instructions to the research assistant governing phone contacts with the subjects. Subjects who fell in the age range of 25-50 and who were professionals, or clerical/sales workers, or semi/unskilled workers, or homemakers, were included in the sample. The research assistant briefly described the purpose of this study, informed potential participants of their right to confidentiality, of amount of time involved in participation, procedures, and asked the subjects for their voluntary participation. Subjects who could not be reached by phone after five trial calls, or who refused to answer any questions, or declined to participate, were replaced by randomly selecting subjects from the 234 subjects in the appropriate occupational status group.
The final target sample consisted of 60 women in each of the four occupational status groups, and of a total of 240 women between the ages of 25 and 50, who lived in Kalamazoo, Michigan, and who were working full time as professionals, or clerical/sales workers, or semi/unskilled workers, or homemakers. The sample size was set at N = 240 to allow for incomplete return of questionnaires. It was expected that about 45 fully completed questionnaires for each of the four groups would be received, resulting in a return rate of 75%.

**Classification Variables**

The main classification variable in this study was occupational status. Occupational status was determined by the listing of occupations in the current Kalamazoo City Directory, and by the subjects' designating themselves as full-time homemakers, or semi/unskilled workers, or clerical/sales workers, or professionals. Marital status was considered as a classification variable because sufficient numbers of subjects fell into the following three categories: never-married, divorced/separated, or currently married.

In the below three sections—Dependent Variable and Its Measurement, Control Variable and Its Measurement, and Predictor Variables and Their Measurement—the following format will be used:

**Definition of the variable.**

1. Scale description of variable measurement.
2. Rationale for selection of the scale.
3. Scale development.
4. Reliability and validity studies of the scale.
Dependent Variable and Its Measurement

In this study, the dependent variable was depression. As summarized in the review of selected literature, the measurement of depression is multifaceted: widely used measures encompass clinical interviews, self-report measures, and interviewer or observer ratings.

Depression was defined as disordered cognitive processes consisting of negative views of (a) self, (b) the world, and (c) the future. These negative cognitions lead to emotional, motivational, and behavioral phenomena such as pessimism, sadness, apathy, increased dependency, sleep disturbance, loss of appetite, and decreased libido. These phenomena have private consequences—the affirmation of the individual's negative views—and interpersonal and social consequences—distancing and isolation. Each of these consequences intensifies the other in a vicious cycle (cf. Beck, 1967; Radloff & Rae, 1979; Trembley, 1979).

Depression was operationally defined as the score on a self-report depression scale, the Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) Scale (Radloff, 1977).

1. The Center for Epidemiological Studies-Depression (CES-D) Scale

The CES-D Scale is a 20-item self-report depression symptom scale in which the subject is asked to indicate how s/he has felt during the past week by circling one of the four answer options:
(a) rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day), (2) a little or some of the time (1-2 days), (c) a moderate amount of time or occasion­ally (3-4 days), and (d) most or all of the time (5-7 days).

This scale was administered twice to measure length and consistency of depression: once with the standard instructions, and once asking the subject to indicate how s/he has felt during the past 6 months.

2. Rationale for Selection of the CES-D Scale

The CES-D Scale was employed in this study because it measures a variety of depressive symptoms, is easily readable and scorable, and has good properties with respect to internal consistency, test-retest stability, concurrent validity, and construct validity.

3. Development of the CES-D Scale

The following excerpt describes the scale development of the CES-D Scale:

The CES-D was developed to measure symptoms of depression in epidemiologic studies of general populations. It consists of 20 items selected from previously existing depression scales (e.g., Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale, Beck Depression Inventory, Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory), selected so that each major factor (or cluster of symptoms) in the clinical syndrome of depression (as identified by clinical judgment and factor-analytic studies) was represented by a few items. Items were also chosen on the basis of validity and discriminatory power when this could be determined from the literature. (Radloff & Rae, 1979, p. 175)
4. Reliability and Validity
Studies of the CES-D Scale

Radloff (1977) summarized results of a large-scale study of 5,066 subjects; the sample was comprised of patients and individuals from the general population. She stated the following reliabilities:
(a) internal consistencies, by measure of coefficient alpha and the Spearman-Brown method, were about .85 in the general population and about .90 in the patient sample; (b) test-retest correlations, by time interval between test and retest, varied as follows: N = 139, 2 weeks interval, r = .51; N = 105, 4 weeks interval, r = .67; N = 97, 6 weeks interval, r = .59; N = 78, 8 weeks interval, r = .59; total N = 419, total r = .57 (Radloff, 1977, p. 392).

Radloff (1977, p. 392) reported the following validities: 70 patients in Washington County scored substantially and significantly higher than the average for the general population samples; specifically, 70% of the patients and only 21% of the general population scored at and above an arbitrary cutoff score of 16. Correlations of the CES-D Scale with the Hamilton Clinician's Rating Scale and with the Raskin Rating Scale were moderate (.44 to .54) at admission, but increased substantially after 4 weeks of treatment (.69 to .75). Low negative correlations with the Marlowe-Crowne Scale of "social desirability" indicated that a general response set may be involved in the CES-D scores, but the bias was small.

Weissman, Sholomskas, Pottenger, Prusoff, and Locke (1977) conducted a validation study of the CES-D Scale and stated:
Results show that the scale is a sensitive tool for detecting depressive symptoms and change in symptoms over time in psychiatric populations, and that it agrees quite well with more lengthy self-report scales used in clinical studies and with clinician interview ratings. Although a symptom scale cannot differentiate between diagnostic groups, the CES-D has demonstrated its validity as a screening tool for detecting depressive symptoms in psychiatric populations. (p. 203)

5. Timeliness, Readability and Scoring of the CES-D Scale

The CES-D Scale takes about 5 minutes to complete; it is easily readable and understandable, and the items are short and specific. The scoring is objective, ranging from 0 to 3 per item, with the possible total range of scores from 0 to 60, with the higher scores indicating more symptoms, weighted by frequency of occurrence during the past week (Radloff, 1977, p. 386). The CES-D Scale and its scoring key are reproduced in Appendices B and C.

In this study, the original version of the CES-D Scale (Appendix B) and a revised version were given. In the revised version, the instructions were changed as follows: Please circle the number for each statement which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way—DURING THE PAST SIX MONTHS: Rarely, A little, Moderate, Most. Thus, the degree of depression over the past week and over the past 6 months was measured.

Control Variable and Its Measurement

The control variable in this study consisted of life events as measured by the Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview (PERI)
Life Events Scale (Dohrenwend et al., 1978).

Life events were defined as major changes of undesirable or desirable quality in an individual's life which interrupt the usual activities of the individual. These life events were conceptualized as similar to stressors. Two problems are apparent in the measurement of stressors based on life events: (a) oppressive stressful conditions may be stable and escape measurement (Makosky, in press); (b) the same stressor may be experienced differently by various individuals based on its idiosyncratic meaning. Despite these limitations, the PERI Life Events Scale was the most comprehensive and well-developed scale available at the time of the study to measure life changes.

1. The Psychiatric Epidemiology Research Interview (PERI) Life Events Scale

The PERI Life Events Scale is a list of 102 life events of desirable, neutral, and undesirable quality. It is an expansion of the list of 43 items used by Holmes and Rahe (1967) whereby additional items are included and the subject is allowed to specify the direction of change in many of the items. The scale scores are based on weighted mean scores for each of the events.

2. Rationale for Selection of the PERI Life Events Scale

The PERI Life Events Scale was utilized in this study because it was the most comprehensive list of life events available and is the result of exemplary scale development. It has been used in various research projects (Askenasy et al., 1977; Dohrenwend et al., 1978),
and some data on validities are available.

3. Development of the PERI Life Events Scale

The PERI Life Events Scale was constructed by asking subjects in New York City for the most recent major life event that interrupted or changed their usual activities. In addition, the researchers utilized previous lists and their own experiences. Each event was classified as to whether it was a possible reflection of the psychological condition the respondent was in, whether it indicated physical illness or injury, or whether it occurred independently of the subjects' psychological or physiological condition.

Based on the consensus among four judges, each event was classified as to whether it was a gain, a loss, or neutral. To arrive at mean scores for each of the 102 life events, the researchers utilized three sampling generations: (a) 2,627 adults, ages 21-64, randomly selected from the five boroughs of New York City; (b) 250 male and female heads of households, married or single, ages 21-64; (c) 124 subjects from sample (b), which represented the residentially most stable and cooperative members of the 4-year-old original sample. All subjects were asked to use marriage as modulus of 500, and to rate the remaining 101 events based on the amount of change that the average person would experience in the event. The order of events was randomized. Rating interviews were ultimately obtained from 124 subjects. This decrease in utilized subjects was due to careful stratification of the subjects in terms of sex, years of education, and ethnicity. Out of these 124 subjects, 92 completed the task.
satisfactorily and 32 failed to follow the instructions. The mean score of each subject's ratings was taken as a measure of the individual's possible rating bias and corrections were made on the individual level or rating.

4. Reliability and Validity Studies of the PERI Life Events Scale

There were no reliability studies available for the PERI Life Events Scale at the time of the present study.

Askenasy and associates (1977) explored "some effects of social class and ethnic group membership on judgments of the magnitude of stressful life events" (p. 432). They correlated the mean ratings of the 92 New York City subjects with previously published mean ratings from West Coast American, from Japanese, and from Western European samples. The following high positive correlations were found: total New York City sample correlated with West Coast Urban American sample, middle class, .90; with Southern Rural American sample, lower class, .73; with Japanese sample, .81; with Western European sample, .78; with Los Angeles Black sample, .79; and with Los Angeles Mexican American sample, .71.

Further analyses, however, showed that true rating differences and errors in the rating task were related to ethnicity and class of the subjects. Scores of subjects, from the New York City sample, having an educational level of 0-7 years, correlated between .32 and .59 with West Coast American, Japanese, and Western European samples.
Scores of subjects, from the same sample, with an educational level of 16 or more years, correlated between .65 and .95 with West Coast American, Japanese, and Western European samples. Based on these results, the supposed nearly universal consensus in life stress scores, previously claimed by Holmes and Masuda (1974), is likely to reflect a middle-class consensus (Askenasy et al., 1977).

In a subsequent study with the PERI Life Events Scale, Dohrenwend et al. (1978) found that for 17 events out of 102 events the ratings varied depending on the ethnicity of the raters, whereas only four events differed with class and three events differed with sex. Thus, ethnicity tended to influence the frequency of ratings of life events.

In summary, there were no data available at the time of the study which would indicate the degree of reliability for the PERI Life Events Scale. In addition, no reliability data on the frequency of occurrence of individual life events were available. Some data indicated that the frequency of occurrence of life events differed between groups of subjects, depending on the ethnicity of the subjects. Further, the subjects' social class influenced correlations with other samples in that middle-class subjects' scores correlated highly with various other samples' scores (around .80), and scores of lower-class subjects correlated less with other samples' scores (around .40).

5. Timeliness, Readability, and Scoring of the PERI Life Events Scale

The PERI Life Events Scale takes about 5 minutes to complete. The items are short and specific, and the subjects mark all items
which apply to them during the past 6 months (Dohrenwend, Note 3).

Two scoring methods are available: (a) a frequency count of all life events, of undesirable life events or losses, of desirable life events or gains, of neutral life events, and of relative losses or gains; and (b) the weighted mean scores of all life events, of desirable life events or gains, of undesirable life events or losses, of neutral life events, and of relative losses or gains. In this study, group comparisons were based on weighted mean scores of undesirable life events. Undesirable life events are conceptually similar to loss experiences, which are related to depression. Appendices D and E show the 102 items of the PERI Life Events Scale and the arithmetic means of the subgroup ratings.

**Predictor Variables and Their Measurement**

In this study, the following predictor variables, or potential vulnerability variables to depression, were used:

1. Achieving styles, as measured by the Achieving Styles Inventory (Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13).

2. Perceived dominance-submission in significant relationship, as measured by the Lu Dominance-Submission Scale (Lu, 1950) which was revised for use in this dissertation.

3. Mastery/powerlessness orientation, as measured by the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale (Frank, et al., 1978).

4. Attitudes toward feminism, as measured by the FEM Scale (Smith et al., 1975).
1. Achieving Style

Achieving style was defined as the characteristic way in which an individual approaches achieving situations, whether directly or through relationships with others. Achieving styles vary to the extent to which they are task- or self-related, and whether they are direct or indirect. Direct achieving styles were characterized by the direct acting on the world and the direct confrontation of the achievement task, using one's personal efforts of mind and body to accomplish the goals. Relational achieving styles were characterized by the seeking of success or achievement through the medium of relationships by establishing, contributing to, acting through, depending on, or manipulating relationships to achieve one's goals.

Achieving style was operationally defined as the total score and the subscale scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory (Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13).

1.1 The Achieving Styles Inventory (ASI). The ASI has been developed over the past 6 years by Handley-Isaksen and colleagues (Note 13). Form 10 of the ASI is a 45-item self-administered instrument, scored by an unweighted sum-score method. The ASI consists of nine subscales, and each subscale is made up of five items with similar content. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale, ranging from "never" = 1 to "always" = 7. The subject is asked to indicate which number on the rating scale is the best behavioral indicator. The ASI scores reflect two major achieving styles, the direct achieving style and the relational achieving style. The direct
achieving style consists of the sum of the scores of the four achieving styles subscales: intrinsic direct, competitive direct, power direct, and instrumental direct. The relational achieving style consists of the sum of the scores of the five relational achieving styles subscales: vicarious relational, contributory relational, collaborative relational, reliant relational, and instrumental relational.

1.2. Rationale for the Selection of the ASI. Much of the previous research on achievement motivation or achievement orientation has focused exclusively on direct achievement needs of individuals. The relational aspects of achievement have been neglected. The ASI is the first scale which measures both direct and relational aspects of achieving behavior. Most of the past research instruments of achievement motivation are projective tests which tend to be lengthy, and which typically do not allow test administration without an extensively trained psychological examiner. The Achieving Styles Inventory is a self-administered instrument which can be completed in less than 10 minutes. In addition, it has good scale properties in terms of reliabilities and discriminant ability (Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13).

1.3. Scale Development of the ASI. The ASI had undergone 10 revisions prior to its use in this study. It was developed over a period of 5 years by first constructing a pool of logical items in behavioral terms; the items were then administered to several populations and items which intercorrelated were eliminated; factor analyses were applied to assure that items of one scale loaded highly on the
particular style being measured and not on other styles; the instru-
ment then was tested in samples of empirically defined criterion
groups, such as individuals in service organizations, managers, and
engineering students; finally, the ASI was administered to more than
3,300 respondents from various samples.

1.4. Reliability and Validity Studies of the ASI. Form 10 of
the ASI is a 45-item instrument which shows "adequate reliability,
using both Cronbach alphas as estimates of scale reliability and four
week test-retest coefficients as estimates of stability" (Lipman-
Blumen et al., in press, p. 32).

At the time of this project, the authors of the ASI were conduct-
ing several validation studies, including an examination of the rela-
tionship between the ASI scales and scales from several other psycho-
logical instruments. They were also in the process of establishing
norms for sex, age, and occupational groups (Handley-Isaksen et al.,
Note 13).

The following scale reliabilities for three samples are reported
in the Preliminary Manual of the Form 10 ASI (Handley-Isaksen et al.,
Note 13).

Cronback Alphas for Identified Samples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples:</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Male Managers &amp; Spouses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample Size:</td>
<td>(N = 2,134)</td>
<td>(N = 52)</td>
<td>(N = 281)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>13-19 years</td>
<td>19-37 years</td>
<td>27-62 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.:</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Samples: High School College Male Managers & Spouses

Scales:
- Intrinsic Direct: .81 .83 .80
- Competitive Direct: .80 .88 .90
- Power Direct: .87 .82 .92
- Instrumental Direct: .76 .75 .75
- Instrumental Relational: .77 .76 .84
- Reliant Relational: .73 .73 .77
- Collaborative Relational: .84 .92 .91
- Contributory Relational: .80 .79 .86
- Vicarious Direct: .82 .79 .86
- *Direct Domain: .88 .86 .91
- *Relational Domain: .85 .69 .89
- *Test Item Mean: .93 .90 .93

*Stratified Alpha

Test-Retest Reliability:

No data on ASI Form 10 are available at the present time; however, over a four week interval on previous forms (ASI-6L (Original item pool), 6S & 6P (Split Halves of Form 6L)), in a sample of 203 Mid-Western Sophomore and Junior High School students, the following data were found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales:</th>
<th>Form 6L 105 Items</th>
<th>Form 6S 50 Items</th>
<th>Forms 6S/6P 50/52 Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Direct</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental Relational</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant Relational</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Domain</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Domain</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Item Mean</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not Corrected by Spearman-Brown Formula

Discriminant Ability of the ASI Form 10:

Both items and scales of the ASI were used as predictors of sex and age groups. On page 21 of the Preliminary Manual.
[Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13], the following summaries of the results on the previously listed three samples are given, using the total sample both to calculate the discriminating statistic and to classify subjects by sex:

The ASI Used to Classify Samples by Sex:

Prior Probability: 50%
Percent of Correct Classification

Group: High School Sample (N = 2,118)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Using Items as Predictors</th>
<th>Using Scales as Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>989</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1,129</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Hit Rate: 71% 68%

Group: College Sample

Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Using Items as Predictors</th>
<th>Using Scales as Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Hit Rate: 94% 83%

Group: Male Managers & Spouses (N = 281) (41 Items Used)

Sex:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Using Items as Predictors</th>
<th>Using Scales as Predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall Hit Rate: 91% 85%

The ASI Used to Classify Sample by Age by Sex:

Group: Male Managers & Spouses (N = 273) (41 Items Used)

Using ASI Items as Predictors
Prior Probability: 16.7%
Percentage of Correct Classification

Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>(N)</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 Years</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>(37)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>(44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>(95)</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>(53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Years or More</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>(31)</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Overall Hit Rate: 63%
Using ASI Scales as Predictors

### Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male (N)</th>
<th>Female (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 40 Years</td>
<td>46% (37)</td>
<td>39% (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 Years</td>
<td>57% (95)</td>
<td>42% (53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Years or More</td>
<td>23% (31)</td>
<td>46% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Overall Hit Rate: 45%

1.5. Timeliness, Readability, and Scoring of the ASI. The 45 items of the ASI Form 10 are easily readable and take about 5-10 minutes to complete. The subject is asked to indicate, on a 7-point scale, the response which best represents the subject's behavior.

The ASI is scored by an unweighted sum-score method. The total score ranges from 45 to 315; the direct domain score from 20 to 140; and the relational domain score from 25 to 175. Mean scores for the total score, for the direct domain score, and for the relational domain score range from 1 to 35. In the ASI manual, a SPSS Program is suggested for the scoring and analyses of the ASI data. Appendices F and G show the Achieving Styles Inventory and its scoring key. Descriptions of the Achieving Styles Inventory Scales are given in Appendix H.

2. Dominance-Submission in Significant Relationship

Type of relationship with one's significant person was defined as the perceptions of the individual concerning her/himself and her/his partner in terms of degree of dominance versus submission. A significant person was defined as the person who is very important to the individual in her/his present life and with whom s/he has regular contact. Dominant relationship with submissive person was defined as the...
individual's perceptions of him/herself as dominant in his/her relationship with his/her partner whom s/he perceives as submissive.

Egalitarian relationship with significant person was defined as the individual's perceptions of her/himself as equal to her/his partner, neither seen as submissive nor dominant. Submissive relationship with dominant person was defined as the individual's perceptions of him/herself as submissive in his/her relationship with his/her partner whom s/he perceives as dominant.

Type of relationship with one's significant person was operationally defined as the discrepancy between scores of the subject's self-perceptions and the subject's perceptions of her significant person, as obtained in the Lu Dominance-Submission Scale (Lu, 1950; revised in this dissertation).

2.1. Lu Dominance-Submission Scale (Dominant-Egalitarian-Submissive = DES). This instrument consists of 16 items: 8 items focus on relationship factors, and 8 on personality variables. Some items have rating scales, some have a forced-choice format, and some are open-ended. The questionnaire exists in two forms: one for the wife and one for the husband. The forms differ only in minor wording—i.e., the wife's form asks about the husband, and the reverse is true for the husband's form. For purposes of this dissertation project, the DES Scale was revised to encompass 27 items from both forms of the Lu DES Scale. Some of the items were slightly modified. Two items in Lu's scale were deleted because of their overlap with other items when only one member of a couple responds. The revised scale was
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administered to women only and asked subjects to rate themselves and to rate their significant person on Lu's relationship and personality items. The term "significant person" rather than "husband" was chosen to include subjects who are not currently married. The ratings of the items were simplified to allow for continuous ratings from 4 = "strongly agree" to 0 = "strongly disagree" on all but four open-ended items. The original version of the Dominance-Submission Scale with its scoring key is given in Appendix I. The revised version of the Dominance-Submission Scale and its scoring are given in Appendices J and K.

2.2. Rationale for the Selection of the DES Scale. Despite its age, the DES has no outdated items. The DES is the shortest scale available which assesses the relational aspects of dominance and submission. It is easily readable and can be completed in less than 5 minutes. Objective scoring is available.

2.3. Scale Development of the DES Scale. Lu (1950) selected 28 personality items from an engagement schedule for couples and from a marriage schedule (Burgess & Wallin, 1953). Lu selected the items because of their face validity in terms of dominant, egalitarian, and submissive roles in marriage. Lu then compared the responses of 42 couples with their response on the following item: "When disagreements arise between husband and wife, who gives in?" She found 8 personality items and 7 relationship items which discriminated between couples in which the husband was dominant, and couples in which the wife was dominant. These 15 items and the "disagreement" item make up
both forms of the instrument.

2.4. Reliability and Validity Studies of the DES Scale. Kokonis (1971) reported a test-retest reliability coefficient of .64 for the DES Scale. This was based on pilot work, and no information was given regarding subjects or the test-retest interval.

Beere (1979) reported the following summary of validity data for the DES Scale:

Lu (1950) compared the scores for forty-two couples with interview information obtained from them. When Lu rated the interview information on dominance, she found that her rating agreed with the classification from the Lu Dominance-Submission Scale for 93 percent of the couples classified as "husband dominant," 71 percent of the couples classified as "equalitarian," and 86 percent of the couples classified as "wife dominant" (n = 14 couples per classification). Lu also reports that for 397 couples, one, two, or three friends rated the dominance of the husband and the wife. The correlation between the scores on the Lu Dominance-Submission Scale and the ratings given by friends was .514 (p < .001). (p. 285)

2.5. Timeliness, Readability, and Scoring of the DES and Its Revision. The DES Scale takes less than 5 minutes to complete. Most items are multiple choice format and allow for fast and easy responding. Four items in the revised version are open-ended. For the multiple choice items, objective scoring is available. The open-ended items are scored based on the degree to which a subject's responses reflect behavioral or personality characteristics of self or of the significant person which are closely related to "dominance" or to "submission." For example, "stubbornness" would be rated +2 for the subject or for her partner, whereas "dependency" would be rated -2 for the subject or for her partner.
Appendix I shows the original version of the Dominance-Submission Scale with its scoring key. Appendices J and K show the revised Dominance-Submission Scale and its scoring key.

3. Mastery/Powerlessness

Mastery was defined as the feelings of success which are experienced as control over one's internal reactions and relevant external events, and whereby the success is attributed to one's own behaviors.

Mastery was operationally defined as the score on a self-report summated rating scale, the Mastery/Powerlessness (M/P) Scale (Frank et al., 1978).

3.1. The Mastery/Powerlessness (M/P) Scale. The Mastery/Powerlessness (M/P) Scale is a 16-item self-report summated rating scale which is composed of three separate sections: (a) eight items assessing situational/behavioral aspects of mastery/powerlessness; (b) seven items assessing attitudinal aspects of mastery/powerlessness, and (c) one item, a global bipolar rating scale, indicating the general degree of control experienced over one's life.

3.2. Rationale for Selection of the M/P Scale. The M/P Scale was selected because it measures situational/behavioral and attitudinal aspects of mastery. It is a theoretically sound scale with good face validity and with some evidence of reliability and validity. The scale takes a few minutes to complete. It has been used in a variety of research projects with clients at the John Hopkins Institute (Frank et al., 1978; Liberman, Note 21).
3.3. Scale Development of the M/P Scale. The M/P Scale was developed by Liberman (1978, cited in Frank et al., 1978) "to provide information concerning a patient's attribution orientation (self vs. external) and is based upon a concept similar to locus of control (Rotter, 1966)" (p. 202). The first section of the scale was designed to assess typical behaviors of an individual in eight everyday situational events. The second section of the M/P Scale was derived from Seeman's Powerlessness Scale (Seeman & Evans, 1962) to measure the degree to which an individual attributes happenings to his or her own efforts or to chance. The third section—a global bipolar rating scale ranging from "no control" to "complete control"—was included to reflect an individual's overall sense of control of life.

3.4. Reliabilities and Validities of the M/P Scale. Reliabilities for the M/P Scale are available from two studies: (a) the Mastery Study with a sample of 29 outpatients, and (b) the Arousal Study with a sample of 42 subjects (Liberman, Note 21). In the Mastery Study, the following within-scale correlations, or within-test reliabilities, were found: total score of the M/P Scale correlated .66 with the situational/behavioral subscale score (p < .01); with powerlessness (attitudinal), .83 (p < .01); with global rating, .79 (p < .01).

The following correlations were found within the subscales: situational/behavioral with powerlessness (attitudinal), .21; situational/behavioral with global rating, .30; powerlessness (attitudinal) with global rating, .55 (p < .01). All correlations were Pearson
Product-Moment coefficients (Liberman, Note 21).

In the Arousal Study (Liberman, Note 21), the correlations were as follows: total score of the M/P Scale correlated with the situational/behavioral subscale score, .71 (p < .01); with the powerlessness (attitudinal) subscale score, .89 (p < .01); with the global rating, .78 (p < .01).

Among the subscales, the correlations were: situational/behavioral with powerlessness (attitudinal), .38 (p < .01); situational/behavioral with global rating, .29; powerlessness (attitudinal) with global rating, .69 (p < .01). Test-retest correlations on each subscale and on the total score over a 12-week period were: situational/behavioral, .48 (p < .01); powerlessness (attitudinal), .46 (p < .01); global rating, .16; total score, .40 (p < .01). All correlations were Pearson Product-Moment coefficients.

The following data on validities of the M/P Scale were reported by Liberman (Note 21). In the Mastery Study (N = 29), the M/P Scale total score correlated with other outcome measures as follows: with the Clark Personal and Social Adjustment Scale (CPSAS), .67 (p < .01); with the Hopkins Symptom Checklist/Discomfort Scale (HSCL), -.56 (p < .01); with the Global Improvement measure (GI), .47 (p < .01); with the Target Complaint measure (TC), .46 (p < .01). All correlations were Pearson Product-Moment coefficients. These assessment instruments are described in detail in Frank and associates (1978, pp. 195-208).

In the Arousal Study (N = 42), the M/P Scale total score correlated with other outcome measures as follows: with the CPSAS, .48
(p < .01); with the GI, .42 (p < .01); with the TC, .39 (p < .01).

In the Mastery Study, scores on the total M/P Scale differed significantly between 32 patients and 34 college students (p < .01), with college students scoring higher than patients. Differences for these two groups on the subscales were significant at the following levels: on the situational/behavioral scale, p < .05; on the powerlessness (attitudinal) scale, p < .05; on the global rating scale, p < .01.

In the Arousal Study, additional data were obtained for the validity of the M/P Scale. Two client groups (N = 27; N = 13) who did not differ on any variable relevant to mastery, and one group of college students (N = 34) were compared. No significant differences were found for mean scores on the total M/P Scale, on the situational/behavioral subscale, on the powerlessness (attitudinal) scale, and on the global rating scale.

Total M/P scores for each of five different samples of subjects were compared. One of the samples, the college students, received no treatment or intervention between pre- and post-evaluation points; the other four groups received some form of psychotherapy, different for each group, between pre- and post-evaluation points. The M/P Scale total mean scores were as follows for each group: "College Student" (N = 34)—pre = 15.44, post = 16.12; "Mastery" (N = 14)—pre = 12.07, post = 15.6, follow-up = 15.1; "Placebo" (N = 15)—pre = 10.90, post = 14.2, follow-up = 14.1; "Adrenalin Experimental" (N = 28)—pre = 13.00, post = 15.07; "No Adrenalin Control" (N = 14)—pre = 12.14, post = 15.00.
The results showed that college students had higher scores on the M/P Scale than any of the patient groups. In addition, post-treatment scores for each of the patient groups were higher than pre-treatment scores, indicating higher mastery-orientation after some form of psychotherapy had occurred.

3.5. Timeliness, Readability, and Scoring of the M/P Scale.
Completion of the M/P Scale takes about 5 minutes. The items on the situational/behavioral subscale are short, specific, and easily readable. The items on the powerlessness (attitudinal) subscale are lengthier, and the forced-choice format was rated as difficult by some of the subjects in the pilot study of this dissertation project.

The scoring is objective and fast, ranging from 0 to 8 on the situational/behavioral subscale, from 0 to 7 on the powerlessness (attitudinal) subscale, and from 0 to 6 on the global rating scale. The total score on the M/P Scale ranges from 0 to 21, with higher scores indicating increasing mastery orientation. Appendix L shows the 16 items of the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, and Appendix M gives its scoring key.

4. Attitudes Toward Feminism

Feminism was defined as belief in equal legal, economic, and personal rights between the sexes. Feminism was operationally defined as the score on the FEM-Scale (Smith et al., 1975).

4.1. The FEM-Scale. The FEM-Scale (Smith et al., 1975) is a 20-item summated rating scale with five response options for each
item, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The statements reflect attitudes toward women's marital and maternal roles. Sample items are: "It is all right for women to work but men will always be the basic breadwinners"; and "A woman should be expected to change her name when she marries." Low scores on the FEM-Scale indicate traditional sex-role attitudes, whereas high scores indicate disagreement with traditional sex-role attitudes and support for feminism. Abbreviated 10-item and five-item versions for use in surveys are available (Singleton & Christiansen, 1977).

4.2. Rationale for the Selection of the FEM-Scale. The 20-item FEM-Scale and the two abbreviated scales are well developed scales with good internal consistency, with acceptable reliabilities, and with evidence of validity (Beere, 1979). The shortened versions can be used with confidence in larger-scale surveys because of their sufficient reliabilities, validities, and short completion times. In an extensive review of scales on women and women's issues, Beere (1979) underscored the worth of these scales and recommended that they be considered for use in further research.

In this dissertation project, the 10-item scale was used because of its short completion time of 3 minutes and its acceptable correlation of .88 with the 20-item FEM-Scale.

4.3. Scale Development of the FEM-Scale. The FEM-Scale is based on 41 items adapted from Kirkpatrick's (1936) "Belief Pattern Scale"--a 50-item measure--and 16 items developed by Smith et al. (1975). These 57 items were given to 39 undergraduates--28 males and 11
females—enrolled in a psychology course at an Ivy League college: subjects were asked to "agree" or "disagree" with the statements and then to role-play "a strong pro-feminist" (19 subjects) or a "strong anti-feminist" (20 subjects). Ambiguous items were eliminated. From the remaining 48 items, 27 items were selected to form a non-repetitive scale with good face-validity. This 27-item scale, with five response options per item, was given to 100 Harvard summer school students—52 females and 48 males—ranging in age from 15 to 34. Factor analyses of the subjects' responses yielded a single factor, "feminism," which accounted for 37.7% of the total variance. Smith et al. (1975) retained 20 items with loadings above .40 to form the final scale.

Singleton and Christiansen (1977) factor analyzed the 20-item FEM-Scale and extracted a single factor which accounted for 38% of the total variance. They constructed 10-item and five-item versions of the FEM-Scale by including items with the highest factor loadings. These shorter versions were found to correlate with the 20-item FEM-Scale .88 and .81.

4.4. Reliability and Validity Studies of the FEM-Scale and Its Shorter Versions. Smith et al. (1975) reported a reliability coefficient of .91 based on responses of the 100 Harvard summer school students. Singleton and Christiansen (1977) reported a reliability coefficient alpha of .91 based on a sample of 283 respondents who were heterogeneous in terms of sex, age, and race. Singleton and Christiansen (1977) further obtained coefficient alpha reliability estimates,
for their abbreviated 10-item and five-item versions with the 20-item FEM-Scale, of .88 and .81.

Smith et al. (1975) reported a correlation, between the 20-item version and the 27-item version, of .973. They predicted and obtained significant positive correlations between scores on the FEM-Scale with a measure of activism in the women's liberation movement ($r = .392, p < .01$), and with a measure of identification with the women's liberation movement ($r = .629, p < .01$). They predicted and obtained a nonsignificant correlation between the FEM-Scale and the Rotter Introversion-Extroversion Scale (Rotter, 1966). Correlations with the Just World Scale (Smith et al., 1975)—a measure of perceptions whether the world is a just place—and the FEM-Scale were predicted negatively and resulted in a correlation coefficient of $- .238, p < .05$. Based on the responses of their heterogeneous sample of 283 subjects, Singleton and Christiansen (1977) correlated the FEM-Scale with three other attitudinal measures. All correlations were significant and in the predicted direction. Thus, the FEM-Scale correlated negatively with a measure of anti-black prejudice ($r = - .462, p < .001$), negatively with a measure of dogmatism ($r = - .506, p < .001$), and positively with the Singleton-Christiansen Index of identification with the women's movement ($r = .638, p < .001$). Correlations for the 10-item and five-item abbreviated versions were: for anti-black prejudice, $- .404$ and $- .401$; for dogmatism, $- .529$ and $- .477$; and, for identification with the women's movement, $.593$ and $.579$. All correlations were significant at beyond the .001 level. In addition, Singleton and Christiansen (1977) administered the FEM-Scale to 88
members of the National Organization for Women (pro-feminist), to 149 female students, to 129 male students, and to 59 members of Fascinating Womanhood (anti-feminist). They predicted a score decrease on the FEM-Scale in the listed sequence. A rank ordering of mean scores conformed exactly to their predictions (91.30; 77.24; 66.16; 51.03), and all mean differences were significant at beyond the .001 level.

4.5. Timeliness, Readability, and Scoring of the FEM-Scale.
The 20-item FEM-Scale can be completed in 5 minutes, the 10-item version in 3 minutes, and the five-item version in 2 minutes. All scales are easily readable. Both the 10-item version and the five-item version have one-directional items which increase ease of responding.

Items are objectively scored and equally weighted. On the 20-item FEM-Scale, total scores range from 20 to 100, with higher scores indicating increasing support for feminism. Scores on the 10-item version range from 10 to 50, and scores on the five-item version from 5 to 25.

In this dissertation project, the 10-item scale was used because of its short completion time of 3 minutes, its strong correlation of .88 with the 20-item FEM-Scale, and its sufficient reliability and validity. Appendices N and O show the 10-item FEM-Scale and its scoring key.
Data Collection

The sample consisted of a total of 240 women between the ages of 25 and 50, who lived in Kalamazoo County, Michigan, who were working as professionals, or clerical/sales workers, or semi/unskilled workers, or homemakers, and who agreed to participate in this study. The sample was stratified so that 60 subjects fell in each of the four occupational status groups.

The 240 volunteering subjects received a cover-letter, an informed consent sheet, the 12-page questionnaire, and a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. Specific written instructions were included for each section of the questionnaire. The subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire within 2 days after they had started to respond. Subjects whose questionnaires had not been returned by 5 days after the requested mail-in date were contacted by phone by the research assistant. When necessary, the questionnaire was mailed a second time. No further follow-up efforts were made. Appendix P shows the letter to the participants, and Appendix Q shows the Women's Roles Questionnaire with the informed consent form.

In the pilot study, 13 out of the 16 randomly selected, volunteering subjects (80%) completed and returned the questionnaire within 10 days. Assuming that a similar response rate would hold true for the actual study, the acceptable return rate of this study was set at 75%, or at a total of 180 returned and completed questionnaires. Because a sufficient number of subjects responded who were either (a) never-married, (b) divorced/separated, or (c) presently married,
analyses of variance were performed to examine group mean differences of the three marital status groups on the dependent variables.

All scales utilized in the questionnaire allowed for objective scoring and coding.

**Operational and Null Hypotheses and Inferential Procedures**

In this section, the following format was used for each of the 16 hypotheses stated in the previous chapter. For each of the hypotheses, the operation was first stated ($H_1$), followed by the hypothesis stated in null form ($H_0$); inferential procedures were given for each null hypothesis.

**Overview**

The first 10 hypotheses of this research refer to differences among the four occupational status groups—(a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals—and among the three marital status groups—(a) married women, (b) never-married women, and (c) divorced/separated women. The dependent variables employed in the first 10 hypotheses are: (a) undesirable life events, (b) the three depression measures, and (c) the four vulnerability variables—achieving styles, perceived dominance, mastery orientation, and attitudes toward feminism.

Whenever a specific rank order was hypothesized, ordered means analyses (Bartholomew, cited in Barlow, Bartholomew, Bremner, & Brunk, 1972; Stoline, 1981) were employed. Analyses of variance were
employed when nondirectional differences on certain variables were expected within the larger population. In this project, any hypotheses of rank order refer to occupational status groups because of the researcher's assumption, based on the literature review, that specific rank ordered differences exist on certain variables among women of differing occupational status. In a few cases, differences between occupational status groups were hypothesized as nondirectional due to the lack of directional data in the literature. Differences between the three marital status groups were hypothesized to be nondirectional and were analyzed by use of the analysis of variance; the contradictory results of the literature on the effects of marital status on certain variables precluded the development of rank order hypotheses.

The first two hypotheses refer to differences in undesirable life event changes among the four occupational status groups, and among the three marital status groups. Undesirable life event changes are conceptually similar to loss events. In this project it was important to control for undesirable life event changes so that the effects of occupational and marital status could be examined independently of loss events. Based on tests of the first two hypotheses, no controls for undesirable life event changes were found to be necessary for occupational status, as the four occupational status groups did not differ on the variable. However, the marital status groups were found to differ significantly with respect to undesirable life event changes, making it necessary to statistically control the effects of undesirable life event changes for the subsequent analyses.
by use of the analysis of covariance in the examination of the effects of marital status on depression. Also, when studying the effects of both marital and occupational status on depression, a two-way analysis of covariance was employed.

Hypotheses 11, 12, and 13 refer to expected relations of certain variables to depression, and to interrelationships among those variables. Hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 refer to predictions of degree of depression through occupational status, the hypothesized vulnerability variables of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors, and selected background variables.

The 16 hypotheses are presented below in summary format; the independent variables, the dependent variables, and the inferential procedures are indicated by "(IV)," "(DV)," and "*," respectively.

1. Occupational status groups (IV) do not differ in undesirable life events (DV); * one-way analysis of variance at α = .5.

2. Marital status groups (IV) do not differ in undesirable life events (DV); * one-way analysis of variance at α = .5.

3. Occupational status groups (IV) differ in a specified rank order on depression (DV); * ordered means analyses (Stoline, 1981) at P = .05.

4. Marital status groups (IV) differ on depression (DV); * one-way analysis of covariance at α = .05 to control for undesirable life events.

5. Depression (DV) varies as a function of both occupational (IV) and marital (IV) status; * two-way analysis of covariance to control for undesirable life event changes and to examine possible
interaction effects, at $\alpha = .05$.

6. Occupational status groups (IV) differ in a specified rank order on direct achieving style (DV) and on total achieving style (DV); * ordered means analyses at $P = .05$.

7. Occupational status groups (IV) differ on relational achieving style (DV), perceived dominance of self (DV) and perceived dominance in relationship (DV); * one-way analyses of variance at $\alpha = .05$.

8. Occupational status groups (IV) differ in a specified rank order on perceived dominance of partner (DV); * ordered means analysis at $P = .05$.

9. Occupational status groups (IV) differ in a specified rank order on mastery orientations (DV's) and on attitudes toward feminism (DV); * ordered means analyses at $P = .05$.

10. Marital status groups (IV) differ on achieving styles (DV's), perceived dominance of self, of partner, and in relationship (DV's), mastery orientations (DV's), and attitudes toward feminism (DV); * one-way analyses of variance at $\alpha = .05$.

11. The four vulnerability variables of this project are related to depression; * Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients, significant at $\alpha = .05$.

12. The four vulnerability variables of this project are inter-related; * Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients, significant at $\alpha = .05$.

13. The 16 background variables and the Brown and Harris (1978) variables are related to depression; * Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients, significant at $\alpha = .05$. 
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14. The four vulnerability measures of this project (IV's) add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression (DV) beyond that predicted by occupational status (IV); * two multiple regressions and F-test at $\alpha = .05$ on the two R-Squares.

15. The Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures (IV's) add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression (DV) beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability measures of this project (IV's) and occupational status together (IV); * multiple regression and F-test at $\alpha = .05$ on the two R-Squares.

16. The 16 background variables (IV's) add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression (DV) beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability measures of this project (IV's), occupational status (IV), and the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures (IV's) together; * multiple regression and F-test at $\alpha = .05$ on the two R-Squares.

Hypotheses 1-16

Hypothesis 1: Occupational Status and Undesirable Life Events

$H_1 = H_0$: The four occupational status groups--(a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals--will not differ in group mean scores of undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule (Dohrenwend et al., 1978).
**Inferential Procedures.** A one-way analysis of variance, with four levels, was employed at $\alpha = .5$ to estimate the probability of having obtained the sample mean score differences, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, by chance, when in fact there may be no differences between these means in the larger population. The results of this one-way analysis of variance at $\alpha = .5$ were used to decide whether or not it was necessary to control for possible differences in undesirable life event changes between the four occupational status groups in further analyses. The purpose of the one-way analysis of variance is: "to test the hypothesis that $J$ population means are equal. . . . Hence Anova is generally employed in experimental studies in which tests on differences among means are of primary interest" (Huitema, 1980, pp. 15-16).

In order to decrease Type II error, or $\beta$—i.e., to decrease the likelihood of retaining a false null hypothesis—$\alpha$ was set at the .5 level. Thus, when there were no significant differences at $\alpha = .5$, the null hypothesis was retained with confidence. In such case, the group means of undesirable life event changes were omitted for further analyses. When the null hypothesis was rejected, variability of life event changes was controlled through the analysis of covariance, with life events scores as the covariate, and the predictor variables as the variates.

If the null hypothesis was rejected, protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed because of their good power and applicability in the unbalanced case, as well as their control of Type I error (false declaration of significance).
Hypothesis 2: Marital Status and Undesirable Life Events

$H_1 = H_0$: The three marital status groups—(a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated—will not differ in group mean scores of undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule.

Inferential procedures and rationale for Hypothesis 2 are equivalent to those for Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 3: Occupational Status and Depression

$H_1$: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, on each of the three dependent variables: (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, as measured by the CES-D Scale.

$H_0$: There will be no differences among the population means of the four occupational status groups at $P = .05$, in scores on the CES-D Scale.

Inferential Procedures. The equality of ordered means was tested "by way of the likelihood ratio principle, which yields a test criterion provided that the likelihood of the sample under the alternative hypothesis can be maximized" (Barlow, Bartholomew, Bremner, & Brunk,
1972, p. 117). This approach was selected because most of the standard tests are not designed to detect any specific kind of differences between the population means (Barlow et al., 1972, p. 116).

Stoline (1981) developed a computer program which deals with up to four group means and tests whether at least one of the group means differs from a predetermined rank ordering of means. The program is based on Bartholomew's (Barlow et al., 1972) approach to testing the equality of ordered means via the likelihood ratio tests in the normal case. This program calculates an E-Squared statistic which has an associated estimated reliability value P. When P > .05, then the null hypothesis, \( H_0: \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_3 = \mu_4 \), was accepted at a \( P = .05 \) level of significance, and no further testing was employed. When \( P < .05 \), then the null hypothesis was rejected. Follow-up pairwise comparison tests consisted of one-tailed directional t-tests, each at \( \alpha = .05 \), to determine in which of the pairwise comparisons there were significant differences in the hypothesized direction. Stoline's (1981) program is the only currently available computer program at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, to test the equality of rank ordered means, as specified in the operational statement of Hypothesis 3.

**Hypothesis 4: Marital Status and Depression**

\( H_1: \) When the effects of undesirable life event changes, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be differences in the group mean scores of subjects on the CES-D
Scale in degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined, among the three marital status groups of (a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated.

$H_0$: When the effects of undesirable life event changes, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be no differences among population means of the three marital status groups, at $\alpha = .05$, in scores on the CES-D Scale in degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined.

Inferential Procedures. Three preliminary homogeneity of regression tests were employed to measure the parallelity of the slopes, and when the assumptions of parallel slopes were met, analyses of covariance were employed.

Three one-way analyses of covariance were employed at $\alpha = .05$ to control statistically for the effects of undesirable life event scores, and to estimate the probability of having obtained the adjusted sample mean score differences, as measured by the CES-D Scale, by chance, when in fact there may have been no differences among these adjusted means in the larger population. In order to decrease Type I error or $\alpha$—i.e., to decrease the likelihood of rejecting a true null hypothesis—$\alpha$ was set at an .05 level of significance.

When significant effects of marital status on depression were found, then protected LSD pairwise comparisons on the adjusted group means were employed to examine differences between each of two groups,
for all possible group combinations.

**Hypothesis 5: Occupational and Marital Status and Depression**

**H₁**: When the effects of undesirable life event changes, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be differences in the group mean scores of subjects on the CES-D Scale in degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined, as a function of occupational and marital status.

**H₀**: When the effects of undesirable life events, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be no differences among population means as a function of occupational and marital status, in scores on the CES-D Scale in degree of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined.

**Inferential Procedures**. Three preliminary homogeneity of regression tests were employed to measure the parallelity of the slopes, and when the assumptions of parallel slopes were met, analyses of covariance were employed.

Three two-way analyses of covariance were employed at α = .05, to control for the effects of undesirable life events on the degree of depression, and to estimate the probability of having obtained the sample mean score differences, as measured by the CES-D Scale, by chance, when in fact there may have been no differences between these means in the larger population.
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When no significant interaction effects of occupational and marital status were found, then Protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed on the adjusted marginal means.

**Hypothesis 6: Occupational Status and Total and Direct Achieving Style**

**H_1:** There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, on each of the two dependent variables: (a) total achieving style, and (b) direct achieving style, as measured by the Achieving Style Inventory.

**H_0:** There will be no differences in the population means of the four occupational status groups, at \( P = .05 \), in scores on the Achieving Style Inventory—Total Domain, and on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain.

Inferential procedures for Hypothesis 6 and the rationale for their selection are identical to those listed under Hypothesis 3.

**Hypothesis 7: Occupational Status, Relational Achieving Style, Dominance of Self, and Dominance in Relationship**

**H_1:** The four occupational status groups—(a) homemaker, (b) semi/unskilled worker, (c) clerical/sales worker, and (d) professional—will differ in group mean scores in (a) relational achieving style, as measured by the Achieving Style Inventory, (b) perceived
dominance of self, as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale, and (c) perceived relative dominance in relationship, as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale.

$H_0$: There will be no difference among population means of the four occupational status groups, at $\alpha = .05$, in scores on (a) the Achieving Style Inventory--Relational Domain, (b) the Dominance/Submission Scale--Perceived Dominance of Self, and (c) the Dominance/Submission Scale--Perceived Relative Dominance in Relationship.

Inferential Procedures. Three one-way analyses of variance, with four levels each, were employed at $\alpha = .05$, to examine the probability of having obtained differences between mean scores of the four occupational status groups, as measured by the Achieving Style Inventory and the Dominance/Submission Scale, by chance, when in fact there may have been no differences between these means in the larger population.

If the null hypothesis among population means was rejected, then Protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed to examine differences between each of the two groups, for all possible group combinations, and for each of the three variables as measured by (a) the Achieving Style Inventory--Relational Domain, (b) the Dominance/Submission Scale--Perceived Dominance of Self, and (c) the Dominance/Submission Scale--Perceived Relative Dominance in Relationship.
Hypothesis 8: Occupational Status and Perceived Dominance of Partner

H$_1$: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, on the dependent variable—perceived dominance of partner—as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale.

H$_0$: There will be no differences in the population means of the four occupational status groups at P = .05, in scores on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Dominance of Partner.

Inferential procedures for Hypothesis 8 and the rationale for their selection are identical to those listed under Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 9: Occupational Status, Mastery, and Attitudes Toward Feminism

H$_1$: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) semi/unskilled workers, (b) homemakers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, on five dependent variables, as measured by the (a) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, (b) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, (c) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, (d) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and (e) FEM-Scale.

H$_0$: There will be no differences in the population means of the four occupational status groups, at P = .05, in scores on the Mastery/
Powerlessness Scale—Global, —Behavioral, —Attitudinal, and —Total, and on the FEM-Scale.

Inferential procedures for Hypothesis 9 and the rationale for their selection are identical to those listed under Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 10: Marital Status, Achieving Styles, Perceived Dominance, Mastery, and Attitudes Toward Feminism

H₁: The three marital status groups—(a) never-married, (b) married, and (c) divorced/separated—will differ in group mean scores on:

1. The Achieving Style Inventory—Total Domain
2. The Achieving Style Inventory—Direct Domain
3. The Achieving Style Inventory—Relational Domain
4. The Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self
5. The Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Partner
6. The Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Dominance in Relationship
7. The Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global
8. The Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral
9. The Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal
10. The Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total
11. The FEM-Scale

H₀: There will be no differences among the population means of the three marital status groups, at α = .05, in scores on the 11 measures, as listed in the above operational statement.
Inferential Procedures and Rationale. Eleven one-way analyses of variance, at $\alpha = .05$, were employed. Analysis of covariance for control of undesirable life event changes was not necessary because the variables under examination are not directly related to undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months, as the variables under examination are probably more long-standing attitudes.

When the null hypothesis was rejected, Protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed for all possible group combinations, and for each of the 11 variables under examination.

Hypothesis 11: Relations Between Vulnerability Variables and Depression

$H_1$: Scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Relational Domain— and on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Partner—will be positively related to scores on the CES-D Scale for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and the combined depression measure. Scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Total Domain, the Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain, the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the FEM-Scale will be negatively related to scores on the CES-D Scale for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and the combined depression measure.

$H_0$: CES-D Scale scores for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and depression combined will be
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unrelated to scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Relational Domain, Total Domain, and Direct Domain—scores on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self and Perceived Partner—scores on the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, Attitudinal, Behavioral, and Total—and to scores on the FEM-Scale.

**Inferential Procedures.** Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were calculated among scores on the CES-D Scale and scores on the above listed measures to determine the direction and strength of associations of the three depression measures with the other variables. Significance levels for the coefficients were calculated.

**Hypothesis 12: Interrelations Among Vulnerability Variables**

H₁: There will be positive relationships among scores on the following: Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain; the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self; the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global; the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral; the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal; the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total; and the FEM-Scale. There will be negative relations between scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Relational Domain and scores on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the FEM-Scale.
H_0: There will be no significant relations, at \( \alpha = .05 \), among scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain and Relational Domain, scores on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self and Perceived Partner, scores on the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, Behavioral, Attitudinal, and Total, and scores on the FEM-Scale.

Inferential procedures are equivalent to those listed under Hypothesis 11.

**Hypothesis 13: Relations Between Other Variables and Depression**

H_1: CES-D Scale scores for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined will be negatively related to the following variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire: (a) occupational prestige (title page), (b) age (item 1), (c) total annual gross family income (item 10), (d) total annual gross income of subject (item 11), (e) educational level (item 8), (f) amount of social contact (item 15), (g) number of confiding relationships (item 14), (h) freedom on the job (item 7), and (i) number of people supervised (item 6).

CES-D Scale scores for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined will be positively related to the following variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire: (a) number of children at home under 6 years of age (item 9), (b) number of changes desired (item 21),
(c) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months (item 13),
(d) overall life dissatisfaction (item 18), (e) absence of a confid­
ing relationship with significant person--if married, with husband  
(items 3, 14, 16, and 17), (f) presence at home of three or more  
children under age 14 (item 9), and (g) loss of mother before age 11  
(item 12).

CES-D Scale scores for depression over the past week, depression  
over the past 6 months, and depression over the past week and over  
the past 6 months combined will vary as a function of (a) expectation  
of source of support for economic needs as an adult (item 19), (b)  
career-homemaker orientation (item 20), and (c) ethnic background  
(item 22).

H₀: There will be no significant relations, at α = .05, between  
the 19 variables identified above and the scores on the CES-D Scale  
for depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months,  
and depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined.

Inferential Procedures. Six one-way analyses of variance were  
employed at α = .05 for the last six listed variables to estimate the  
probability of having obtained differences between group mean scores  
for each of the six variables, as measured by items 9, 12, 19, 20,  
and 22, of the Women's Roles Questionnaire, by chance, when in fact  
there may have been no differences between these means in the larger  
population. When the null hypothesis was rejected, then Protected  
LSD pairwise comparisons were employed at α = .05 to examine the dif­
ference between each of the two groups, for all possible group combi­
nations.
Hypothesis 14: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status and Vulnerability Variables

H$_1$: The four vulnerability measures—(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, as measured by the Achieving Styles Inventory, (b) powerlessness orientation, as measured by the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, (c) perceived dominance of partner, as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism, as measured by the FEM-Scale—will add a significant amount of predictiveness, at $\alpha = .05$, for degree of depression as measured by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by occupational status.

H$_0$: There will be no difference between $\rho_1^2$—the proportion of variation of depression (as measured by the CES-D Scale) accounted for by the combination of occupational status and the vulnerability measures of this project (as specified in the operational statement of Hypothesis 14), and $\rho_0^2$—the proportion of variation of depression accounted for by occupational status alone.

$H_0$: $y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occupation}}$ --- $\rho_0^2$

$H_1$: $y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occupation}} + \beta_{\text{vulnerabilities}}$ --- $\rho_1^2$

Inferential Procedures. Two multiple regression analyses were employed, one for the null hypothesis, and one for the alternate hypothesis as stated under the null hypothesis of Hypothesis 14. An F-test was employed at $\alpha = .05$ on the two R-Squares, using the formula:
Thus, it was determined whether the vulnerability measures of this project add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression beyond that predicted by occupational status.

**Hypothesis 15: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status, Vulnerability Variables, and Brown and Harris (1978) Variables**

\[ F = \frac{R_1^2 - R_0^2}{1 - R_1^2} \frac{N - 4 - 1}{r_1 - r_0} > F_{\alpha, r_1 - r_0, N - r_1 - 1} \]

(Source: Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973, p. 189, theorem 8.12)

Thus, it was determined whether the vulnerability measures of this project add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression beyond that predicted by occupational status.

**H_1**: The Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures, as measure by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionaire—(a) loss of mother before age 11 (item 12), (b) presence at home of three or more children under age 14 (item 9), and (c) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person—if married, with husband (items 3, 14, 16, and 17)—will add a significant amount of predictiveness, at \( \alpha = .05 \), for the degree of depression as measured by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability measures of this project—as specified in research Hypothesis 14—and occupational status together.

**H_0**: There will be no difference between \( \rho_1^2 \)—the proportion of variation of depression (as measured by the CES-D Scale) accounted for by the combination of occupational status, the vulnerability measures of this project and the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures (as specified in the operational statement of Hypothesis 15), and \( \rho_0^2 \)—the proportion of variation of depression accounted for by occupational status and the vulnerability measures of this project.
H\(_0\): \( y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occupation}} + \beta_{\text{vulnerabilities}} \quad \rho_0^2 \)

H\(_1\): \( y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occup.}} + \beta_{\text{vulnerabilities}} + \beta_{\text{Brown & Harris}} \quad \rho_1^2 \)

**Inferential Procedures.** A multiple regression analysis was employed for \( H_1 \) of Hypothesis 15, whose \( \rho_1^2 \) was compared with the \( \rho_0^2 \), whereby \( \rho_0^2 \) of Hypothesis 15 equals the \( \rho_1^2 \) of Hypothesis 14, using the F-test formula as stated under Hypothesis 14.

Thus, it was determined whether the Brown and Harris (1978) measures add a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability measures of this project and occupational status together.

**Hypothesis 16: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status, Vulnerability Variables, Brown and Harris (1978) Variables, and Background Variables**

\( H_1 \): The 16 background variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire—(a) occupational prestige (title page), (b) age (item 1), (c) total annual gross family income (item 10), (d) total annual gross income of subject (item 11), (e) educational level (item 8), (f) amount of social contact (item 15), (g) freedom on the job (item 7), (h) number of people supervised (item 6), (i) number of children at home under 6 years of age (item 9), (j) number of changes desired (item 21), (k) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months (item 13), (l) overall life dissatisfaction (item 18), (m) number of confiding relationships (item 14), (n) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an
adult (item 19), (o) career-homemaker orientation (item 20), and  
(p) ethnic background (item 22)— will add a significant amount of  
predictiveness, at $\alpha = .05$, for the degree of depression as measured  
by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability  
measures of this project—as specified in Hypothesis 14—the Brown  
and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures—as specified in Hypothesis  
15—and occupational status together.  

$H_0$: There will be no difference between $\rho^2_1$—the proportion of  
variation of depression (as measured by the CES-D Scale) accounted  
for by the combination of occupational status, the vulnerability  
measures of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability  
measures, and the 16 background variables (as specified in the opera-  
tional statement of Hypothesis 16), and $\rho^2_0$—the proportion of vari-  
ation of depression accounted for by occupational status, the vulnera-  
ability measures of this project, and the Brown and Harris (1978)  
vulnerability measures.

$H_0$: $y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occup.}} + \beta_{\text{vulnerabilities}} + \beta_{\text{Brown & Harris}} -- \rho^2_0$  

$H_1$: $y = \alpha + \beta_{\text{occup.}} + \beta_{\text{vulner.}} + \beta_{\text{Brown & Harris}} + \beta_{\text{bkgd.}} -- \rho^2_1$

**Inferential Procedures.** A multiple regression analysis was em-  
ployed for $H_1$ of Hypothesis 16, whose $\rho^2_1$ was compared with the $\rho^2_0$,  
whereby $\rho^2_0$ of research Hypothesis 16 equals the $\rho^2_1$ of Hypothesis 15,  
using the F-test formula as stated under Hypothesis 14.  

Thus, it was determined whether the 16 background variables add  
a significant amount of predictiveness to the degree of depression.
beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability variables of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors, and occupational status together.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter presents the findings of the statistical analyses for the 16 hypotheses under study. The purpose of this project was to explore and describe relationships among differing occupational and marital statuses, achieving styles, dominance, mastery orientation, attitudes toward feminism, and depression in women. The study also explored whether certain variables were related to and would predict the degree of depression for women.

Sample Description and Response Rate

The research assistant contacted 578 randomly selected women. Of these 578 women, 183 were over 50 years of age, 48 were under 25 years of age, and six did not understand the American language well enough to participate. A total of 237 women were thus excluded from the study because they did not fit the requirements for inclusion. Of the remaining 341 women contacted, 45 women (13.2%) refused to participate. Reasons frequently given for refusal were being too busy to participate, or feeling not comfortable to be part of a survey. Two hundred and ninety-six women who were between 25 and 50 years of age agreed to participate. However, 56 women were employed part time and therefore were excluded from the analyses. Of the contacted 578 women, 285 women were employed full time or were full-time...
homemakers, and fell within the age range of 25-50. Of these 285 women, 240 women (84.2%) agreed to participate, whereby 60 women fell within each of the four occupational status groups of (a) homemakers, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) semi/unskilled workers, and (d) professionals.

Of the 240 volunteering women, 215 women completed and mailed back the questionnaire, which resulted in an overall response rate of 89.6%. In the professional group, 58 women (96%) responded; in the clerical/sales group, 55 women (91.7%) responded; in the homemaker group, 54 women (90%) responded; and in the semi/unskilled group, 48 women (80%) responded. The total sample of \( N = 215 \) women fell into the following occupational groups.

- Professionals 27.0%; \( n = 58 \)
- Clerical/sales workers 25.6%, \( n = 55 \)
- Homemakers 25.1%; \( n = 54 \)
- Semi/unskilled workers 22.3%; \( n = 48 \)

The total sample of 215 women fell into the following marital groups:

- Married 61.9%; \( n = 133 \)
- Never-married 12.6%; \( n = 27 \)
- Divorced/separated 25.6%; \( n = 55 \)

In the following sections, an overview of the results is given first. Results are reported at a significance level of \( \alpha = .05 \), unless otherwise specified. Then the findings for each hypothesis are reported and presented in tabular form. The information given is factual, with inferences and interpretations reserved for Chapter V.
Overview of Results for Hypotheses 1-16

Hypotheses 1-10 focused on differences among occupational status groups and among marital status groups on undesirable life event changes, depression, and the vulnerability variables.

Based on one-way analyses of variance, no differences were found between the four occupational status groups on undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months at $\alpha = .74$. However, married women indicated fewer undesirable life event changes than never-married and divorced/separated women, and never-married women indicated fewer undesirable life event changes than divorced/separated women.

Based on ordered means analyses, professionals were less depressed than clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers on depression over the past 6 months and on the combined depression measure. Based on two-way analyses of covariance, on depression over the past week, professionals were less depressed than homemakers, clerical/sales workers, and semi/unskilled workers.

Using ordered means analyses of achieving styles responses, homemakers, semi/unskilled workers, and clerical/sales workers were less achievement oriented overall than were professionals. Homemakers were less direct achievement oriented than clerical/sales workers and professionals. Semi/unskilled workers showed less direct achievement orientation than professionals. Using one-way analysis of variance, no differences were found between the four occupational status groups on relational achieving style.
Using one-way analysis of variance of dominance-submission responses, no differences were found between the four occupational status groups on perceived dominance of self. Using one-way analysis of variance, professionals were more dominant in their significant relationship than were clerical/sales workers. Using ordered means analyses of dominance-submission responses, professionals viewed their partners as less dominant than did semi/unskilled workers and clerical/sales workers.

Using ordered means analyses of mastery orientations, semi/unskilled workers and clerical/sales workers showed less global mastery than professionals. In behavioral mastery, semi/unskilled workers scored lower than clerical/sales workers and professionals, and homemakers scored lower than professionals. In both attitudinal and total mastery, semi/unskilled workers scored lower than clerical/sales workers, homemakers, and professionals; clerical/sales workers and homemakers scored lower than professionals.

Using ordered means analyses of attitudes toward feminism, semi/unskilled workers had more stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles than homemakers, clerical/sales workers, and professionals; homemakers had more stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles than clerical/sales workers and professionals; and clerical/sales workers had more stereotypical attitudes than professionals.

Based on a one-way and a two-way analysis of covariance, never-married and married women were less depressed than divorced/separated women on the three depression measures. No differences were found between the three marital status groups in total achieving style,
direct achieving style, relational achieving style, perceived dominance of partner, perceived dominance in relationship, global mastery, attitudinal mastery, total mastery, and attitudes toward feminism.

In behavioral mastery, never-married women scored lower than married women.

A summary of the results follows. Groups are listed in the obtained group mean order and not necessarily in the predicted order. The group names are abbreviated as follows: professionals = P, homemakers = H, clerical/sales workers = C/S, and semi/unskilled workers = S/U; never-married women = NM, married women = M, and divorced/separated women = DS. Underlining indicates nonsignificance for the pairwise comparisons at \( \alpha = .05 \); underlining does not indicate similarity, as there still may be differences between underlined groups. The only conclusion possible is that underlined groups do not differ at \( \alpha = .05 \) on the criterion variable as measured by the instruments in this project. The symbol < indicates directional differences between the group mean scores, which may or may not be significant, as indicated by absence vs. presence of underlining.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable:</th>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Marital Groups (AOV or AOC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable Life Events (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; P &lt; S/U &lt; C/S ns</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (3 measures) (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>P &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U *</td>
<td>NM &lt; M &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression (2-way ANCOVA) over the past week</td>
<td>P &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U *</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable:</td>
<td>Occupational Groups</td>
<td>Marital Groups (AOV or AOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Achieving Style (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>NM &lt; M &lt; DS ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Achieving Style (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational Achieving Style (AOV)</td>
<td>C/S &lt; H &lt; S/U &lt; P ns</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Dominance—Self (AOV)</td>
<td>C/S &lt; H &lt; P &lt; S/U ns</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Dominance—Partner (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>P &lt; H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S *</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Dominance—Relationship (AOV)</td>
<td>P &lt; S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S *</td>
<td>DS &lt; M &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Mastery (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S &lt; H &lt; P *</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Mastery (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudinal Mastery (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S &lt; H &lt; P</td>
<td>NM &lt; M &lt; DS ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mastery (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S &lt; H &lt; P *</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes Toward Feminism (ordered means analyses)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; DS &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. An asterisk (*) indicates significance of the overall F-test or $E^2$ - Test at $\alpha = .05$ or at $P = .05$; "ns" indicates nonsignificance of the overall tests at $\alpha = .05$ or at $P = .05$. Groups which are not underlined differ significantly from each other at or below $\alpha = .05$. For example, on the last variable, Attitudes Toward Feminism, all pairwise group comparisons are significant at or below $\alpha = .05$. 
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Hypotheses 11-13 focused on relations of depression with the vulnerability variables and the background variables, and on interrelations among the variability variables.

For the vulnerability variables of this project, the relations to depression were as follows: behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientations were negatively related to depression; perceived dominance of partner, and perceived dominance of self (in opposite to the predicted direction) were positively related to depression. No relations were found between depression and achieving styles, global mastery orientation, total, direct, and relational achieving styles, global mastery orientation, and attitudes toward feminism. Reliant relational achieving style, however, was positively related to depression.

The interrelations of the vulnerability variables were as follows: Direct achieving style, mastery orientations, and attitudes toward feminism were positively interrelated. Relational achieving style was not related to perceived dominance of self and of partner, to the mastery orientations nor to attitudes toward feminism. Perceived dominance of self was positively related to direct achieving style, but not to mastery orientations and attitudes toward feminism. Perceived dominance of partner was not related to achieving styles, mastery orientations, and attitudes toward feminism.

Background variables were related to depression as follows: Occupational prestige, educational level, and family income were negatively related to depression; subject's income, age, amount of social contact, freedom on the job, and number of people supervised
were not related to depression. Positive relations were found between depression and number of changes desired, dissatisfaction with social life, overall life dissatisfaction, and absence of a confiding relationship with significant person. Number of children at home under 6 years of age was not related to depression. Depression scores were not related to presence at home of three or more children under age 14, loss of mother before age 11, expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult, and career-homemaker orientation. However, on number of confiding relationships, women with three or more confiding relationships were less depressed than were women with one confiding relationship. Black women were more depressed than were white women, and no differences were found between white women and women of other ethnic background.

Hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 focused on the prediction of depression through four sets of predictor variables.

Occupational group membership accounted for an average of 5.2% of the variance on the three depression measures, whereby professional status, as the best predictor, accounted for an average of 3.3% of the variance; however, these results were not significant at $\alpha = .05$.

The potential vulnerability variables added significantly up to an average prediction of 26.1% of the variance on the three depression measures; best predictors were (a) attitudinal mastery orientation (12.37%) for depression over the past week, (b) reliant relational achieving style (5.68%) for depression over the past 6 months, and (c) global mastery orientation (9.23%) for the combined depression scores.
The Brown and Harris (1978) factors increased the prediction of depression significantly to an average level of 33.4% of the variance on the three depression measures; best predictors were (a) attitudinal mastery orientation (12.37%) for depression over the past week, (b) absence of a confiding relationship (10.71%) for depression over the past 6 months, and again, (c) absence of a confiding relationship (9.65%) for the combined depression measure.

The 15 background variables increased the prediction of depression significantly to an average level of 60.1% of the variance on the three depression measures. General life dissatisfaction, as the best predictor for all three depression measures, accounted for an average of 29.4% of the variance.

To summarize, the best predictors of depression for the four sets of variables were found to be (a) professional status and (b) attitudinal mastery orientation, which were both negatively related to depression; and (c) absence of a confiding relationship and (d) general life dissatisfaction, which showed strong positive relations with and predicted depression.

Hypothesis 1: Occupational Status
and Undesirable Life Events

H1 = H0: The four occupational status groups—(a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals—will not differ in group mean scores of undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule.
A one-way analysis of variance was employed at \( \alpha = .50 \). The \( F \)-value for undesirable life event changes was found to be nonsignificant at \( \alpha = .74 \) (Table 1). Thus, with a high degree of probability, the differences of reported undesirable life event changes between the four occupational status groups were due to chance alone, and the null hypothesis was retained. No controls for undesirable life event changes were found to be necessary for any of the hypotheses concerning the occupational status of the subjects. Sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and significance level are reported in Table 1.

**Hypothesis 2: Marital Status and Undesirable Life Events**

\( H_1 = H_0: \) The three marital status groups—(a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated—will not differ in group mean scores of undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule.

A one-way analysis of variance was employed at \( \alpha = .50 \). The \( F \)-value for undesirable life event changes was found to be significant at \( \alpha = .00 \), and the null hypothesis was rejected. Protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the group mean scores found that married women scored lowest on undesirable life event changes, and differed significantly from never-married and from divorced/separated women. Divorced/separated women scored highest on undesirable life event changes and differed significantly from married and from never-married women (Table 1).

Because of the significant differences between the three marital status groups on undesirable life event changes, hypotheses concerning
### Table 1

**Differences in Undesirable Life Events by Occupational and Marital Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational status groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA Prob. = .74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker (H)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>563.46</td>
<td>704.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled worker (S/U)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>682.67</td>
<td>642.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales worker (C/S)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>699.67</td>
<td>655.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (P)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>678.04</td>
<td>790.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Marital status groups**   |    |        |      |
| One-way ANOVA Prob. = .00*  |    |        |      |
| Married                    | 133| 523.22 | 661.83 |
| Never-married              | 27 | 738.33 | 667.35 |
| Divorced/separated         | 55 | 936.00 | 732.10 |

Nondirectional protected LSD pairwise comparisons of marital status group mean scores on undesirable life event changes:
- Married < never-married *
- Married < divorced/separated *
- Never-married < divorced/separated *

**Note.** Table 1 reports the results for the two one-way analyses of variance for the four occupational status groups and for the three marital status groups on undesirable life event changes over the past 6 months, and the results of the nondirectional protected LSD pairwise comparisons of marital group mean scores. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05.
marital status were tested with the analysis of covariance to statistically control for the effects of undesirable life event changes.

Sample sizes, means, standard deviations, significance levels, and significance levels of Protected LSD pairwise comparisons are reported in Table 1.

Hypothesis 3: Occupational Status and Depression

H₁: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, on each of the three dependent variables: (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, as measured by the CES-D Scale.

The three analyses for the equality of ordered means (Stoline, 1981) for the four occupational status groups on degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined, were significant at or below P = .01. In all three cases, the null hypothesis was rejected.

One-tailed t-tests of the group means at α = .05 showed that the degree of depression for clerical/sales workers and for homemakers was predicted in the wrong order, which is reflected in the very high levels of probability that the results are due to chance alone, and in the minus value for the mean difference (Table 2). Professionals were significantly less depressed than were clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers on all three measures of depression, but there was no significant difference between professionals and
Table 2

Rank-Order Differences in Depression by Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality of ordered means analyses</th>
<th>CES-D—Past week</th>
<th>CES-D—Past 6 months</th>
<th>CES-D—Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( E^2 )</td>
<td>Prob. P</td>
<td>( E^2 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups in predicted rank order</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (P)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers (H)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.94</td>
<td>10.74</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>9.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled workers (S/U)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality of ordered means analyses</th>
<th>CES-D—Past week</th>
<th>CES-D—Past 6 months</th>
<th>CES-D—Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E²</td>
<td>Prob. P</td>
<td>E²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-tailed t-test pairwise comparisons of group means</th>
<th>Mean-diff.</th>
<th>α-Prob.</th>
<th>Mean-diff.</th>
<th>α-Prob.</th>
<th>Mean-diff.</th>
<th>α-Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P &lt; C/S</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &lt; H</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &lt; S/U</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S &lt; H</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-1.92</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S &lt; S/U</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &lt; S/U</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Table 2 reports the results for the three analyses for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups and three measures of depression, and the results of one-tailed _t_-tests for the group means. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05, or _P_ = .05. Minus sign (−) indicates reversal of predicted with obtained order.
Homemakers on any of the three depression measures. Homemakers were significantly less depressed than were semi/unskilled workers in degree of depression over the past 6 months and in the combined degree of depression, but not in degree of depression over the past week. Homemakers tended to be less depressed than clerical/sales workers on all three measures of depression; whether these differences were significant is not known due to the reversal of the predicted rank order from the obtained rank order. Clerical/sales workers did not differ significantly from the semi/unskilled workers on any of the three depression measures.

Table 2 reports the sample sizes, means, standard deviations, values of $E^2$, probability values $P$, and one-tailed $t$-tests for the means of the four occupational status groups on the three depression measures.

Hypothesis 4: Marital Status and Depression

H$_1$: When the effects of undesirable life event changes, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be differences in the group mean scores of subjects on the CES-D Scale in degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined, among the three marital status groups of (a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated.

In order to statistically control for the effects of undesirable life event scores on the three measures of depression, three one-way analyses of covariance were employed, with undesirable life event scores as the covariate, marital status as the variate, and the three depression measures as the dependent variables.
For all three depression measures, the overall homogeneity of regression tests yielded nonsignificant F-values, and the overall homogeneity of regression hypotheses were retained (Table 3). Thus, the assumption of parallel slopes for the analysis of covariance was met, and three analyses of covariance were employed at $\alpha = .05$.

On depression over the past week, differences among the adjusted mean scores of the three marital status groups were significant at $\alpha = .08$, and the null hypothesis was retained. On depression over the past 6 months, the adjusted mean scores of the three marital status groups differed significantly at $\alpha = .03$, and on the combined depression measure at $\alpha = .05$. In both cases, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 3).

Nondirectional Protected LSD comparisons at $\alpha = .05$ between the adjusted group mean scores showed that never-married women and married women did not differ significantly in degree of depression over the past 6 months and in degree of combined depression. Married women were significantly less depressed than were divorced/separated women on depression over the past 6 months and on the combined depression measure. Never-married women were significantly less depressed than were divorced/separated women in degree of depression over the past 6 months. Never-married women did not differ significantly from divorced/separated women on the combined depression measure at $\alpha = .05$, but did differ significantly at $\alpha = .1$.

Table 3 reports the results of the homogeneity of regression tests, the results of the one-way analyses of covariance for the three depression measures, and nondirectional Protected LSD
Table 3

Differences in Depression by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CES-D--Past week (N = 204)</th>
<th>CES-D--Past 6 months (N = 205)</th>
<th>CES-D--Combined (N = 197)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
<td>Sign. at α = .05</td>
<td>Mean diff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity of regression test</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANCOVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted marital status</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nondirectional protected LSD comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married &lt; married</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married &lt; divorced/separated</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married &lt; divorced/ separated</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 3 reports the results of three analyses of covariance and protected LSD adjusted group mean score comparisons for the three marital status groups on the three measures of depression. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at α = .05.
comparisons on the adjusted marital group mean scores for depression over the past 6 months and for the combined depression measure.

**Hypothesis 5: Occupational and Marital Status and Depression**

H<sub>1</sub>: When the effects of undesirable life event changes, as measured by the PERI Life Events Schedule, are controlled for, there will be differences in the group mean scores of subjects on the CES-D Scale in degrees of depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and past week and past 6 months combined, as a function of occupational and marital status.

In order to statistically control for the effects of undesirable life event scores on the three measures of depression, three two-way analyses of covariance were employed at α = .05, with undesirable life event changes as the covariate, marital status and occupational status as the variates, and the three measures of depression as the dependent variables.

For depression over the past week, the overall homogeneity of regression test yielded a nonsignificant F-value, and the overall homogeneity of regression hypothesis was retained (Table 4). Therefore, the assumption of parallel slopes for the analysis of covariance was met, and a three-by-four ANCOVA was employed, with three levels on marital status, and with four levels on occupational status. Adjusted group mean scores were found to differ significantly as a function of marital status at α = .05, and as a function of occupational status at α = .01, and the null hypotheses were rejected. The adjusted interaction of marital and occupational status (α = .12) was found not to be significant, and the null hypothesis was retained.
Table 4
Differences in Depression Over the Past Week by Occupational and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups compared</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Sign. at α = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker vs. semi/unskilled</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker vs. clerical/sales</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales vs. semi/unskilled</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional vs. homemaker</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional vs. semi/unskilled</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional vs. clerical/sales</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married vs. never-married</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married vs. divorced/separated</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married vs. divorced/separated</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 4 reports the results of the overall homogeneity of regression test, the three-by-four ANCOVA, and the nondirectional Protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the main effects of the occupational-by-marital status groups on depression over the past week. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05; "ns" indicates non-significance at α = .05.
(Table 4). Nondirectional Protected LSD pairwise comparisons at $\alpha = .05$ of the main effects—i.e., of the marginal means—showed that professionals were significantly less depressed over the past week than were homemakers, semi/unskilled workers, and clerical/sales workers. Homemakers did not differ significantly from semi/unskilled workers and from clerical/sales workers, and there was no significant difference between semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers. Divorced/separated women were significantly more depressed over the past week than were both married and never-married women. There was no significant difference between never-married and married women on depression over the past week (Table 4).

Table 4 reports the results of the overall homogeneity of regression test, the three-by-four ANCOVA, and the nondirectional Protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the main effects or marginal means of the occupational-by-marital status groups on depression over the past week.

Figure 1 shows the adjusted means, for depression over the past week, for occupational-by-marital status groups; Figure 2 shows the adjusted means for marital-by-occupational status groups.

For both depression over the past 6 months, and for the combined depression measure, the assumption of homogeneous slopes for the analysis of covariance were not met, and no further analyses were employed.
Figure 1. Adjusted means for depression over the past week (occupational by marital status).
Figure 2. Adjusted means for depression over the past week (marital by occupational status).
Hypothesis 6: Occupational Status and Total and Direct Achieving Style

H₁: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) homemakers, (b) semi/unskilled workers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, on each of the two dependent variables (a) total achieving style, and (b) direct achieving style, as measured by the Achieving Style Inventory.

The two analyses for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on total and direct achieving style found significance levels at or below P = .01. In both cases, the null hypotheses were rejected. The predicted rank order was congruent with the actual order of the group means.

One-tailed t-tests of the group mean scores at α = .05 showed that professionals scored significantly higher on both total and on direct achieving style than did homemakers and semi/unskilled workers. When compared with clerical/sales workers, professionals scored significantly higher on total achieving style, but not on direct achieving style. Clerical/sales workers scored significantly higher than did homemakers on direct but not on total achieving style. No significant differences were found on either direct or total achieving style between homemakers and semi/unskilled workers, nor between semi/unskilled workers and clerical/sales workers.

Values of E-squared, probability values P, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and one-tailed t-test results for all possible group comparisons of the four occupational status groups are reported in Table 5.
Table 5

Rank-Order Differences in Total and Direct Achieving Styles by Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equalities of ordered means analyses</th>
<th>Total achieving style</th>
<th>Direct achieving style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$E^2$</td>
<td>Prob. $P$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups in predicted rank order</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker (H)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled workers (S/U)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales workers (C/S)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (P)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-tailed t-test pairwise comparisons of group mean scores</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>$\alpha$-Prob.</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>$\alpha$-Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H &lt; S/U$</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H &lt; C/S$</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H &lt; P$</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S/U &lt; C/S$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$S/U &lt; P$</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.04*</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C/S &lt; P$</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 5 reports the results for the two analyses for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on total and on direct achieving style, and the results of one-tailed t-tests for the group means. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$, or $p = .05$. 
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Hypothesis 7: Occupational Status, Relational Achieving Style, Dominance of Self, and Dominance in Relationship

H1: The four occupational status groups—(a) homemaker, (b) semi/unskilled worker, (c) clerical/sales worker, and (d) professional—will differ in group mean scores on (a) relational achieving style as measured by the Achieving Style Inventory, (b) perceived dominance of self as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale, and (c) the perceived relative dominance in relationship as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale.

Three one-way analyses of variance were employed at α = .05. The significance level for relational achieving style was found to be .42, and the null hypothesis was retained. The significance level for perceived dominance of self was found to be .20, and the null hypothesis was retained. The significance level for the relative degree of dominance/submission in significant relationship was found to be .03, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Nondirectional Protected LSD pairwise comparisons at α = .05 showed that professional women were significantly more egalitarian in their significant relationship than clerical/sales women who were more submissive. All other group comparisons were found to be not significant at α = .05, and the null hypotheses were retained in all other cases.

Probability levels, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and probability levels for Protected LSD pairwise comparisons are reported in Table 6.
Table 6
Differences in Relational Achieving Style, Perceived Dominance of Self, and Perceived Dominance in Relationship by Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers (H)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-4.67</td>
<td>18.82</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled workers (S/U)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-2.48</td>
<td>19.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales workers (C/S)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-10.16</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (P)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.40</td>
<td>11.21</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>14.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Sign. at α = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondirectional protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the group mean scores of the four occupational status groups on perceived dominance in relationship:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &lt; semi/unskilled</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &lt; homemaker</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &lt; clerical/sales</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled &lt; homemaker</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled &lt; clerical sales</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker &lt; clerical/sales</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 6 reports the results of three one-way analyses of variance for the four occupational status groups on relational achieving style, perceived dominance of self, and relative degree of perceived dominance in relationship, and protected LSD comparisons for the last variable. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at α = .05; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at α = .05.
Hypothesis 8: Occupational Status and Perceived Dominance of Partner

$H_1$: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, on the dependent variable, Perceived Dominance of Partner, as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale.

One analysis for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on perceived dominance of partner found a significance level at $P = .02$. The null hypothesis was rejected.

The predicted rank order was not congruent with the obtained rank order for clerical/sales workers, homemakers, and semi/unskilled workers, which is reflected in the high probabilities that the results are due to chance alone, and in the minus values for the mean differences (Table 7). One-tailed $t$-tests of the group mean scores at $\alpha = .05$ showed that professionals viewed their partners as significantly less dominant than did both clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers. There was no significant difference in perception of partners' dominance between professionals and homemakers. Due to the reversal of the predicted with the obtained rank order, it is not clear whether clerical/sales workers differed significantly from homemakers and from semi/unskilled workers in their perceptions of their partners' dominance. Homemakers and semi/unskilled workers did not differ significantly in their perceptions of their partners' dominance.
Table 7

Rank-Order Differences in Perceived Dominance of Partner by Occupational Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equality of ordered means analyses</th>
<th>$E^2$</th>
<th>Prob. $P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups in predicted rank order</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (P)</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>12.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales workers (C/S)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>16.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers (H)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled workers (S/U)</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-tailed $t$-test pairwise comparisons of group mean scores</th>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P &lt; C/S$</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P &lt; H$</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P &lt; S/U$</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C/S &lt; H$</td>
<td>-3.18</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C/S &lt; S/U$</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H &lt; S/U$</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 7 reports the results for one analysis for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on perceived dominance of partner, and the results of one-tailed $t$-tests for the group mean scores. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$, or $P = .05$. A minus sign (-) indicates reversal of predicted with obtained rank order.
Value of $E^2$ squared, probability value $P$, sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and one-tailed $t$-test results for all possible group comparisons of the four occupational status groups are reported in Table 7.

**Hypothesis 9: Occupational, Status, Mastery, and Attitudes Toward Feminism**

$H_0$: There will be at least one directional difference among the four ordered occupational status group mean scores, from smallest to largest, in the rank order of: (a) semi/unskilled workers, (b) homemakers, (c) clerical/sales workers, and (d) professionals, on five dependent variables, as measured by the (a) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, (b) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, (c) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, (d) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the (e) FEM-Scale.

The five analyses for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on global, behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, and on attitudes toward feminism, all found significance levels at or below $P = .01$. In all five cases, the null hypothesis was rejected (Table 8).

On the global, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, the predicted rank order was not congruent with the obtained rank order for homemakers and for clerical/sales workers, which is reflected in the high probabilities that the results are due to chance alone, and in the minus value for the mean differences (Table 8). On behavioral mastery/powerlessness orientation and on attitudes toward feminism, the predicted rank order was congruent with the obtained order of group mean scores.
Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery/Powerlessness—Global</th>
<th>Mastery/Powerlessness—Behavioral</th>
<th>Mastery/Powerlessness—Attitudinal</th>
<th>Mastery/Powerlessness—Total</th>
<th>Attitudes Toward Feminism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Groups in predicted rank order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi/unskilled workers (S/U)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers (H)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/sales workers (C/S)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals (P)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One-tailed t-test pairwise comparisons of group means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean diff.</th>
<th>a- diff.</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S/U &lt; H</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/U &lt; P</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &lt; C/S</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H &lt; P</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S &lt; P</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 8 reports the results for five analyses for the equality of ordered means for the four occupational status groups on (a) mastery/powerlessness—global, (b) mastery/powerlessness—behavioral, (c) mastery/powerlessness—attitudinal, (d) mastery/powerlessness—total, and (e) attitudes toward feminism, and the results of one-tailed t-tests for the group mean scores. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$, or $P = .05$. A minus sign (-) indicates reversal of predicted with obtained rank order.
One-tailed $t$-tests of the group mean scores at $\alpha = .05$ showed that semi/unskilled workers scored significantly lower than did homemakers on attitudinal and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, but not on global and behavioral mastery/powerlessness orientation. Semi/unskilled workers scored significantly lower than did clerical/sales workers on behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, but not on global mastery/powerlessness orientation. Semi/unskilled workers scored significantly lower than did professionals on all four measures of mastery/powerlessness orientation. Homemakers and clerical/sales workers did not differ significantly on behavioral mastery/powerlessness orientation. Homemakers tended to score higher than did clerical/sales workers on global, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation; whether these differences are significant is not known due to the reversal of the predicted from the obtained rank order. Homemakers scored significantly lower than did professionals on behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, but did not differ significantly on global mastery/powerlessness orientation. Clerical/sales workers scored significantly lower than professionals on global, attitudinal, and total mastery/powerlessness orientation, but did not differ significantly from professionals on behavioral mastery/powerlessness orientation.

On attitudes toward feminism, all groups scored significantly higher than the previous group(s) in the predicted rank order. Professionals scored significantly higher than did clerical/sales workers, homemakers, and semi/unskilled workers. Clerical/sales workers
scored significantly higher than did homemakers and semi/unskilled workers. Homemakers scored significantly higher than did semi/unskilled workers. Therefore, the following alternate hypothesis was retained for the four occupational status groups on attitudes toward feminism:

\[ H_1: \bar{x}_{\text{semi/unskilled workers}} < \bar{x}_{\text{homemakers}} < \bar{x}_{\text{clerical/sales workers}} < \bar{x}_{\text{professionals}} \]

Values of \( E \) squared, probability values \( P \), sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and one-tailed \( t \)-test results for all possible group combinations of the four occupational status groups are reported in Table 8.

**Hypothesis 10: Marital Status, Achieving Styles, Perceived Dominance, Mastery, and Attitudes Toward Feminism**

\[ H_1: \] The three marital status groups—(a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated—will differ in group mean scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Total Domain, Direct Domain, and Relational Domain, on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, Perceived Partner, and Perceived Dominance in Relationship, on the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, Behavioral, Attitudinal, and Total, and on the FEM-Scale.

Eleven one-way analyses of variance, with the three levels of (a) married, (b) never-married, and (c) divorced/separated each, were employed at \( \alpha = .05 \).

The significance level for behavioral mastery/powerlessness was found to be .04, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Nondirectional Protected LSD pairwise comparisons showed that married women scored significantly higher than did never-married women on behavioral...
mastery/powerlessness. There were no significant differences at $\alpha = .05$ between married and divorced/separated women, nor between never-married and divorced/separated women on behavioral mastery/powerlessness.

The significance levels for the other 10 instruments were all found to be higher than .10, and the 10 corresponding null hypotheses were retained. A list of the significance levels for the 10 instruments follows:

- Achieving Style Inventory—Total Domain: .55
- Achieving Style Inventory—Direct Domain: .54
- Achieving Style Inventory—Relational Domain: .29
- Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self: .37
- Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Partner: .44
- Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Dominance in Relationship: .94
- Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global: .43
- Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal: .24
- Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total: .10
- Attitudes Toward Feminism: .12

Table 9 shows probabilities, sample sizes, means, and standard deviations for the 11 analyses of variance for the three marital status groups and nondirectional $t$-test results for the group mean scores on behavioral mastery/powerlessness.
Table 9
Differences in Achieving Style, Perceived Dominance, Mastery/Powerlessness Orientation, and Attitudes Towards Feminism by Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Total achieving style</th>
<th>(2) Direct achieving style</th>
<th>(3) Relational achieving style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | (4) Perceived dominance of self | (5) Perceived dominance of partner | (6) Perceived dominance in relationship |
|                                | One-way ANOVA                 | Prob.                             | Prob.                             |
|                                |                             | .37                               | .44                               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>20.27</td>
<td>14.64</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-4.03</td>
<td>19.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12.70</td>
<td>10.73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-4.11</td>
<td>15.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-3.02</td>
<td>20.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                                | (7) M/P—Global | (8) M/P—Behavioral | (9) M/P—Attitudinal |
|                                | One-way ANOVA  | Prob.               | Prob.               |
|                                | Prob.          | .43                 | .04*                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nondirectional protected LSD pairwise comparisons of group mean scores on behavioral mastery/powerlessness:</th>
<th>Never-married &lt; married</th>
<th>*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divorced/separated &lt; married</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never-married &lt; divorced/separated</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(10) Mastery/powerlessness—total</th>
<th>(11) Attitudes toward feminism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34.09</td>
<td>9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37.92</td>
<td>9.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 9 reports the results for 11 analyses of variance for the three marital status groups on (1) total achieving style, (2) direct achieving style, (3) relational achieving style, (4) perceived dominance of self, (5) perceived dominance of partner, (6) perceived dominance in relationship, (7) global mastery/powerlessness, (8) behavioral mastery/powerlessness, (9) attitudinal mastery/powerlessness, (10) total mastery/powerlessness, and (11) attitudes toward feminism. It shows the results of nondirectional protected LSD tests for the group mean scores on (8) behavioral mastery/powerlessness. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at $\alpha = .05$. 
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Hypothesis 11: Relations Between Vulnerability Variables and Depression

H1: There will be positive relations among scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Relational Domain and the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Partner and scores on the CES-D Scale on depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and the combined depression measure. There will be negative relations among scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Total Domain, the Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain, the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the FEM-Scale and scores on the CES-D Scale on depression over the past week, depression over the past 6 months, and the combined depression measure.

For the above-listed variables, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were calculated with scores on the CES-D Scale on depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and over the past week and over the past 6 months combined. Significance levels for the correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether the obtained coefficients reflect actual degrees of association between depression scores and the above-listed variables within the larger population.

The three depression measures were found to be positively related with perceived dominance of partner at α = .05, and the null hypothesis was rejected. No significant relations were found between the three depression measures and relational achieving style at α = .05, and the null hypothesis was retained.

The three depression measures were found to be negatively related with behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientation at
a = .05, and the null hypotheses were rejected. No significant relations were found between the three depression measures and total and direct achieving style, global mastery orientation, and attitudes toward feminism, and the null hypotheses were retained. The three depression measures were found to be positively related with perceived dominance of self at \( \alpha = .05 \), which is in the opposite direction of the directional hypothesis.

Correlation coefficients and significance levels at \( \alpha = .05 \) are reported in Table 10.

Hypothesis 12: Interrelations Among Vulnerability Variables

\( H_1: \) There will be positive relations among scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Direct Domain, the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the FEM-Scale. There will be negative relations among scores on the Achieving Styles Inventory—Relational Domain and scores on the Dominance/Submission Scale—Perceived Self, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Global, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Behavioral, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Attitudinal, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale—Total, and the FEM-Scale.

For the above listed combinations of variables, Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients and significance levels were calculated.

Direct achieving style was found to be positively related at \( \alpha = .05 \) with perceived dominance of self, with global, behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientation, and with attitudes toward feminism. Global mastery orientation was found to be positively
Table 10

Relations Between Depression and Vulnerability Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CES-D week</th>
<th>CES-D 6 mo.</th>
<th>CES-D comb.</th>
<th>ASI-T total</th>
<th>ASI-D direct</th>
<th>ASI-R relat.</th>
<th>DES-S self</th>
<th>DES-P part.</th>
<th>MP-G glob.</th>
<th>MP-B beh.</th>
<th>MP-A att.</th>
<th>MP-T tot.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-D week</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D 6 mo.</td>
<td>.706*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D comb.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-T</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-D</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.845*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-R</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.817*</td>
<td>.382*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-S</td>
<td>.134*</td>
<td>.184*</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-P</td>
<td>.207*</td>
<td>.123*</td>
<td>.205*</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-G</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-B</td>
<td>-.184*</td>
<td>-.286*</td>
<td>-.256*</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.147*</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.188*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-A</td>
<td>-.390*</td>
<td>-.328*</td>
<td>-.373*</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>.272*</td>
<td>-.041</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.186*</td>
<td>.333*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-T</td>
<td>-.353*</td>
<td>-.321*</td>
<td>-.356*</td>
<td>.152*</td>
<td>.305*</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.591*</td>
<td>.651*</td>
<td>.837*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.231*</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.766*</td>
<td>.171*</td>
<td>.173*</td>
<td>.476*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 10 reports correlation coefficients for all combinations of the following variables: depression during past week, depression during past 6 months, combined degree of depression, total achievement style, direct achievement style, relational achievement style, perceived dominance of self, perceived dominance of partner, mastery/powerlessness—global, —behavioral, —attitudinal, —total, and attitudes toward feminism. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05.
related at \( \alpha = .05 \) with behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientation, and with attitudes toward feminism. Behavioral mastery orientation was found to be positively related at \( \alpha = .05 \) with attitudinal and total mastery orientation and with attitudes toward feminism. Attitudinal mastery orientation was found to be positively related at \( \alpha = .05 \) with total mastery orientation and with attitudes toward feminism, and total mastery orientation was found to be positively related at \( \alpha = .05 \) with attitudes toward feminism. In the above cases, null hypotheses were rejected. Perceived dominance of self was found not to be significantly related at \( \alpha = .05 \) to global, behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientation and to attitudes toward feminism, and the null hypotheses were retained.

Relational achieving style was found not to be significantly related at \( \alpha = .05 \) to perceived dominance of self, global, behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery orientation, and to attitudes toward feminism, and the null hypotheses were retained.

Correlation coefficients and significance levels at \( \alpha = .05 \) are reported in Table 10.

**Hypothesis 13: Relations Between Other Variables and Depression**

\( H_1: \) There will be negative relations between scores on the CES-D Scale on (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, and the following variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire, (a) occupational prestige (title page), (b) age (item 1), (c) total annual gross family income (item 10), (d) total annual gross income of subject (item 11), (e) educational level (item 8),
There will be positive relations between scores on the CES-D Scale on (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, and the following variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire, (j) number of children at home under 6 years of age (item 9), (k) number of changes desired (item 21), (l) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months (item 13), (m) overall life dissatisfaction (item 18), (n) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person—if married, with husband (items 3, 14, 16, and 17), (o) presence at home of three or more children under age 14 (item 9), and (p) loss of mother before age 11 (item 12). Scores on the CES-D Scale on (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, will vary as a function of (q) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult (item 19), (r) career-homemaker orientation (item 20), and (s) ethnic background (item 22).

For variables (a) through (n), Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients were calculated with scores on the CES-D Scale on depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and over the past week and over the past 6 months combined. Significance levels for the correlation coefficients were calculated to determine whether the obtained coefficients reflect actual degrees of association between depression scores and the 14 variables within the larger population.

With the exception of variable (f), amount of social contact, all relations were predicted in the correct directions. For all three depression measures, significant negative relations at $\alpha = .05$ were found with (a) occupational prestige and (e) educational level,
and the null hypotheses were rejected. Family income (c) was found to correlate significantly at $\alpha = .05$ with depression over the past week and with the combined depression measure, but was not correlated significantly at $\alpha = .05$ with depression over the past 6 months. Subject's income (d) was found not to be significantly related to depression over the past week, over the past 6 months, and to the combined depression measure at $\alpha = .05$, and the null hypotheses were retained. Age (b), social contact (f), freedom on the job (h), and number of people supervised (i) were not significantly related to the three depression measures at $\alpha = .05$, and the null hypotheses were retained (Table 11).

Significant positive relations at $\alpha = .05$ were found for the three depression measures and number of changes desired (k), dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months (l), overall life dissatisfaction (m), and absence of a confiding relationship with significant person—if married, with husband (n), and the null hypotheses were rejected. Number of children at home under 6 years of age (j) were not significantly related to the three depression measures at $\alpha = .05$ (Table 11).

Six one-way analyses of variance were employed at $\alpha = .05$ for variables (g) and (o) through (s). $F$-values were found not to be significant at $\alpha = .05$ for the variables: presence at home of three or more children under age 14 (o), loss of mother before age 11 (p), expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult (q), and career-homemaker orientation (r), and the null hypotheses were retained (Table 11).
The F-value for number of confiding relationships (g) was found to be significant at $\alpha = .05$, and the null hypothesis was rejected. Protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the group mean scores found that women with three or more confiding relationships were significantly less depressed over the past week at $\alpha = .05$ than were women who had only one confiding relationship; on depression over the past 6 months and on the combined depression measure, women who had two or more confiding relationships were significantly less depressed at $\alpha = .05$ than were women who had one confiding relationship (Table 11).

The F-value for ethnic background (s) was found to be significant at $\alpha = .05$ on depression over the past week and on the combined depression measure, and the null hypotheses were rejected. Protected LSD pairwise comparisons of the group mean scores found that white women were significantly less depressed over the past week than were black women at $\alpha = .05$. White women and women of other ethnic background were significantly less depressed at $\alpha = .05$ on the combined depression measure than were black women. The F-value for ethnic background on depression over the past 6 months was found not to be significant, and the null hypothesis was retained.

Table 11 reports directional Pearson Product Moment Correlations with significance levels; for the six one-way analyses of variance, Table 11 reports sample sizes, means, standard deviations, and significance levels of Protected LSD pairwise comparisons.
### Table 11

Relations Between Depression and Other Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Negative Relations</th>
<th>(1) Occup. Prestige</th>
<th>(2) Age</th>
<th>(3) Family Income</th>
<th>(4) Subject's Income</th>
<th>(5) Educ. Level</th>
<th>(6) Social Contact</th>
<th>(7) # Confiding Relations</th>
<th>(8) Freedom on Job</th>
<th>(9) # People Supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—past week</td>
<td>-.164*</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>-.257*</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>-.228*</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.193*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—past 6 mo.</td>
<td>-.115*</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>-.110</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>-.204*</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.131*</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—combined</td>
<td>-.142*</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.196*</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.229*</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.165*</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted Positive Relations</th>
<th>(10) # Children 6 Years</th>
<th>(11) Desired Changes</th>
<th>(12) Social Dissatis.</th>
<th>(13) Life Dissatis.</th>
<th>(14) Absence of Confiding Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—past week</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.203*</td>
<td>.473*</td>
<td>.624*</td>
<td>.351*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—past 6 mo.</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.235*</td>
<td>.464*</td>
<td>.554*</td>
<td>.397*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D—combined</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.237*</td>
<td>.511*</td>
<td>.648*</td>
<td>.415*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Table 11 reports directional Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients between the three depression measures and selected background variables and the Brown and Harris (1978) variable: Absence of Confiding Relationship with Significant Person—if married, with husband. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CES-D--past week</th>
<th>CES-D--past 6 months</th>
<th>CES-D--combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) 3 or more children under 14</td>
<td>.57 .06 .14</td>
<td>.57 .06 .14</td>
<td>.57 .06 .14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at home</td>
<td>No 189 12.96 10.03</td>
<td>No 189 13.98 10.16</td>
<td>No 183 13.27 9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 15 11.40 11.56</td>
<td>Yes 16 9.06 7.03</td>
<td>Yes 14 9.46 7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No 194 13.06 10.24</td>
<td>No 195 13.74 10.15</td>
<td>No 187 13.18 9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 10 8.70 6.31</td>
<td>Yes 10 10.80 7.05</td>
<td>Yes 10 9.75 5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(16) Expected economic support</td>
<td>.94 .89 .95</td>
<td>.94 .89 .95</td>
<td>.94 .89 .95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as adult</td>
<td>Self 80 13.23 10.24</td>
<td>Self 79 13.51 8.95</td>
<td>Self 76 13.34 8.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don't know 58 12.17 10.67</td>
<td>Don't know 60 13.87 11.04</td>
<td>Don't know 57 12.85 10.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Career–homemaker-orientation</td>
<td>.70 .52 .66</td>
<td>.70 .52 .66</td>
<td>.70 .52 .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homemaker 87 13.52 11.54</td>
<td>Homemaker 89 13.29 10.91</td>
<td>Homemaker 85 13.04 10.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career 20 13.40 9.34</td>
<td>Career 20 12.80 8.86</td>
<td>Career 19 12.89 8.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both: No conflict 69 11.67 7.95</td>
<td>Both: No conflict 69 13.16 8.62</td>
<td>Both: No conflict 66 12.22 7.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both: Conflict 28 13.29 10.96</td>
<td>Both: Conflict 27 16.30 11.18</td>
<td>Both: Conflict 27 14.89 10.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>CES-D—past week</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CES-D—past 6 months</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>CES-D—combined</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
<td>Prob. N Mean SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) # of confiding</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.03*</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7 17.71 5.28</td>
<td>5 17.80 6.50</td>
<td>5 16.70 4.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 and more</td>
<td>143 11.73 9.24</td>
<td>144 12.69 9.52</td>
<td>139 12.07 8.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected LSD pairwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 &lt; 0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; 0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &lt; 0</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; 1</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &lt; 1</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 &lt; 3</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Ethnic background</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>185 12.32 9.84</td>
<td>189 13.43 10.04</td>
<td>182 12.75 9.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11 21.55 9.95</td>
<td>9 20.22 10.60</td>
<td>8 20.75 9.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 13.13 12.60</td>
<td>7 9.43 4.93</td>
<td>7 10.72 7.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected LSD pairwise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &lt; Black</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other &lt; Black</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &lt; Other</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 11 reports sample sizes, means, standard deviations, significance levels, and significance for the Protected LSD pairwise comparisons, if applicable, for the six one-way analyses of variance for the categorical background variables on the three depression measures. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$. "ns" indicates nonsignificance at $\alpha = .05$. 
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Hypothesis 14: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status and Vulnerability Variables

H_1: The four potential vulnerability factors—(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, as measured by the Achieving Styles Inventory, (b) powerlessness orientation, as measured by the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, (c) perceived dominance of partner, as measured by the Dominance/Submission Scale, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism, as measured by the FEM-Scale—will add a significant amount of predictive- ness at $\alpha = .05$ for the degree of depression, as measured by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by occupational status.

Two multiple regressions were run on each of the three dependent variables: (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined.

On depression over the past week, occupational status group membership accounted for 5.30% of the variance at $\alpha = .1$; professional group membership was the strongest predictor of the occupational status groups and accounted for 4.21% of the variance. Occupational status group membership and the vulnerability variables together accounted for 26.20% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; attitudinal mastery/powerlessness orientation was the strongest predictor and accounted for 12.37% of the variance. The vulnerability variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in depression beyond occupational status group membership, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past 6 months, occupational status group membership accounted for 4.73% of the variance at $\alpha = .1$; professional group membership was the strongest predictor and accounted for 2.22%
of the variance. Occupational status group membership and the vulnerability variables together accounted for 25.62% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; reliant relational achieving style was the strongest predictor and accounted for 5.68% of the variance. The vulnerability variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past 6 months beyond occupational status group membership, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, occupational status group membership accounted for 5.59% of the variance at $\alpha = .1$; again, professional group membership was the strongest predictor and accounted for 3.67% of the variance. Occupational status group membership and the vulnerability variables together accounted for 26.50% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; global mastery/powerlessness orientation was the strongest predictor and accounted for 9.23% of the variance. The vulnerability variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined, beyond occupational status group membership, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 12 reports the $R$ squares for occupational status group membership and for the combination of occupational status group membership and the vulnerability variables, $R$ squares for the best predictor of each equation, the increase in $R$ square when comparing the equations, and the level of significance for the $R$ squares.
Table 12
Predictors of Depression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictive equations</th>
<th>CES-D—past week N = 121</th>
<th>CES-D—past 6 months N = 121</th>
<th>CES-D—combined n = 121</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R squared</td>
<td>Sign. at α = .05</td>
<td>R squared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupations (3)</td>
<td>.0530</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>.0473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best predictor</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>.0421</td>
<td>Professionals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. + Vulnerabilities (18)</td>
<td>.2620</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.2562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best predictor</td>
<td>Attitudinal mastery</td>
<td>.1237</td>
<td>Reliant rel. ach. style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. + Vulnerabilities + Brown &amp; Harris (21)</td>
<td>.3217</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.3377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best predictor</td>
<td>Attitudinal mastery</td>
<td>.1237</td>
<td>Absence of confid. rel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. + vuln. + BSH + 16 background vari. (37)</td>
<td>.5778</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.6054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best predictor</td>
<td>Life dissatisfaction</td>
<td>.3005</td>
<td>Life dissatisfaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase in R squared</th>
<th>Sign. at α = .05</th>
<th>Increase in R squared</th>
<th>Sign. at α = .05</th>
<th>Increase in R squared</th>
<th>Sign. at α = .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupations vs. occ. + vulnerabilities</td>
<td>.2090</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.2089</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.2091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. + vuln. vs. occ. + vuln. + Brown &amp; Harris</td>
<td>.0597</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.0815</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.0763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. + vuln. + B &amp; H vs. occ. + vuln. + B &amp; H + 16 background variables</td>
<td>.2561</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.2677</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>.2803</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 12 reports R squares for the four predictive equations for the three depression measures and for the best predictor of each equation; increase in R squares when comparing the predictive equations; level of significance obtained for the R squares. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below α = .05, "ns" indicates nonsignificance at α = .05.
Hypothesis 15: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status, Vulnerability Variables, and Brown and Harris (1978) Variables

H1: The Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire—(a) loss of mother before age 11 (item 12), (b) presence at home of three or more children under age 14 (item 9), and (c) absence of a confiding relationship with significant person, if married, with husband (items 3, 14, 16, and 17)—will add a significant amount of predictiveness at $\alpha = .05$ for the degree of depression, as measured by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability measures of this project, as specified in Hypothesis 14 and occupational status together.

For each of the three dependent variables—(a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined—a multiple regression was run by entering occupational status group membership, the potential vulnerability factors of this project, and the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors.

On depression over the past week, occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, and the Brown and Harris (1978) factors accounted for 32.17% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; attitudinal mastery/powerlessness orientation was the strongest predictor and accounted for 12.37% of the variance. The Brown and Harris (1978) factors accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past week, beyond occupational status group membership and the potential vulnerability variables, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past 6 months, occupational group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, and the Brown and
Harris (1978) factors accounted for 33.77% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; absence of a confiding relationship was the strongest predictor and accounted for 10.71% of the variance. The Brown and Harris (1978) factors accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past 6 months, beyond occupational status group membership and the potential vulnerability variables, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined, occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, and the Brown and Harris (1978) factors accounted for 34.13% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; absence of a confiding relationship was the strongest predictor and accounted for 9.65% of the variance. The Brown and Harris (1978) factors accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined, beyond occupational status group membership and the potential vulnerability variables ($F = 5.79$), and the null hypothesis was rejected.

Table 12 reports the $R^2$ for the combination of occupational status, the vulnerability variables and the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, $R^2$ for the best predictor of this equation, the increase in $R^2$ when adding the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, and the level of significance for the $R^2$ squares.
Hypothesis 16: Prediction of Depression by Occupational Status, Vulnerability Variables, Brown and Harris (1978) Variables, and Background Variables

H₁: The 16 background variables, as measured by the indicated items of the Women's Roles Questionnaire—(a) occupational prestige (title page), (b) age (item 1), (c) total annual gross family income (item 10), (d) total annual gross income of subject (item 11), (e) educational level (item 8), (f) amount of social contact (item 15), (g) freedom on the job (item 7), (h) number of people supervised (item 6), (i) number of children at home under 6 years of age (item 9), (j) number of changes desired (item 21), (k) dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months (item 13), (l) overall life dissatisfaction (item 18), (m) number of confiding relationships (item 14), (n) expectation of source of support for economic needs as an adult (item 19), (o) career-homemaker orientation (item 20), and (p) ethnic background (item 22)—will add a significant amount of predictiveness at α = .05 for the degree of depression, as measured by the CES-D Scale, beyond that predicted by the four vulnerability factors of this project, as specified in Hypothesis 14, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors, as specified in Hypothesis 15, and occupational status together.

For each of the three dependent variables, (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) depression over the past week and over the past 6 months combined, a multiple regression was run by entering occupational status group membership, the potential vulnerability factors of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability factors, and the 16 background variables.

On depression over the past week, occupational group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, and the 16 background variables accounted for 57.78% of the variance at α = .05; general life dissatisfaction was the strongest predictor and accounted for 30.05% of the variance. The 16 background
variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past week, beyond occupational status group membership, the potential vulnerability variables, and the Brown and Harris (1978) variables, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past 6 months, occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, and the 16 background variables accounted for 60.54% of the variance at $\alpha = .05$; overall life dissatisfaction was the strongest predictor and accounted for 25.69% of the variance. The 16 background variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past 6 months, beyond occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, and the Brown and Harris (1978) factors ($F = 2.75$), and the null hypothesis was rejected.

On depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined, occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, and the 16 background variables accounted for 62.16% of the variance. Overall life dissatisfaction was the strongest predictor and accounted for 32.46% of the variance. The 16 background variables accounted for a significant increase at $\alpha = .05$ in the prediction of depression over the past week and the past 6 months combined, beyond occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, and the Brown and Harris (1978) factors ($F = 2.79$), and the null hypothesis was rejected.
Table 12 reports the R square for the combination of occupational status group membership, the four potential vulnerability factors, the Brown and Harris (1978) factors, and the 16 background variables, R square for the best predictor of this equation, the increase in R square when adding the 16 background variables, and the level of significance for the R squares.

Additional Analyses

The purpose of Hypotheses 11 and 12 was to examine relations of the proposed vulnerability variables and depression, and the interrelations among the vulnerability variables. Results are reported in Table 10 (p. 195). Hypothesis 14 was stated to explore prediction of depression by occupational group membership and the proposed vulnerability variables. Of the vulnerability variables, the strongest predictor was found to be reliant relational achieving style—a subscale of the relational achieving styles domain—which accounted for 5.68% of the variance on depression over the past 6 months. Thus, relations of the Achieving Styles Inventory subscale scores to those of the depression and vulnerability measures became of interest. As no hypothesis was stated for the Achieving Styles Inventory subscale scores with vulnerability and depression scores, these relationships are explored in the following. Table 13 reports Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients between the nine achieving style subscales—four direct achieving styles and five relational achieving styles—and the three depression measures as well as the other proposed vulnerability measures.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depression</th>
<th>Direct ASI Domains</th>
<th>Relational ASI Domains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CES-D week</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D 6 mo.</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES-D comb.</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI Subscales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intr. Direct</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Direct</td>
<td>.400*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>.395*</td>
<td>.543*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Direct</td>
<td>.148*</td>
<td>.502*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instr. Relat.</td>
<td>.169*</td>
<td>.426*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant Relat.</td>
<td>-.180*</td>
<td>.087*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collab. Relat.</td>
<td>.144*</td>
<td>.205*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contr. Relat.</td>
<td>.404*</td>
<td>.146*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicar. Relat.</td>
<td>.249*</td>
<td>.201*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vulnerability Variables</td>
<td>Direct ASI Domains</td>
<td>Relational ASI Domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-T</td>
<td>.546*</td>
<td>.683*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-D</td>
<td>.646*</td>
<td>.812*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASI-R</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.331*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-S</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES-P</td>
<td>.100&quot;</td>
<td>-.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-G</td>
<td>.192*</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-B</td>
<td>.222*</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-A</td>
<td>.269*</td>
<td>.218*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP-T</td>
<td>.332*</td>
<td>.175*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEH</td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>.068</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 13 reports the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficients for the subscales of the Achieving Styles Inventory, Depression, and the Vulnerability Variables. Results are reported for nine achieving styles: (a) intrinsic direct, (b) competitive direct, (c) power direct, (d) instrumental direct, (e) instrumental relational, (f) reliant relational, (g) collaborative relational, (h) contributory relational, and (i) vicarious relational. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at $\alpha = .05$; the symbol (") indicates significance at $\alpha = .10$. 
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Based on the results reported in Table 13, the following relations were found between the nine achieving styles subscales with depression and with the other vulnerability variables.

Reliant relational achieving style was moderately positive related to depression over the past 6 months and to the combined depression measure. Instrumental direct and collaborative relational achieving styles were moderately positive related to depression over the past 6 months. Contributory relational style was moderately negative related to depression over the past 6 months. Power direct achieving style was slightly negative related to the three depression measures.

Perceived dominance of self was moderately positive related to competitive direct, power direct, instrumental relational styles, and moderately negative to collaborative relational achieving style. Perceived dominance of partner was not significantly related to any of the achieving style subscales. Global mastery was moderately positive related to intrinsic direct, power direct, instrumental relational style, and moderately negative related to reliant relational style. Behavioral mastery was moderately positive related to intrinsic direct, power direct, contributory relational style, and moderately negative to reliant relational style. Attitudinal mastery was moderately positive related to intrinsic direct, competitive direct, power direct, contributory relational style, and moderately negative to reliant relational style. Total mastery was strongly positive related to power direct style ($r = .416$), moderately positive to intrinsic direct, competitive direct, contributory relational style, and
strongly negative related to reliant relational achieving style ($r = -0.390$). Attitudes toward feminism were strongly positive related with power direct style ($r = 0.377$), moderately positive with intrinsic direct and instrumental relational style, and moderately negative with reliant relational style.

To summarize these results, women with a strong sense of mastery—global, behavioral, attitudinal, and total—and with positive attitudes toward feminism tend to be highly task oriented and to enjoy accomplishment for its own sake (intrinsic direct), enjoy control and exercise of power (power direct), and do not view themselves in need of help by others to meet their own goals; instead, they take responsibility for their achievements themselves (low reliant relational).

Hypotheses 1-10 were stated to examine differences among the four occupational groups and among the three marital groups on undesirable life events, depression, and the proposed vulnerability variables. However, no differences among these groups were explored on the nine Achieving Styles Inventory subscale scores. As reliant relational achieving style was found to be the strongest single predictor variable of the vulnerability variables for degree of depression over the past 6 months, possible differences among occupational and among marital groups became of interest on this and other achieving style subscale scores. Table 14 presents an overview of the results for the four occupational groups and for the three marital groups on group mean score differences for the nine Achieving Styles Inventory subscales. Results are reported in the same format as used
for the overview of Hypotheses 1-10 (Chapter IV, pp. 161-162). One-way analyses of variance and Protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed at $\alpha = .05$. More detailed results are reported in Appendix R.

Table 14

Differences in Achieving Styles Subscale Scores by Occupational and Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic direct</td>
<td>$S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P^*$</td>
<td>$M &lt; NM &lt; DS$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitive direct</td>
<td>$H &lt; S/U &lt; P &lt; C/S$ ns</td>
<td>$NM &lt; M &lt; DS$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power direct</td>
<td>$S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P^*$</td>
<td>$M &lt; NM &lt; DS$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental direct</td>
<td>$H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U &lt; P^*$</td>
<td>$DS &lt; M &lt; NM$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental relational</td>
<td>$H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U &lt; P^*$</td>
<td>$M &lt; NM &lt; DS$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliant relational</td>
<td>$C/S &lt; P &lt; H &lt; S/U$ ns</td>
<td>$NM &lt; M &lt; DS$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative relational</td>
<td>$C/S &lt; H &lt; S/U &lt; P$ ns</td>
<td>$NM &lt; DS &lt; M$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory relational</td>
<td>$S/U &lt; C/S &lt; H &lt; P^*$</td>
<td>$NM &lt; DS &lt; M$ ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicarious relational</td>
<td>$P &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U$ ns</td>
<td>$NM &lt; DS &lt; M$ *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the results reported in Table 14 ($\alpha = .05$), professionals scored significantly higher than clerical/sales workers, semi/unskilled workers, and homemakers on power direct achieving style; homemakers and semi/unskilled workers were lower than the clerical/sales workers on power direct style, and no significant difference was found between homemakers and semi/unskilled workers on this variable.
Professionals reported significantly higher levels of intrinsic direct achieving style than did homemakers and semi/unskilled workers, but did not differ from clerical/sales workers. Professionals and semi/unskilled workers scored significantly higher on instrumental direct style than did the homemakers, but did not differ significantly from clerical/sales workers. On contributory relational achieving style, professionals scored higher than the clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers, but did not differ from homemakers. Professionals scored higher on instrumental relational style than any of the other groups, and homemakers scored lower than did clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers on this variable.

No significant differences were found between the occupational groups on competitive direct style, reliant relational style, collaborative relational style, and on vicarious relational style.

The marital status groups did not differ significantly on any of the achieving style subscales, with exception of vicarious relational style: On this variable, married women scored significantly higher than never-married women, but did not differ from divorced/separated women.

Thus, professionals scored comparatively high on power direct, instrumental relational, intrinsic direct, and on contributory relational achieving styles.

In Hypothesis 16, the prediction of depression was explored by a combination of (a) occupational group membership, (b) the proposed vulnerability variables, (c) the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables, and (d) 16 background variables. The background
variable "dissatisfaction with general life" was found to be the strongest predictor for the three depression scores of all variables entered in the equation, and accounted for an average of 29.40% of the variance on depression. As this variable proved so powerful a predictor of depression, potential differences among the occupational groups and among the marital groups on this and other background variables became of interest. As no specific hypotheses were stated for occupational and marital group mean differences on selected background variables, an overview of the results for the 16 background variables among these groups is given here for descriptive purposes. Results are reported in Table 15 in the same format as used for the overview of Hypotheses 1-10 (Chapter IV, pp. 161-162). Analyses of variance and Protected LSD pairwise comparisons were employed at $\alpha = .05$ for the continuous variables (1-14); chi-square analyses were employed for the categorical variables (15-19). More detailed results are reported in Appendix S (p. 351 of this dissertation).

Results (at $\alpha = .05$) showed that professionals were higher in occupational and educational level, personal income, and number of people supervised than the other occupational groups. Professionals reported the highest confiding relationship with their partner, a high number of other confiding relationships, and felt the least amount of freedom on their job. They were very satisfied with their social life, and did not differ significantly from the homemakers. Homemakers reported highest satisfaction with life overall, and did not differ significantly from the professionals. Homemakers had the highest number of children under age 6 at home, and more children
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Occupational prestige (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; DS &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Age (AOV)</td>
<td>C/S &lt; H &lt; P &lt; S/U ns</td>
<td>NM &lt; M &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Family income (AOV)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P &lt; H *</td>
<td>DS &lt; NM &lt; M *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Personal income (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; DS &lt; NM *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Education (AOV)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>DS &lt; M &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Amount of social contact (AOV)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; C/S &lt; H &lt; P ns</td>
<td>NM &lt; M &lt; DS ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) No. of confiding relationships (AOV)</td>
<td>S/U &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>DS &lt; M &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Lack of freedom on job (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; DS &lt; NM *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) No. of people supervised (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; S/U &lt; C/S &lt; P *</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10) No. of children under 6 (AOV)</td>
<td>C/S &lt; P &lt; S/U &lt; H *</td>
<td>NM &lt; DS &lt; M *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(11) No. of changes desired (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; P &lt; C/S &lt; S/U ns</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Social dissatisfaction (AOV)</td>
<td>P &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U *</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Life dissatisfaction (AOV)</td>
<td>H &lt; P &lt; C/S &lt; S/U *</td>
<td>M &lt; NM &lt; DS *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(14) Absence of confiding relationship (AOV)</td>
<td>P &lt; H &lt; C/S &lt; S/U *</td>
<td>M &lt; DS &lt; NM ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15) 3 or more children under 14 (x^2)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 15—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(16) Loss of mother before 11 ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(17) Expectation of source of support as adult ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) Career-homemaker orientation ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) Ethnic background ($\chi^2$)</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 15 reports results for 14 one-way analyses of variance for the continuous background variables for occupational and marital groups, and Protected LSD comparisons. Five chi-squares were employed for categorical background variables for occupational and marital groups. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at $\alpha = .05$; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at $\alpha = .05$.

Under age 14 than the other groups. Homemakers reported the highest family income, though they did not differ significantly from the professionals. Clerical/sales workers had the lowest personal income of the employed women though they did not differ significantly from the semi/unskilled workers. Their educational level was higher than that of the semi/unskilled workers, though they did not differ significantly from the homemakers. Semi/unskilled workers reported the lowest educational level, lowest family income, least number of confiding relationships, and the lowest occupational prestige of the employed women. Semi/unskilled workers were very dissatisfied with their social and general life though they did not differ significantly from the clerical/sales workers. No significant differences among
the occupational groups were found in amount of social contact, number of changes desired, age, and loss of mother before age 11.

Never-married women were significantly younger than married and divorced/separated women. Married women reported a higher family income and a lower personal income than did the never-married and divorced/separated women. Married women had significantly more children under age 6 at home than never-married and divorced/separated women. Married women were significantly more satisfied with their overall life than the other groups, and were more satisfied with their social life than were the divorced/separated women, though they did not differ from the never-married women in this variable. Married women reported stronger homemaker-orientation than did the never-married and divorced/separated women. No significant differences were found between the three marital groups in occupational and educational level, amount of social contact, number of changes desired, level of confiding relationship, loss of mother before age 11, presence of three or more children at home, expectation of source of support for economic needs as adult, and ethnic background.
Chapter V is organized as follows: (a) discussion and conclusions, (b) limitations of the study, (c) theoretical implications, (d) practical implications, (e) recommendations for further research, and (f) summary.

Discussion and Conclusions

The basic premise of this study was that the proposed vulnerability variables related to depression in women form a cluster which tends to occur more frequently in certain occupational groups. If this premise were substantiated, then progress toward a theoretical framework for further understanding women's roles and vulnerability to depression will be possible. The core of the study was to determine whether four variables, (a) high relational combined with low direct achieving style, (b) perception of one's partner as dominant, (c) powerlessness, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism, are vulnerability factors to depression in women. Moreover, the study determined whether these depression vulnerability variables are related to occupational and marital roles.

This section includes the findings of each of the 16 research hypotheses discussed in relation to the pertinate literature, alternate explanations of the findings, methodological limitations of this study, conceptual and methodological bases for differences of these
results with those of other studies, and theoretical and practical implications of the findings.

As a way of organizing the 16 research hypotheses, five areas are presented: (a) undesirable life events in women of varying occupational and marital status, (b) depression in women of varying occupational and marital status, (c) vulnerability variables in women of varying occupational and marital status, (d) relationships between vulnerability variables and other background variables and depression in women, and (e) prediction of depression. The research questions (Chapter I, p. 12) are used as an outline to the following discussion and conclusions.

Undesirable Life Events in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status

In this study, the conceptualization of depression parallels the psychosocial model of depression (Brown & Harris, 1978):

The provoking agents influence when the depression occurs, the vulnerability factors whether these agents will have an effect, and the symptom-formation factors the severity and form of the depressive disorder itself. (pp. 280-281)

Provoking agents were measured with the PERI Life Events Scale (Dohrenwend et al., 1978), which requires subjects to mark, on a list of 102 life events, those events which, for better or for worse, interrupted their usual activities over the past 6 months (Dohrenwend, Note 3).

The recent literature emphasized the importance of vulnerability variables as mediators between stressful or undesirable life events and the experience of distress (Brown & Harris, 1978; Kessler, 1979;
Makosky, in press; Markush & Favero, 1974; Paykel, 1974a; Radloff, 1975; Radloff & Rae, 1979; Rahe, 1974). Since undesirable life events have been found to be related to depression (Paykel, 1974b), this study controlled for such events when examining the effects of occupational and marital status on depression. There are no studies in the current literature on differences in the experience of undesirable life events among women of varying occupational status. However, Dohrenwend (1973a) and Brown and associates (1975) reported that stressful life events were more frequent in lower socioeconomic classes, and decreased with increasing social class.

When examining the relationship between marital status and undesirable life events in women, divorced/separated women, as a group, experience especially high levels of stress (Aslin, 1976; Campbell et al., 1976; Guttentag & Salasin, 1976). Based on these considerations, it is likely that women in varying occupational and marital groups would differ in the experience of undesirable life events.

Given the main focus of the present study, the variable of undesirable life events was included for control purposes. It was important to find out whether such a control would be necessary.

**Research Question 1.** Will the four occupational status groups and the three marital status groups differ in undesirable life events?

The purpose of Hypothesis 1 was to test whether women in varying occupational groups differ in their experience of undesirable life events over the past 6 months. In order to minimize the likelihood of retaining a false null hypothesis, α was set at a high level of .5.
Women in the four occupational groups did not differ significantly in their experience of undesirable life events ($\alpha = .74$). Thus, it was not necessary to control for undesirable life events when examining the effects of occupational status on depression, findings which are contrary to those reported by Dohrenwend (1973a) and Brown and associates (1975). Possible explanations for these contrary results are that Dohrenwend (1973a) employed the 43-events life change measure developed by Holmes and Rahe (1967), whereas in the present study, the 102-item PERI Life Events Scale (Dohrenwend et al., 1978) was employed. Brown and associates (1975) used an interviewing procedure. Therefore, the measures are not necessarily comparable and may account, at least in part, for the differences in results. Other factors must be considered in discussing Hypothesis 1:

1. The ratings of the severity of life events have been found to vary in different educational and ethnic background groups (Askenasy et al., 1977). In this study, previously established weighted mean scores (Dohrenwend et al., 1978) were utilized to control for differences in recent loss events, leading to the possibility that the same event would be rated differently among the varying occupational groups.

2. As pointed out by Makosky (in press), life event changes do not measure long-term stressful life conditions such as poor housing, inadequate child care facilities, and lack of support. Women in the four occupational groups may well differ in their experience of long-term stressful life conditions, which may impact depression.
3. Due to most women's relational orientation, they may experience stress when they see their relatives and friends in stress. In this study, only individually experienced undesirable life events were measured, thus leading possibly to an underestimate for certain occupational groups in vicariously experienced stress.

Hypothesis 2 was designed to test whether women in three marital status groups differ in their experience of undesirable life events over the past 6 months. Again, the $\alpha$ level was set at .5 to minimize the likelihood of retaining a false null hypothesis. The findings were that women differed significantly ($\alpha = .00$) in the experience of undesirable life events as a function of marital status. Subsequent hypotheses concerning marital status and depression were therefore tested with the effects of undesirable life events over the past 6 months controlled.

It was concluded that marriage apparently is related to a low experience of undesirable life events, and divorce or separation to a high experience of undesirable life events, with never-married women occupying a middle position. These results are consistent with the reviewed literature (Aslin, 1976; Brown & Harris, 1978; Havlick, 1975; Pearlin & Johnson, 1977; White, 1974).

As pointed out previously for the occupational groups, it is likely that women of varying marital status would also experience different levels of stressful life conditions. It was concluded that the findings of this study reflect a realistic picture, and that a woman's experience and report of undesirable life events varies according to her marital status.
Depression in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status

Research Question 2. Will the four occupational status groups differ in depression?

In Hypothesis 3, it was postulated that women in the occupational groups would show systematic rank-ordered differences in depression. The rationale was based on studies suggesting that employment per se may not affect one's well-being, but that the type of employment may be related to level of psychological distress and depression. It was expected that women in higher-level occupations (professionals and, to a lesser degree, clerical/sales workers) would report lower depression than homemakers, and that semi/unskilled workers would report the highest level of depression.

Depression was measured with the CES-D Scale (Radloff, 1977), a widely used self-report scale which serves as a rough indicator of clinical depression in general population samples (Myers & Weissman, 1980). Three ordered means analyses of variance (Stoline, 1981) were employed for (a) depression over the past week, (b) depression over the past 6 months, and (c) a combined depression measure. It was found that the four occupational groups differed significantly in the degree of depression on the three measures. However, the predicted rank ordering of group means was only in part supported. Homemakers were found less depressed than expected, and did not differ significantly from the professionals. When comparing the employed groups, professionals were significantly less depressed that the clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers. Clerical/sales workers
were more depressed than predicted: They did not differ significantly from the most depressed group, the semi/unskilled workers. Homemakers were, as predicted, significantly less depressed than the semi/unskilled workers. It is unclear due to the reversal of the predicted with the obtained rank order, whether homemakers were also significantly less depressed than the clerical/sales workers.

Previous large-scale surveys reported inconsistent or insignificant differences in life satisfaction and emotional well-being among employed women and homemakers (Campbell et al., 1976; Pearlin, 1975). Wright (1978) warned researchers to not exaggerate supposed benefits from outside employment for women. In these surveys, varying levels of employment were not distinguished. Radloff (1977) reported that 70% of patients and only 21% of the general population scored above a cut-off point of 16 on the CES-D Scale. In this study, the semi/unskilled workers on the average scored at this clinically significant level of depression. These findings are consistent with Guttentag and Salasin's (1976) report of high depression among women employed in low-level, low-status jobs. In the present study, employment per se was not related to level of depression. However, among the employed women, level of employment and psychological well-being (low depression) were related: Lower-level jobs were related to higher levels of depression, and higher-level jobs to lower levels of depression. These findings are similar to those reported by Ilfeld (Note 7), who suggested, based on a large-scale survey in Chicago, that to lower women's epidemiological depression, they should be encouraged and enabled to find higher level jobs.
One confining variable may be that the sample was drawn from Kalamazoo County, Michigan. Kalamazoo is a medium-sized town in lower Michigan, with a population whose per capita income is well above average when compared to the general population of the United States. The Kalamazoo homemakers' mean family income approaches $29,500. Thus, these homemakers may be a select and relatively affluent group, increasing their sense of well-being. It is likely that these women saw little economic need to be employed.

It was concluded for this sample that employment per se may not be a critical variable in women's depression. However, among the employed women, higher level occupations were related to lower levels of depression.

Research Question 3. Will the three marital status groups differ in depression?

It was postulated in Hypothesis 4 that women in three marital status groups would differ in depression. Married adults generally have been found to have lower rates of mental illness than nonmarried adults (Rohrbaugh, 1979). Of the single women, never-married women have been reported as having comparatively low rates of depression (Bequaert, 1976; Birnbaum, 1975; Brown & Harris, 1978; White, 1974), whereas divorced/separated women had higher rates (Brown & Harris, 1978; Pearlin & Johnson, 1977). However, Gordon and associates (Note 11) found no significant difference in depression between never-married and divorced/separated women and reported observing a slight advantage for the divorced/separated women in well-being.
Based on the results of three analyses of covariance to control for undesirable life events, it was concluded that marital status does not significantly impact depression over the past week ($\alpha = .08$), but is associated with depression over the past 6 months ($\alpha = .03$) and with the combined depression measure ($\alpha = .05$). Divorced/separated women were the most depressed group and reported significantly higher levels of depression than did married and never-married women on depression over the past 6 months, but did not differ significantly from the never-married women on the combined depression measure. (Appendix T reports congruent results for analyses of variance for the marital groups on depression, without control for undesirable life events.)

These results support Campbell and associates' suggestion (1976) that the costs of divorce are high for women. Gordon and associates (Note 11) reported a slight advantage of the divorced/separated women over the never-married women. Their sample of single women in Boston had a college degree as mean educational level, and a mean income of $17,000. The results of the present study are contrary in that never-married women were significantly less depressed over the past 6 months than were divorced/separated women. No significant differences were found between these groups on the combined depression measure. In the sample of the present study, the family and personal income of the divorced/separated women was lower, although not statistically lower (Appendix S) than that of the never-married women, and they had more children at home. None of the never-married women in this sample had a child at home. Thus, divorced/separated women,
when compared to never-married women, may have to cope with more stressful conditions which may impact higher levels of depression. Though undesirable life events were controlled by use of analysis of covariance, long-term stressful conditions may be especially high for divorced women and may well contribute to depression.

Results for the marital status groups on depression are reported with less confidence due to uneven sample sizes. In summary, it was concluded that marital status impacts depression in women, whereby married women are less depressed than divorced/separated women; never-married women tend to be less depressed than divorced/separated women; and never-married and married women do not differ significantly in depression.

Research Question 4. Will depression vary as a function of occupational and marital status?

In Hypothesis 5 it was expected that depression would vary as a function of both occupational and marital status when controlling for undesirable life events. This expectation was based on Guttentag and Salasin's (1976) report of the devastating effects of divorce and separation on working-class women who have access only to low-level and unsatisfactory jobs. College-educated married women, on the other hand, may experience the absence of employment, or full-time homemaking, as dissatisfying (Birnbaum, 1975). To test this hypothesis, three two-way analyses of covariance were employed for the three depression measures. For depression over the past week, the assumption of homogeneous slopes for the analysis of covariance was
met, but not for depression over the past 6 months and for the combined depression measure. Thus, the last two variables were not explored further.

Results revealed that depression over the past week varied significantly as a function of both occupational and marital status when controlling for undesirable life events over the past 6 months. No significant interaction effect was found ($\alpha = .12$) between occupational and marital status, and both main effects were significant ($\alpha = .05$ for adjusted marital status; $\alpha = .01$ for adjusted occupational status). One cannot conclude that occupational and marital status are independent in their impact on depression, as there may well be an interaction effect, even if not statistically significant.

Previous studies did not examine effects of specific levels of marital and occupational status on women's depression. Campbell and associates (1978) suggested, based on a large-scale survey in Michigan, that marriage is more important for women's life satisfaction than is participation in the labor force. Results of the present study revealed, however, that both factors have to be included when considering women's depression. Being married or never-married did not lead to significant differences in degree of depression over the past week, but being divorced or separated was associated with significantly higher levels of depression. Professionals were significantly less depressed than the three other occupational groups, but no significant differences were found among homemakers, clerical/sales workers, and semi/unskilled workers. In the group of divorced/separated women, the professionals were lowest in depression. Divorced or
separated professionals reported slightly lower levels of depression, though not statistically significant, than the married and never-married semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers. Thus, the findings of Campbell and associates (1976) may apply only when comparing women in the general labor force with homemakers. When more specific occupational levels are distinguished, employment as a professional, based on the present study, may serve to decrease negative consequences of divorce or separation. Results of this study also support Guttentag and Salasin's (1976) suggestion that divorced/separated women employed in low-level jobs have especially high levels of depression.

It was concluded that professional employment appears to protect women from depression, especially when divorced or separated, and that occupational levels are at least as important as are marital levels in their impact on depression in women.

Vulnerability Variables in Women of Varying Occupational and Marital Status

Based on the review of literature on women's socialization, four vulnerability variables to depression were proposed: (a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct and total achieving style, (b) perceived dominance of partner, (c) powerlessness orientation, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism.

Research Question 5. Will the four occupational groups differ in (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism?
Hypothesis 6 predicted rank-ordered differences among the four occupational groups on direct and total achieving styles as measured by the Achieving Styles Inventory (Form 10; Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13), which is an experimental instrument, with acceptable reliabilities and discriminant validity (Lipman-Blumen et al., in press; Handley-Isaksen, et al., Note 13). The Achieving Styles Inventory is the only achievement measurement based on behavioral/attitudinal characteristics of the subjects. Despite the experimental nature of this scale, the results are reported with a fair degree of certainty due to the thorough and extensive development of this scale. Total achieving style was defined as the sum of relational and direct achieving styles.

The reviewed literature indicated that women with a strong relational or "vicarious" achieving style have rather low educational and occupational aspirations (Lipman-Blumen, 1972), whereas women who have strong direct achieving styles reported higher educational and occupational aspirations (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1978). Thus, in this study, it was expected that employed women would report higher direct and total achieving styles than the homemakers. Among the employed women, the following rank-order was predicted for direct and total achieving styles: semi/unskilled workers < clerical/sales workers < professionals.

Professionals were found to score significantly higher on both total and direct achieving styles than did homemakers and semi/unskilled workers. Thus, the results of this study are in accord with Lipman-Blumen's (1972) and Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt's (1978)
findings. When compared with clerical/sales workers, professionals scored significantly higher on total achieving style (α = .05), but only slightly higher on direct achieving style (α = .07). Clerical/sales workers scored significantly higher than did homemakers on direct, but not on total, achieving style. No significant differences were found on direct or on total achieving style between homemakers and semi/unskilled workers, nor between semi/unskilled workers and clerical/sales workers. Apparently, only the highest level of occupational employment was associated with significant differences in direct and total achieving styles.

Hypothesis 7 predicted differences in relational achieving style, dominance of self, and dominance in relationship among the four occupational groups. No rank-ordered differences were predicted for relational achieving style as women in the labor force predominantly continue nurturant and enabling roles such as nurse, teacher, or secretary (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1978).

Results showed that women in the four occupational groups did not differ significantly in relational achieving style, a finding which is consistent with Lipman-Blumen and Leavitt's (1978) report. Also, Lemkau (1979) reported no differences in "warmth and expressiveness" traits among women who differ in "competency" traits, as most women continue vicarious and relational expressions of themselves regardless of occupational status. As direct achieving style was found to be related to continuation of education and focus on career (Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1978), women with high direct achieving style are more likely to reach employment as a professional than are
women with low direct achieving style. Women with high relational achieving style, and low direct and total achieving styles, instead tend to fulfill traditional female roles (Lipman-Blumen, 1970). These findings seem to explain the low direct and total achieving styles found for homemakers of the present sample.

When examining analyses of the subscales of the total and direct achieving style domains (Table 14; Appendix R), professionals were found to be more task-oriented (intrinsic direct) than were homemakers and semi/unskilled workers, but did not differ significantly from the clerical/sales workers. Professionals enjoyed more control and exercise of power (power direct) than the other groups, and clerical/sales workers also scored significantly higher on this variable than did the homemakers and semi/unskilled workers. Professionals used relationships more for achievement (instrumental relational) than did the other groups, and homemakers reported lowest instrumental relational achieving style. Professionals had a significantly stronger sense of contributing to others' achievement (contributory relational) than did the semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers, but they did not differ significantly from the homemakers on this variable.

It was concluded that occupational status is associated with direct and total, but not with relational, achieving styles. The occupational groups did not differ significantly on competitive direct, reliant relational, collaborative relational, and vicarious relational achieving styles.
Perceived dominance of self, of one's partner, and relative degree of perceived dominance in relationship was measured with a revision of the Lu-Dominance-Submission Scale (Lu, 1950). For purposes of this dissertation, the scale was revised as only one partner's perceptions of self and partner were measured. No reliability and validity data are available for this revised scale. Therefore, conclusions regarding the findings are tentative. A further caution is that the concept "perceiving one's partner as dominant" was theoretically based on the clinical descriptions by Arieti and Bemporad (1978). The measurement of this concept with the revised Dominance-Submission Scale certainly does not reflect Arieti and Bemporad's elaborations in depth; it is at best an approximation. Further studies are needed to explore whether the measurement of "perception of one's partner as dominant" in the sense of Arieti and Bemporad (1978) is possible with this revised scale.

Previous studies showed that most women avoid describing themselves as dominant, and perceive their partners as still higher functioning than themselves (Birnbaum, 1975; Horner, 1970, cited in Rohrbaugh, 1979, p. 186). Therefore, no rank-ordered group mean differences were predicted on self-perceptions of dominance and no rank-ordered differences were predicted for the relative degree of dominance in the relationship.

Results showed that women in varying occupational status groups did not differ in self-perceptions of dominance. It was concluded that occupational status is not significantly related to perceiving oneself as dominant, at least as measured with the revised
Dominance-Submission Scale. Relative degree of dominance in relationship was measured by self-perceptions minus perceptions of dominance of partner. Professionals were found to report more egalitarian relationships than did the clerical/sales workers, who described themselves as significantly more submissive. It is suggested that professionals and clerical/sales workers may be at opposite ends on the continuum of relative dominance-submissiveness in relationship, possibly because their workroles may call for differing degrees of individual initiative versus subservience.

In Hypothesis 8, it was expected that professionals, due to their comparatively strong focus on a career, would perceive their partners as least dominant, followed by clerical/sales workers and homemakers. Previous studies showed that relationships with less dominant partners were related to higher career-orientation in the other partner (Walstedt, 1974; Winter et al., 1977). Semi/unskilled workers were expected to view their partners as most dominant due to traditional sex-role stereotypes (Guttentag & Salasin, 1976). Findings of this study are partly consistent with previous research in that professionals were lowest in their perception of their partner's dominance when compared with other employed groups. In addition, professionals viewed their partners as less dominant than did the homemakers, although those differences were not significant. Semi/unskilled workers did not perceive themselves as submissive in their relationships, nor their partners as dominant, when compared to the other groups. Several possible explanations may be considered:

(a) Most black women in this sample were semi/unskilled workers
(66.7%), and it may be that ethnicity affects perceived dominance in one's relationship. (b) The majority of the semi/unskilled workers (58.4%) were not married, and may have thought of their significant person in terms of a child or friend, who, by nature of the relationship, may have been less dominant. (c) Many women of the working class maintain the family unit as both breadwinners and homemakers; this may contribute to a sense of dominance, at least in relation to significant persons in one's life.

It was concluded that employment status per se may not be crucial in affecting one's perceived dominance of partner, but that higher level occupational employment was related to lower perceived dominance of partner, whereby the concept of perceived dominance was measured with a scale of unknown reliabilities and validities.

Hypothesis 9 predicted rank-ordered differences among the four occupational groups on mastery orientation and attitudes toward feminism. Professionals were expected to report highest levels of mastery and positive attitudes toward feminism.

Mastery/powerlessness was measured with the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale (Frank et al., 1978), a self-report scale measuring situational/behavioral, attitudinal, and global sense of mastery; the subscales can be added up to a total score.

Strodtebeck (1958, cited in Frank et al., 1978) found mastery to be related to social class, with the lower class reporting less internal sense of mastery and control, and a reliance on luck and fate. Researchers have suggested associations between higher employment status and higher sense of mastery (Barnett & Baruch, 1978).
Therefore, the following rank order was predicted for mastery: semi/unskilled workers < homemakers < clerical/sales workers < professionals.

The results of this study partly agree with the prediction, in that professionals scored significantly higher in global and attitudinal mastery than did the clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers. Professionals did not differ significantly on behavioral mastery from the clerical/sales workers, but differed significantly from semi/unskilled workers and homemakers. Homemakers reported significantly lower mastery than did the professionals on behavioral, attitudinal, and total scales, but not on the global scale. Unexpectedly, homemakers tended to score higher than the clerical/sales workers on global, attitudinal, and total mastery, and did not differ significantly on behavioral mastery. As suggested in the discussion regarding homemakers' low level of depression, the mean family income of $29,500 for homemakers in Kalamazoo County may be a factor which increases the homemakers' sense of mastery. As predicted, the homemakers' attitudinal and total sense of mastery was significantly higher than that of the semi/unskilled workers, and slightly higher, though not statistically significant (α = .06) on global and (α = .10) on behavioral mastery.

Based on these results, it was concluded that among the employed women, one's sense of mastery increases with higher occupational levels. Homemakers, when compared with lower level employed women, tend to score higher on mastery, but tend to score lower than the professionals, especially on the total mastery index. Again, when
comparing women on mastery, labor force participation versus full-time homemaking is less relevant a variable. It was concluded that occupational levels need to be differentiated when examining mastery in varying groups of women.

Attitudes toward feminism were measured with the FEM-Scale (Miller et al., 1975).

Beckman and Houser (1979) found that women employed as professionals had more positive attitudes toward the women's liberation movement than women employed as nonprofessionals. Also, length of employment was related to more positive attitudes toward the women's movement. Guttentag and Salasin (1976) noted the especially traditional attitudes among low-income employed women toward women's roles. Due to the varying levels of occupation and training among the occupational groups, the following rank-order was predicted for positive attitudes toward feminism: semi/unskilled workers < homemakers < clerical/sales workers < professionals.

On attitudes toward feminism, the predicted rank order was congruent with the obtained rank order. Significant differences at or below $\alpha = .03$ were found for each pair of the four occupational groups. Negative attitudes toward feminism ranged from low to high, in the rank order of: professionals < clerical/sales workers < homemakers < semi/unskilled workers. These results support those by Beckman and Houser (1979) and by Guttentag and Salasin (1976).

It was concluded that occupational group membership and attitudes toward feminism are significantly related.
Research Question 6. Will the three marital status groups differ in (a) achieving styles, (b) perceived dominance, (c) mastery orientation, and (d) attitudes toward feminism?

The purpose of Hypothesis 10 was to explore whether three marital status groups would differ in the proposed vulnerability variables. No rank-ordered differences were expected as there is a lack of literature on differences between marital status groups on these variables. Results for 10 of the 11 one-way analyses of variance for the subscales and totals for the four measurement scales were nonsignificant at $\alpha = .05$. On behavioral mastery, married women scored significantly higher than the never-married women ($\alpha = .05$). No other significant differences were found for the pairwise comparisons. Due to the lack of literature, the results of this study cannot be related to other studies.

It was concluded that married women may have a stronger sense of behavioral mastery than the never-married women. For the other proposed vulnerability variables, the three levels of marital status used in this study may be too general to detect any possible differences among marital status groups. One cannot conclude, based on these findings, that the groups in fact do not differ on these variables, as differences still may exist, though not at a level of statistical significance.
Research Question 7. Will the four potential vulnerability factors---(a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (b) powerlessness orientation, (c) perceived dominance of partner, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism---be related to depression?

Hypothesis 11 suggested directional relationships of the proposed vulnerability variables and depression in women. In the reviewed literature, women's relational or "vicarious" orientation was related to emotional and economic dependencies (Alper, 1978; Lipman-Blumen, 1972; Miller, 1976), which may increase their submission to a "dominant-other" (Arieti, 1979; 1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978), their low sense of mastery (Barnett & Baruch, 1978), their rigid adherence to traditional "feminine" roles (Bernard, 1972; Marecek, 1978), and ultimately, clinical depression (Arieti, 1979; Weissman, 1980).

The conclusions are based on Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients with a significance level of α at or below .05. The total, direct, and relational domains of the achieving styles were not significantly related to the three depression measures, nor were the subscales of intrinsic direct, competitive direct, instrumental relational, and vicarious relational achieving styles. However, reliant relational achieving style was positively and significantly related to the depression measures, and collaborative relational and intrinsic direct styles were significantly and positively related to
depression over the past 6 months. Contributory relational style was significantly and negatively related to depression over the past week, and power direct styles were slightly negative related, though not statistically significant \((\alpha = .10)\) to the three depression measures.

Behavioral, attitudinal, and total mastery were significantly negative related to depression; there were no significant relations between global mastery and the three depression measures. Perceived dominance of partner was, as expected, significantly positive related to the three depression measures. Unexpectedly, perceived dominance of self was also significantly positive related to depression. Perceived dominance, as measured by the revised Dominance-Submission Scale, may reflect a sense of frustration and anger rather than actual dominance (see Appendix J regarding face validity of the items). Positive relations of perceived dominance of self and of partner to depression may support the results of Lu's (1952) study who reported that perceived dominance of self, and perceived dominance of partner were both negatively related to good marital adjustment.

No significant relations were found between attitudes toward feminism and depression.

Research Question 8. Will the four variables—(a) achieving style, (b) mastery orientation, (c) perceived dominance, and (d) attitudes toward feminism—be related with each other?

Hypothesis 12 was designed to examine interrelations among the vulnerability variables. The same rationale was given for the expected interrelations as was stated for the relations of depression.
with the vulnerability variables.

The conclusions are again based on Pearson Product Moment correlation coefficients, with $\alpha = .05$. A cluster of positive significant interrelationships was found among direct achieving style, global mastery, attitudinal mastery, behavioral mastery, total mastery, and liberal attitudes toward feminism. In addition, perceived dominance of self and relational achieving style were significantly and positively related to direct achieving style, but were not significantly related to the other vulnerability variables.

Perception of partner as dominant was not significantly related to achieving styles, mastery, and attitudes toward feminism, and perception of self as dominant was not significantly related to relational achieving style, mastery, and attitudes toward feminism.

When examining the relations among achieving style subscales and the other vulnerability variables, the following cluster was found. Power direct achieving style was significantly and positively related to perceived dominance of self, positive attitudes toward feminism, and to the four mastery orientations. Contributory relational style was significantly and positively related to the mastery orientations. Reliant relational achieving style was significantly and negatively related to mastery orientations and to positive attitudes toward feminism. Vicarious relational style was significantly and negatively related to positive attitudes toward feminism.

When summarizing the conclusions for the relations of vulnerability variables to depression, and for the interrelations among the vulnerability variables, the following picture emerges: The
expectation that high relational achieving style combined with low
direct and total achieving style would be related to higher depression
was met only partially. The total, direct, and relational domains
per se were not significantly related to depression. However, direct
achieving style, mastery, and positive attitudes toward feminism all
formed a positively interrelated cluster, and mastery was inversely re-
lated to depression. Women low in depression took control and charge
(power direct), and had a sense of contributing to others' achieve-
ments (contributory relational). Women high in depression viewed
themselves in need of others' help for achievements (reliant
relational), and to a slight degree, viewed accomplishments mainly as
means to other ends (instrumental direct) and sought a social context
for achievements (collaborative relational). Gaining pleasure from
others' accomplishments (vicarious relational) was not significantly
related to depression, whereas helplessness (reliant relational) and
lack of enjoyment in achievement per se (instrumental direct) were
related to higher depression.

Miller's (1976) observations may help to integrate these find-
ings. She pointed out that women's typical strengths of affiliation
and communion, when used exclusively to please men, lead to subservi-
ence and lack of freedom. "It is only when the woman can move away
from thinking of first pleasing another and conforming to his desires
and expectations that she can even begin to know herself. With the
economic and psychological realities today, this risk is still huge"
(p. 110). When adding power and self-determination to the strength
of contributory relational style, and when "reclaiming conflict"
(Miller, 1976) as growth-producing rather than destructive force, thus not relying on others for achievements, a psychologically healthier environment would develop.

As expected, powerlessness orientation was directly related to higher levels of depression. Also, women who described their partners as dominant—and unexpectedly, who described themselves as dominant—were more depressed.

Though not directly related to depression, the last proposed vulnerability variable, negative attitudes toward feminism, was inversely related to the four mastery orientations. As pointed out earlier, all mastery orientations were negatively related to depression. It is possible that negative attitudes toward feminism may indirectly increase one's vulnerability to depression. However, as correlation coefficients do not lend themselves to causal explanations, more elaborate analyses need to be employed to suggest potential directional relationships among the variables.

Research Question 9. Will selected background variables and the Brown and Harris (1978) variables be related to depression?

The purpose of Hypothesis 13 was to examine systematic relationships between 19 background variables and depression. In line with the reviewed literature, and based on the results of this study, it was concluded that depression increases significantly with decreases in the following variables: occupational prestige, educational level, number of confiding relationships, family income, and slightly with personal income ($\alpha = .10$ for the three depression measures).
Depression increases significantly with increases in the following variables: number of changes desired, dissatisfaction with social life over the past 6 months, overall life dissatisfaction, and absence of a confiding relationship with significant person. Blacks were more depressed than were other minorities and Whites.

In contrast to the reviewed literature which found increases of depression with younger age (Benefari et al., 1972; Guttentag & Salasin, 1976; Radloff, 1975), age was not found to be significantly related to depression. The limitation of the sample to women between the ages of 25 and 50 may have contributed to this found lack of relationship between age and depression.

Also, in contrast to the findings in the literature, in this study the number of preschoolers and the number of children at home were not significantly related to depression. Homemakers of this sample reported significantly more children at home than any of the other groups, and may have chosen to be full-time mothers especially with preschoolers at home.

It was further concluded that the following variables were not significantly related to depression: amount of social contact (which may actually increase one's stress), freedom on the job, number of people supervised, loss of mother before age 11, expectation of support for one's economic needs as an adult, and career-homemaker orientation.
Prediction of Depression in Women

Research Question 10. Will the four vulnerability measures of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability measures, and selected background variables predict the degree of depression?

Hypotheses 14, 15, and 16 were designed to examine whether certain predictor sets would increase the amount of variance accounted for on the dependent variable depression. Hypothesis 14 proposed that the potential vulnerability variables of this study would add significantly in the prediction of depression beyond that of occupational group membership alone. Results of the multiple regression analyses and an F-test on the two R-squares showed that the vulnerability variables added an average of 20.9% to the prediction of depression beyond that of occupational group membership (\( \alpha = .05 \)).

Hypothesis 15 suggested a significant increase in the prediction of depression by adding the three vulnerability variables identified by Brown and Harris (1978). This addition proved significant (\( \alpha = .05 \)). On the average, these three variables added 7.3% to the prediction of depression, whereby absence of a confiding relationship with one's partner was found to be the strongest predictor of all variables considered for both depression over the past 6 months, and for the combined depression measure. This variable alone accounted for an average of 10.1% of the variance of depression.

Hypothesis 16 stated that the addition of the 16 background variables would further increase the prediction of depression beyond that by occupational group membership, the proposed vulnerability variables,
and the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables. Results were found to be significant at $\alpha = .05$, adding on the average 26.8% to the variance on depression up to a total of 60.2% of the variance on the three depression measures. Of the 16 background variables, general life dissatisfaction, measured with a 4-point scale, accounted by itself for an average of 29.4% of the variance on the three depression measures.

To summarize, 60.2% of the variance on the three depression measures could be predicted by a combination of occupational group membership, the vulnerability variables, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables, and selected background variables. Strongest predictors of each of the predictor sets were as follows:

(a) occupational group membership: professional employment (3.4%; not significant at $\alpha = .05$); (b) vulnerability measures: attitudinal mastery (12.4% for depression over the past week; $\alpha = .05$); global mastery (9.2% for the combined depression measure; $\alpha = .05$); and reliant-relational achieving style (5.7% for depression over the past 6 months; $\alpha = .05$); (c) Brown and Harris (1978) measures: attitudinal mastery (12.4% for depression over the past week; $\alpha = .05$); and absence of a confiding relationship (10.7% for depression over the past 6 months and 9.7% for the combined depression measure; $\alpha = .05$); (d) background variables: overall life dissatisfaction (average 29.4% for the three depression measures; $\alpha = .05$).

Depression scores decreased significantly with increasing scores in attitudinal and global mastery. Depression scores increased significantly with increasing scores in absence of a confiding
relationship, general life dissatisfaction, and reliant-relational achieving style.

As the background variable "overall life dissatisfaction" proved so powerful a predictor of depression, potential differences among the occupational groups and among the marital groups on this and other background variables became of interest. Therefore, the following question was added for descriptive purposes:

Additional Question 11. Will the four occupational groups and the three marital groups differ in selected background variables?

Of the occupational groups, professionals had the highest occupational prestige (Temme, 1975), educational level, personal income, number of people supervised, degree of a confiding relationship with their partner, and had the strongest sense that they had not enough freedom on their job. Based on the results reported in Table 15, professionals and homemakers reported high satisfaction with social and overall life, high family income, high number of confiding relationships, and did not differ significantly from each other on these variables. Semi/unskilled workers were the most disadvantaged of the occupational groups: their educational level, family income, number of confiding relationships, and occupational prestige were lowest of the employed women. Semi/unskilled workers were very dissatisfied with social and overall life though they did not differ significantly from the clerical/sales workers. Clerical/sales workers reported the lowest personal income of the employed women, though they did not differ significantly from the semi/unskilled workers; their
educational level was significantly higher than that of the semi/unskilled workers, though they did not differ significantly from the homemakers.

As relationships among many of these background variables were found with depression, it was concluded that these variables need to be considered when describing differences in depression among the varying occupational groups.

When comparing the marital groups on the background variables, significant differences were found. Married women had a higher family income, more children at home under 6 years of age, had a stronger homemaker-orientation, and were more satisfied with their overall life when compared with never-married and divorced/separated women. Married women were more satisfied with their social life than divorced/separated women, though they did not differ significantly from the never-married women on this variable. Never-married women were significantly younger than the other groups. It was concluded that these differences need to be considered when describing marital status and depression in women.

**Summary of Conclusions**

A summary of the conclusions in the outline of the research questions follows.

1. With a high degree of certainty, women in the four occupational status groups report similar levels of undesirable life events, though they may well differ in experience of long-term stressful life conditions. Marriage is related to a low experience of undesirable
life events, and divorce or separation to a high experience of undesirable life events, with never-married women occupying a middle position.

2. Employment versus homemaking may not be a critical variable in women's depression. However, among the employed women, higher level occupations are related to lower levels of depression.

3. Marital status impacts depression in women, whereby married women are less depressed than are divorced/separated women; never-married women tend to be less depressed than divorced/separated women; and never-married and married women do not differ significantly in depression.

4. Professional employment appears to protect women from depression, especially when divorced or separated. Occupational levels are at least as important as are marital levels in their impact on depression in women.

5. Only the professional occupational level is associated with high direct and total achieving styles; homemaking is associated with lowest direct and total achieving styles. Occupational status is not related to relational achieving style, and to perceived dominance of self, at least when measured with the revised Dominance-Submission Scale. Professionals report egalitarian relationships with their partners, and clerical/sales workers report submissive relationships with their partners. Employment status per se is not crucial in affecting one's perceived dominance of partner, but higher occupational employment is related to lower perceived dominance of partner, at least when measured with the revised Dominance-Submission Scale.
When comparing women on mastery, employment status versus homemaking is less relevant a variable, but among the employed women, mastery increases with higher occupational levels. Occupational status and attitudes toward feminism are strongly related, with most negative attitudes toward feminism among the semi/unskilled workers, followed by the homemakers and clerical/sales workers, and professionals with most positive attitudes toward feminism.

6. As measured in this study, marital status is not associated with the proposed vulnerability variables, with the exception that married women have a stronger sense of behavioral mastery than do never-married women.

7. The total, direct, and relational achieving styles are not related to depression; however, reliant relational, collaborative relational, and intrinsic direct achieving styles are positively related to depression. Contributory relational and power direct achieving styles are negatively related to depression. Perceived dominance of self and partner are positively related to depression. Higher mastery is related to lower depression. Attitudes toward feminism are not related to depression.

8. A cluster of positive interrelationships exists among direct achieving style, mastery orientations, and positive attitudes toward feminism. Perceived dominance of self and relational achieving style are positively related to direct achieving style, but not to the other variables.

9. Negatively related to depression are: occupational prestige, educational level, number of confiding relationships, family income,
and personal income. Positively related to depression are: number of changes desired, dissatisfaction with social and general life, absence of a confiding relationship, and being black rather than another minority or white.

10. The combination of occupational group membership, the proposed vulnerability variables of this project, the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables, and selected background variables strongly predict depression: the variance accounted for is 60.1%. Best predictors are general life dissatisfaction (29.4%), attitudinal mastery (12.4%), absence of a confiding relationship (10.7%), global mastery (9.2%), and reliant-relational achieving style (5.7%).

Limitations of the Study

This study was designed to contribute information relative to a model explaining the prevalence of women's depression. The literature does not contain a comprehensive theoretical model of women's depression, but it does contain the results from empirical studies, clinical descriptions, theoretical observations, and suggestions which were essential to this research.

Statements of hypotheses referring to marital status, depression, and vulnerability variables were developed as were hypotheses concerning depression and occupational groups. These hypotheses were based on clinical judgments and on deductions from relevant literature. It is noted, however, that a systematic body of knowledge does not yet exist concerning social-psychological variables in women's depression. The number of variables considered in this study was large compared to
many studies; unfortunately, a more complete and systematic examination of all interrelations of variables was beyond the scope of this dissertation.

This study was further limited in that no life-cycle perspective or developmental stages were included when examining women's roles and depression (Brown et al., 1975; Brown & Harris, 1978; Markus, Note 2). No attempt was made in this study to match an individual's career versus homemaking orientation with her current role, when examining the effects of employment on well-being (Manis & Markus, Note 18). Further complexities in combining roles of homemaking and career were neglected. The fact that most women are part-time, if not full-time, homemakers regardless of their labor force participation was not taken into account. Also not accounted for were possible differences in existing support systems, such as their partners' sharing of homemaking and parenting, access to child care facilities, and help with housework. Although differences in the experience of undesirable life events as related to depression were considered, the effects of long-term stressful conditions on depression were not examined in this study. No results for part-time workers in varying occupational levels were included. The main focus of the study was to examine women in varying occupational levels in terms of depression measures and vulnerability variables. Moreover, no conclusions regarding the relative benefits of employment versus homemaking may be drawn. In order to examine potential protective effects of labor force participation as compared to full-time homemaking, homemakers of one social class would have to be compared with another. Relative
to this point, Brown and associates (1975) suggested:

If having a job is protective, . . . a vulnerable woman would be well-advised to seek employment. There is a hint of such a possibility. Of women with a child at home with an event or difficulty but without an intimate tie with their husband, 79 per cent of those who were unemployed (11/14) as against 14 per cent (2/14) of those employed became disturbed—p < .005. (pp. 238-239)

These researchers reported that women who became employed in the weeks following a severe life event or major difficulty did not develop psychiatric disturbance and instead reported a greater sense of achievement and self-esteem. Thus, labor-force participation may protect against psychiatric symptomatology. However, based on the results of this study, no conclusions can be made regarding this issue.

The design of the study was ex post facto and descriptive, and therefore no causal interpretations of data are possible. Relations among variables are only examined in terms of degree of association, not directionality.

The instruments employed have technical features which permit varying levels of certainty in interpreting results. The PERI Life Events Scale is an acceptable measure of experience of undesirable life event changes, but no claims are made that it actually measures the experience of stress, or long-term conditions. The CES-D Scale cannot be used to diagnose a person as depressed, although it serves satisfactorily as an indicator of depression in general population samples. The revised version of the Dominance-Submission Scale is the least reliable and valid measure employed in this study. No data on properties of this scale were available since it was used for the first time in this research as an experimental instrument. The
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Mastery/Powerlessness Scale is a reliable and valid instrument when used as a total index; the subscales, however, do not have well documented scale properties. The FEM-Scale has excellent reliabilities and good evidence of discriminant validity. The Achieving Styles Inventory (Form 10), although still experimental, has shown promising properties in test-retest reliabilities and discriminant validities.

The questionnaires employed in this study contained items and scales in the same order. Thus, the order of the scales was not counterbalanced, and no possible order effects could be analyzed. Social desirability measures, to control for response biases, were not included. However, this may not be a serious limitation, as Pearlin (1975) reported that "denial" actually led to an increase in degree of depression. Radloff (1977) also reported nonsignificant slightly negative correlation coefficients of scores on the CES-D Scale with those on the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. No measures of differences in the verbal ability of the subjects were employed. The questionnaire was possibly too difficult for some of the subjects, which may explain in part the relatively low response rate of the semi/unskilled workers when compared to the high response rates of homemakers, clerical/sales workers, and professionals.

Of the scales employed in this study, the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale and the CES-D Scale were not theoretically independent, as both can be used to measure psychological disturbance versus sense of mastery and well-being. The measures used in this study for the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables are at best an approximation, and no claim is made that they were presented as specific and
exact as in the original studies by these researchers. A theoretically important concept in this study was reliance on a "dominant-other" (Arieti & Bemporad, 1978). However, the measure of "perceived dominance of partner" with the revised Dominance-Submission Scale is at best a preliminary attempt to measure this concept.

Possible sampling biases and limitations in generalizability of the results of this study may be due to the fact that the sample was drawn from the population in Kalamazoo County, Michigan. Though the sample was randomly selected and stratified according to occupational status, the population of Kalamazoo County is likely not to be representative of the general population of the United States due to the high per capita income in this county. The effects of this generally high standard of living may have shown in the high annual family income of the homemakers in this sample. Further, the subjects volunteered to participate, and thus were a select group. As reported earlier, of 341 women contacted who fit the criteria for inclusion (full-time homemaker or full-time employed, and between the ages of 25 and 50), 45 women (13.2%) refused to participate. Frequently given reasons were being too busy, feeling not comfortable participating in a survey, or for some women, lack of permission of their husbands to participate in a study on "women's roles and lives." It is possible that depressed women were screened out, as they would be probably less willing to participate in a survey than would non-depressed women. Women who participated and who indicated an interest in the results of the study received a letter and summary of the results. When eliciting volunteers for participation, the research
assistant did not mention the word "depression," and explained the study as examining women's lives and roles, specifically, their feelings about themselves, about important people in their lives, and their attitudes and feelings about life in general. Thus, there was a slight deception of the subjects which was explained in the second letter enclosed with a summary of the results. Participants were encouraged to share their reactions to the process of the study and to the results, and were offered access to more detailed information. The second letter and the summary of the results are given in Appendices U and V (pp. 362-365).

Selection biases may have occurred as the research assistant, though without personal investment in eliciting subjects for participation, was a male. Some women were curious why the main researcher—a woman—did not ask potential participants herself, as they would be more comfortable sharing certain information with another woman. No biases occurred due to data analyses, as the statistician employed had no personal investment in outcomes of the study.

A last limitation has to do with the attempt in this study to explore broad social-psychological variables in women's lives with use of scales and statistical analyses. In-depth interviews and actual observations are likely to reflect deeper and more accurate levels of the variables examined. However, due to lack of resources, a mailed-questionnaire approach was selected despite its inherent limitations.
Theoretical Implications

Various models of depression provide partial explanations for the prevalence of depression in women. The cognitive model proposes cognitive distortions such as negative expectations about self, the future, and the world. Women, more so than men, tend to internalize cultural expectations of failure due to sex-typed depressogenic socialization. The original version of the learned helplessness model explained depression as loss of control over reinforcers. The more recent revision and elaboration of this model encompasses attributions of events. The belief that one has no control over important events, together with attribution of failure to global, stable, and internal characteristics and that of success to external, unstable sources leads to a depressogenic way of thinking. Heightened interpersonal influence and responsibility were found typical in depressed individuals as well as in women. The combination of a sense of lack of control and of personal responsibility for this lack is typical in depressed individuals and in women, as is the development of an egocentric cognitive schema. Based on women's focus on child care, they are less individuated than are men due to their roles as nurturers and supporters of others. Women's restricted access to actual power and resources, combined with their belief that they should be able to "control" another person's happiness, and that it is their personal failure if this proves impossible, may well contribute to depression.

The socialization process in women encourages dependency in women due to lack of individuation, reliance on dominant others—
typically men—for safety and need fulfillment, a vicarious and relational orientation with high interpersonal responsibility, and a low sense of actual power and mastery due to actual social discrimination against women. Elements in traditional roles of women as homemakers, wives and mothers were proposed to lead to low self-esteem and depression. Comparisons between women in the labor force and full-time homemakers, however, did not reveal significant or consistent differences in sense of well-being and life satisfaction among these women.

From the present study, it was concluded that being married, fulfilling a traditional role—and being never-married, possibly choosing not to fulfill traditional roles, or not yet fulfilling traditional roles—are associated with low depression. These findings caution against propositions that marriage per se impacts negatively on women. Being divorced/separated—possibly having failed at the expected role of wife—is associated with high depression. An alternate explanation of these findings is that divorced/separated women have to cope with more aversive conditions, low income, inadequate support in child care, and stress from combining full-time homemaking with full-time employment. The experience of severe economic stress for divorced women is suggested in the literature (Marecek & Ballou, 1981); for example, only 20%-30% of ex-husbands make child support payments (Aslin, 1976).

Though marital status clearly impacts depression in women, none of the vulnerability variables proposed in this research are associated with marital status. Thus, when considering the effects of marital status on depression, economic conditions and lack of personal
support rather than the proposed vulnerability variables are major depressogenic influences.

As long as a woman fulfills the traditional roles of "women's work"—i.e., she is married, a homemaker, and provided for adequately by her husband—she may have a sense of control and of making valuable contributions, and not experience depression. Given a husband's economic support, women may choose to fulfill roles of homemaker and mother, especially when having children of preschool age at home, and thus feel satisfied with their lives. It must be pointed out that the homemakers of this sample may well be a privileged group as their family income was highest of all groups studied, and they probably saw no economic need to be employed. Thus, in contrast to some suggestions in the literature, traditional roles per se do not necessarily contribute to depression. However, the privileged position of traditional women changes rapidly at the moment when they have to enter the labor force, especially as a consequence of divorce or separation, or to a lesser degree because their partners do not provide sufficient economic support. Then the effects of nontraditional roles for women—labor force participation—become crucial for their sense of well-being.

Results for the occupational groups indicate that level of employment clearly impacts depression and is associated with vulnerability variables. Professional women seem to have escaped or overcome traditional sex role socialization in that they have high direct, especially power-direct achieving styles, egalitarian relationships with partners, a lack of perceived dominance of partner, high sense
of mastery, and a positive attitude toward feminism. All of these factors are conducive to low levels of depression in professional women. Professionals as a group integrate labor force participation into their view of appropriate women's roles. They believe that women have the same rights as men, and that women as well as men are "breadwinners."

Lower occupational levels are associated with depression and higher vulnerability to depression. This finding lends support to the hypothesis that low social status impacts depression in women. Of the occupational groups, the semi/unskilled workers are most disadvantaged. Their sense of mastery, of power, and of making valuable contributions, is extremely low compared to professionals. Paid employment is a must for this group and they are least prepared educationally for labor force participation. At the same time, they have more children at home than the clerical/sales workers, and their attitudes toward feminism are extremely negative. Thus, they maintain traditional role attitudes while employed. High depression and high dissatisfaction with social and overall life are likely to result from this combination of depressogenic variables. Despite their traditional attitudes toward women's roles, they do not perceive their partners as dominant. In their lives, there simply may be nobody whom they can consider dominant as they themselves are responsible for providing income and homemaking, with little access to support.

Support for the concept of dependence on a dominant other as a significant variable in depression was found in that perceived
dominance of partner was associated with increase in depression for the whole sample. This is particularly relevant for the group of the clerical/sales workers. They perceive their partners as most domi-
nant, which may be a function of generally subservient work roles both at home and at place of employment. However, their sense of mas-
tery is average, their direct achieving style and educational level fairly high, and their attitudes toward feminism fairly positive. These potentially protective variables, however, are apparently not sufficient to prevent a fair degree of depression in this group. The combination of viewing one's partner as dominant, being in a subserv-
vient work role and earning little personal income may lead to depres-
sion and life dissatisfaction.

As pointed out earlier, divorce clearly is a difficult experience for many women, as divorced/separated women are most depressed and most dissatisfied with their lives. A variable which mediates the effects of divorce is one's occupational status. Divorced/separated women employed as professionals are somewhat less depressed than the married or never-married clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers. Based on this study, it appears that a woman's occupational status is at least as important as is her marital status in protect-
ing against depression. This finding modifies Campbell and asso-
ciates' (1976) suggestion that marriage is relatively more important for women's well-being than is labor force participation. Apparently, occupational levels are a mediating variable in depression. The com-
bination of divorce or separation and low occupational levels is most devastating and related to clinically significant levels of depression.
for divorced/separated, semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers. These groups are most disadvantaged economically, a finding which again lends support to the social status hypothesis when explaining depression in women.

As the family income of the homemaker group is higher than that of the three employed groups—at least in this sample—it is likely that most women, professionals included, are employed for the same reasons as are men: to support their families and themselves. Given the fact that 90% of all women in the United States are employed at some point in their lives, young women may well be advised to take their careers more seriously than traditional socialization messages would suggest. The importance of a woman's career, and the depressogenic potential of low-income jobs, are illustrated in this study.

Women employed as professionals—regardless of marital status—are clearly less depressed and more satisfied with their lives than are women employed as clerical/sales workers or semi/unskilled workers. It seems safe to conclude that employment as a professional, with higher levels of education, occupational prestige, and personal income, may serve to protect women against depression.

Women need to learn to care for themselves, financially and psychologically. This does not mean that the traditional womanly strengths of affiliation and communion must be given up. Instead, women and men alike need to develop and maintain close and intimate relationships with others to foster societal and individual well-being. Findings of this study suggest that women who have a close confiding relationship with a significant person, or with several
people, are less depressed than women without such relationships.

Professional women reported higher confiding relationships than the other occupational groups. It is tempting to speculate that a sense of mastery and competence in one's own occupation may give one the strength to develop power, self-determination, and authenticity, and to move toward more egalitarian and healthier relationships. These factors increase the potential for true intimacy in one's relationships as they eliminate having to acquiesce to a dominant other for safety reasons. However, women forced into employment for economic reasons while desiring to be a full-time homemaker, and who have access to only low-income, low-status jobs due to lack of education and few opportunities, who have little sense of impact on one's work environment due to an unresponsive work setting or subservient work roles, and who lack a supportive confiding relationship with a significant person, may well experience depression. This is especially true for economically disadvantaged groups of women.

Gaining access to higher-level occupations may be a crucial factor in decreasing epidemiological depression in women. Employment which fosters a sense of impact and mastery, close affiliation in one's relationships, neither perceiving oneself nor one's partner as dominant, constitutes a viable protective package against depression in women.

Results of this study confirm and elaborate previously suggested models of women's prevalence in depression in women. General conclusions and far-reaching implications are congruent with those stated by Brown and associates (1975):
Certain groups of women in our society have a significantly greater than average risk of suffering from depressive conditions. To the extent that the unequal distribution of such risk is the result of more widely recognized inequalities within our society, and our findings certainly point in this direction, we believe that it constitutes a major social injustice. (p. 248)

**Practical Implications**

Based on this study, depression in women was found associated with the vulnerability variables of perceived dominance of partner, low sense of mastery and low power direct achieving style, high reliant relational achieving style, and indirectly, with negative attitudes toward feminism or stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles.

These vulnerability variables are learned based on sex-typed socialization and they can be unlearned. To facilitate such unlearning, traditional approaches to the treatment of depression need to be expanded or altered. Weissman (1976) compared traditional and nontraditional treatment approaches to depression and concluded that antidepressants—though effective in decreasing depressive symptomatology—have a limited impact on improving problems in living associated with depression. Treatment for social inequities associated with depression instead has to encompass, in addition to psychotherapy, political, legal, and social changes on a societal level, and the development of technical skills on a personal level. Thus, traditional medication approaches achieve little in preventing depression as they do not address the basic cause of depression, which lies in social inequities.
A recently developed approach to counteract women's patterns of helplessness and submissiveness is assertiveness training (Butler, 1976). Women learn to challenge socialization messages and to develop a belief system about their personal rights. The combination of behavioral and cognitive restructuring is effective in integrating assertive behaviors and attitudes in one's daily life.

Cognitive approaches (Beck, 1967; Beck & Greenberg, 1974; Beck et al., 1979) in individual and group therapy can assist women in challenging cultural depressogenic stereotypes about themselves. Women learn to become aware of their automatic thoughts, and to examine their own and others' assumptions about women's roles rationally. Thus, they acquire self-reliance, responsibility for their own circumstances, and learn to distance themselves from cultural prejudices. Graded task assignments are helpful in fostering a sense of mastery and control (Beck, et al., 1979; Liberman, 1978).

Consciousness raising groups facilitate exploring identity issues and moving from personal individual solutions to group actions (Brodsky, 1973; Kravetz, 1980). Women re-socialize each other through role modeling in a process of opening up to each other, sharing, analyzing, and abstracting from their personal experiences (Eastman, 1973; Kirsh, 1974). Consciousness raising groups are a viable alternative mental health resource for women in dealing with problems resulting from sex-role stereotyping and discrimination (Kravetz, 1976). Based on a study of 1,669 women involved in consciousness raising groups, areas in which women found consciousness raising especially helpful were sharing commonalities, involvement, risk taking, insight,
and role analysis (Lieberman & Bond, 1976). The therapeutic outcome of consciousness raising groups consists of heightened self-esteem, intellectual and personal autonomy, self-awareness, reduction of isolation, and a growing realization that problems are not solely the result of personal failure or inadequacy (Warren, 1976).

Feminist therapy has examined the role of societal messages and inequities in the etiology of women's depression. Though there is no specific definition of feminist therapy, the following principles are commonly endorsed by therapists who identify themselves as feminists (Gilbert, 1980). (a) The personal is political: women learn to separate the internal from the external, to explore relations between sociological and psychological factors; the therapist assists clients in validation of the female experience, and explores and confronts own values and attitudes regarding women's roles; emphasis is on societal and personal changes rather than adjustment to the status quo. (b) The therapist-client relationship is viewed as egalitarian: clients are encouraged to "shop around" for a therapist, and the therapist disclaims "expert status"; techniques are employed which enhance a client's personal power, self-nurturance, and expression of anger; the therapist serves as a role model and uses appropriate self-disclosure (Gilbert, 1980, pp. 248-260). Rather than "getting stuck" in blaming the system and remaining a victim, feminist therapy may be more effective when encompassing the following steps: "1. The environment may not be healthy. 2. It may not be your fault. 3. You may want to change it. 4. You can change its influence on you by changing yourself. 5. You have power and influence, though you do
not have full control over others" (Richard, Note 22, p. 11).

Women who become divorced or separated may face severe crises (Aslin, 1976). When counseling "single-again"—divorced/separated or widowed—women, emotional, legal, economic, parental, and social difficulties need to be addressed through women's groups, assertiveness training, legal information, career planning, parenting, and financial management (Aslin, 1976). "All-women's groups" are likely to be more effective than individual therapy or mixed-sex groups because women then tend to become less dependent on one person, and learn to receive support and protection from other women (Carter, 1977). Divorce adjustment organizations have proven effective, especially when combined with an academic class on the subject of divorce adjustment (Dries, 1975).

When dealing with women who have very little income, real life problems of economic survival have to be addressed through vocational and social rehabilitation. Job training programs are important in assisting women to develop realistic hopes for their future (Messer & Lehrer, 1976). Reentry of women into school, training programs, or employment should be considered a normal transitional stage; support groups are needed in dealing with problems of low self-confidence, role conflict and resulting guilt, and time management (Brooks, 1976). Manis and Mochizuki (1972) developed a "search for fulfillment" program at the Western Michigan University Counseling Center to help reentry homemakers in removing psychological blocks which prevent them from changing their lives. This program consists of trust building, realistic assessment of own abilities and of available opportunities.
in the community, decision-making skills, and support in risk taking.

There is some indication that employment may decrease depression (Ferree, 1976). Mostow and Newberry (1975) reported that employment in women of low socioeconomic status has a protective effect. They suggested to encourage depressed women to maintain their jobs because employment may contribute to a faster recovery from depression. Similarly, Weissman and Paykel (1974) found in a 20-month study of 40 acutely depressed women and 40 demographically matched "normal neighbors" that women working outside the home were less depressed than the homemakers. Brown and associates (1975) also suggested that employment may help to decrease and prevent depression, when comparing homemakers and employed women of the same social class. Tebbets (1980) pointed to the increase in mastery and self-esteem due to longer periods of employment in lower-class women.

The effectiveness of intervention strategies to women's depressogenic achievement orientation is currently explored through re-attribution training and reorientation of locus of control and expectations (Galluchi, Note 23).

When dealing with couples in counseling and therapy, the development of a more equalized balance of power is recommended. Rice and Rice (1977) pointed to the need to establish a division of labor in the sharing of household tasks, and to spell out a contract in terms of sex-role expectations and behaviors to work toward an open companionship model in relationships. Seidler-Fiedler (1976) suggested to pay attention to the differential power bases of women and men in therapy, and to assist women in developing broader power bases, and
men in developing more considerate modes of power.

These treatment approaches and suggestions have in common their focus on women's resocialization, and are designed to improve women's economic circumstances, their realistic sense of mastery and control, to decrease women's dependencies on a "dominant other," to develop other modes of achievement orientation, and to integrate employment into their self-perceptions. Thus, stereotypes about appropriate choices in role-combinations are challenged, and options for individual choices in role-combinations are encouraged.

Findings of this study suggest that social factors—level of employment, economic status, educational level—impact depression in women. Long-term prevention of epidemiological depression in women requires changes in educational, employment, and other social policies. School curricula need to emphasize adult roles of occupation, homemaking, and parenting for women and men alike. As women and men share more equally the responsibilities of child rearing, employers will have to offer child care facilities for employed parents. Employment policies will have to include paternity leaves for fathers as well as maternity leaves for mothers. The development toward equalized roles between the sexes may not happen in American society as long as women depend on men to make policy regarding women's roles and status (Lipman-Blumen & Bernard, 1979).

In Sweden, legislation in favor of egalitarian sex roles has met with little resistance due to a long uninterrupted period of humanitarian social policy under the Social Democrats (Lipman-Blumen & Bernard, 1979; Safilios-Rothschild, 1979). However, subtle sex
discrimination continues at an interpersonal and implementation level, and is reflected in a reluctance to partake in previously sex-inappropriate roles even when the legislature facilitates these options (Safilios-Rothschild, 1979).

In the United States, the women's movement is characterized by more conflict and confrontation between the sexes than in Sweden. Most American men abstain from actively endorsing egalitarian roles and fail to see an expansion of their own options as result of egalitarian ideology. Conflict between the sexes arises in that women begin to expect of men nurturance and support on a psychological level beyond men's traditional roles as material providers. These new expectations are directly related to women's rejection of exclusively vicarious modes of living. The more women choose direct achievement and employment, the more struggle between the sexes results at interpersonal and structural levels over scarce resources, especially in times of unemployment (Safilios-Rothschild, 1979). As discrimination against women in the United States is characterized by a paternalistic, "protective" attitude on part of men, some women opt to continue their economic and psychological dependencies on the "stronger" sex. Fragmentation among the women results, which is encouraged by men who label nontraditional women deviants. Obvious conflict on structural levels decreases, with an increase of subtle interpersonal conflict. Thus, it is important for women to understand their individual experience of conflict in the societal context of discrimination.

Legislative changes have reduced unequal pay, but have no impact on sex segregation in occupations. Lipman-Blumen (1976) demonstrated
that the absence of women from certain segments of the occupational world is part of a much larger pattern of a male homosocial world. Women are excluded from this world because their lack of resources makes them less useful and interesting both to men and to other women. . . . Merely by ignoring the existence of women outside the domestic, sexual, and service realms the male homosocial world relegates women to the sidelines of life. (pp. 30-31)

Some slight hope for the next decades in decreasing sexism lies in the realization on part of male political figures that an equalization of roles will improve men's as well as women's lives (Lipman-Blumen & Bernard, 1979). Agassi (1979) argues that the final goal is not a fairer distribution of low-level and high-level jobs among the sexes. Instead, a process of restructuring the productive system needs to take place so that the division of jobs into manual, clerical, and professional levels can be eliminated, for men and women alike. Thus, while working toward equality for women and men, the cause of enhancement for the quality of working life would be fostered. The current segregation of women in the lowest industrial, secretarial, and semi/professional jobs is not likely to change. Agassi (1979) instead suggests a radical redesign of these low-level jobs to eliminate inferiority and to enhance the attractiveness of traditional "women's work" for men. A process of coordination and cooperation of the women's movement with organizations for quality of working life would prove beneficial to both sexes.

Women are becoming aware what long-term changes are desirable for both sexes because they have experienced intimately the effects of their subordinate status. In working toward equality of the sexes and toward improvement of work for both sexes, women need to learn
how to deal with conflict. Women in their traditional roles as nurturers and supporters are experts in smoothing out conflict at the expense of sacrificing autonomy and personal needs (Miller, 1976; Safilios-Rothschild, 1979). Instead, women must become aware and accept that they "are not creating conflict; they are exposing the fact that conflict exists" (Miller, 1976, p. 126). By reclaiming conflict as growth-producing rather than destructive, and by "engaging in conflict, even as one is involved in cooperation" (Miller, 1976, p. 81), women will contribute to a psychologically healthier environment for both sexes.

Thoughts by Rainer Maria Rilke

The integration of conflict, power, and autonomy, with responsibility for others and nurturance, is a slow process. Women and men need to learn to exist both as individuals and in relationships. Rilke— an early feminist (1875-1926)— spoke of the balance of separateness and closeness:

Once the realization is accepted that even between the closest human beings infinite distances continue to exist, a wonderful living side by side can grow up, if they succeed in loving the distance between them which makes it possible for each to see the other whole and against a wide sky. (Cited in Mood, 1975, p. 36)

Rilke fully acknowledged the human strengths of women:

[The] humanity of woman, born its full time in suffering and humiliation, will come to light when she will have stripped off the conventions of mere femininity in the mutations of her outward status, and those men who do not yet feel it approaching today will be surprised and struck by it. . . . This advance will . . . change the love-experience . . . into a relation that is meant to be one human being to another. . . . And this more human
love . . . consists in this, that two solitudes protect and border and salute each other. (Cited in Mood, 1975, pp. 36-37)

Finding ways to integrate separateness and closeness in one's life may seem an overwhelming task. However, as Rilke stated:

If only we arrange our life according to that principle which counsels us that we must always hold to the difficult, then that which now still seems to us the most alien will become what we most trust and find most faithful. (Cited in Mood, 1975, p. 1)

Rather than having to have all the answers, Rilke encourages:

to try to love the questions themselves like locked rooms and like books that are written in a very foreign tongue. Do not now seek the answers, which cannot be given you because you would not be able to live them. And the point is, to live everything. Live the questions now. Perhaps you will then gradually, without noticing it, live along some distant day into the answer.

Resolve to be always beginning--to be a beginner. (Cited in Mood, 1975, p. 25)

**Recommendations for Further Research**

In the area of hypothesis construction, future studies should include propositions about long-term stressful conditions for varying groups of women in their impact on depression. It is recommended that potential resources in dealing with stress be explored. Variables to be considered are, for example, one's partner's attitudes toward sharing roles in homemaking and child care, access to child-care facilities, help with housework, and access to transportation.

When predicting depression for women of varying occupational status, an exploration of psychosocial variables for each of the status groups is recommended. In this study, the sample size of an
occupational group was too small to allow for an examination of the prediction of depression within a group.

As a woman's career orientation influences whether employment is related to well-being (Markus, Note 2, pp. 6, 11), studies need to be developed to explore career orientation as a mediating variable between employment versus full-time homemaking and depression. Ideally, a life cycle perspective would be considered, whereby full-time homemaking is viewed as a temporary occupation. This would reflect recent societal changes in the high participation of women in the labor force. An important question is whether employment serves as a protective factor to depression in women of the same social class. Thus, homemakers, when compared with employed women, should be differentiated according to social class rather than be treated as a homogeneous group.

In this study, the classification variable marital status proved too general to be related to potential differences in vulnerability variables of women in varying marital status groups. It may be appropriate to distinguish between women who live with a partner, women who are married but are not living with their spouse, women living with an extended family or in a network of friends, and women in other living arrangements.

The issue of part-time employment in its effect on women's well-being versus depression needs to be addressed, as well as varying levels of occupation in part-time employment.

In the area of methodology, studies in which the same questionnaire is employed could be improved if the order of scales is
counterbalanced to neutralize order effects of responses. Inclusion of social desirability measures may control for possible denial of stress and depression in varying groups.

When considering the scales employed, improvement is especially needed for the revised Dominance-Submission Scale. Future studies in the area of perceived dominance might serve to establish and explore reliabilities, and discriminant and construct validities. A comparison of the measurement of the concept of dominance with this scale and that of other personality inventories would be in order. Researchers interested in the concept of achieving styles may consider obtaining the most recent form of the Achieving Styles Inventory, as this scale is currently under revision. Further examination of reliabilities and validities of the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, especially the subscales, is recommended. When examining the Brown and Harris (1978) vulnerability variables, a researcher ideally should be trained at their research institute, or obtain information from the researchers directly, to assure an accurate measure of these variables in future studies.

A further question is whether the findings of this study would hold in other populations, for example, in rural or larger urban samples. Further, a more in-depth examination of the effects of ethnic background on vulnerability and depression measures may yield differing findings.

Changes in the methodology by employing a female research assistant versus a male research assistant may increase the number of subjects who volunteer to participate. Lastly, more detailed knowledge
about depressogenic factors in women's lives would be gained by using in-depth structured or unstructured interviews, or direct observation, to substantiate the exploration with experiential and observational data.

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The increase of the incidence of depression in women is a mental health problem of epidemic proportions. Studies are needed to identify variables which may explain women's prevalence in depression. The purpose of this study was to examine possible effects of occupational and marital roles on depression in women. Four social-psychological vulnerability variables to depression in women were proposed: (a) high relational achieving style combined with low direct achieving style, (b) powerlessness orientation, (c) subservience to a dominant partner, and (d) negative attitudes toward feminism. Data were sought to clarify how different occupational and marital roles may be related to these vulnerability variables and to depression in women. Relations of vulnerability variables and selected background variables to depression were explored, and depression was predicted as a function of these variables.

Analysis of Related Literature

The prevalence of depression in women is widely recognized in the current literature (Arieti, 1979; Arieti & Bemporad, 1978; Fields,
Theoretical explanations regarding this prevalence encompass genetic and endocrinological factors, depressogenic variables in women's socialization process, the learned helplessness model, the cognitive model of depression, actual social discrimination against women, and effects of marital and occupational roles. Though complexities in the etiology of depression were recognized, this study was focused on selected social-psychological variables in their impact on depression in women.

The socialization process for most women encourages nurturant, submissive, and conservative aspects of the female role, whereas assertiveness, achievement orientation, and independence are explicitly discouraged (Block, Von der Lippe, & Block, 1973). Daughters, more so than sons, frequently continue affiliations and dependencies well into adulthood (Chodorow, 1974, 1978; Hoffman, 1975). Women typically learn to vicariously achieve through their husband's and children's accomplishments rather than through their own (Lipman-Blumen, 1972; Lipman-Blumen & Leavitt, 1978). They tend to be submissive to a "male-dominant-other" (Arieti, 1979; 1978, in Arieti & Bemporad, 1978) and become economically, socially, and psychologically dependent. Due to actual social discrimination, such women have difficulties in achieving mastery, direct action, and self-assertion, which may lead to clinical depression (Weissman, 1980).

Rizley (1978) found that depressed individuals, similar to women in general (Frieze et al., Note 9), tend to view failure more often than success, as a function of ability and effort, and tend to view
themselves as more responsible in an interpersonal rather than im-
personal context than do nondepressed individuals. High interpersonal
responsibility for others' behavior was also found more typical for
women than for men (Alper, 1978; Miller, 1976). Traditional female
roles of wife and mother may contribute to depression (Bernard, 1973;
in highly educated women is related to well-being (Birnbaum,
1975; Sears & Barbee, 1977). However, women in low-income jobs may
experience additional stress of employment, especially when they con-
tinue to fulfill traditional homemaker roles (Guttentag & Salasin,
1976). The combination of women's depressogenic socialization—lack
of direct achievement, high interpersonal responsibility, little
actual power and status, psychological submissiveness to a dominant
other combined with economic dependency, and differential depresso-
genic attribution of success and failure—may serve as a valid,
partial explanation for why so many women are depressed in Western
cultures.

Design and Methodology

A stratified random sample of full-time employed women and full-
time homemakers, age 25 to 50, was drawn from Kalamazoo County, Michi-
gan. Of 240 contacted volunteers, 89.6% responded: 58 professionals,
55 clerical/sales workers, 54 homemakers, and 48 semi/unskilled work-
ers. The questionnaire mailed to participants included the (a) PERI
Life Events Scale, (b) CES-Depression Scale, (c) Achieving Styles
Inventory, (d) Dominance-Submission Scale, (e) Mastery/Powerlessness
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Scale, (f) FEM-Scale, and (g) selected background information.

It was hypothesized that the proposed vulnerability factors and depression would be distributed differently among the occupational groups of (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers, (c) homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers, and among the marital status groups of (a) married women, (b) never-married women, and (c) divorced/separated women. Rank-ordered differences in the vulnerability measures were hypothesized for the occupational groups, but not for the marital status groups. Depression was expected to vary as a function of both occupational and marital status. Systematic relationships of the vulnerability variables and other selected background variables were investigated, and interrelations among the vulnerability variables were proposed. The prediction of depression from occupational group membership, the vulnerability variables, and selected background variables was explored.

As depression had been found to be related to the experience of undesirable life events (Paykel, 1974a), this variable was included to examine the effects of occupational and marital status on depression when controlling for undesirable life events over the past 6 months (Dohrenwend, Note 3).

An overview of the 16 hypotheses and inferential procedures is given in Chapter III (pp. 136-138). Ordered means analyses of variance, analyses of variance and covariance, Pearson product moment correlations, and multiple regression analyses were employed. Figure 3 presents the hypothesized rank-ordering of means for the occupational groups on the three depression measures, and on the four
Figure 3. Occupation, depression, and vulnerability variables in women—RANK-ORDERED HYPOTHESES
vulnerability variables.

Findings

No significant differences were found among the occupational groups in experience of undesirable life events at \( \alpha = .74 \), and no control for this variable was necessary. Divorced/separated women reported significantly higher undesirable life events than did married and never-married women \( (\alpha = .00) \), thus making the control of this variable necessary when examining the effects of marital status on depression. In Chapter IV (pp. 161-162) an overview of results for Research Hypotheses 1-10 regarding undesirable life events, depression, and vulnerability variables for the occupational and marital status groups was presented. The results of the ordered means analyses of variance for the four occupational groups (hypotheses reference numbers 3a, b, c; 6a, b; 8i; 9a, b, c, d, e; pp. 140-147) are reported in Figure 4. Group mean scores were transformed into Z-scores, and the relative standing of the occupational groups on the depression and vulnerability measures is graphically depicted. It should be noted that in Figure 4, distances between group mean scores are only comparable within each of the scales employed. The symbol \((r)\) for the \( \alpha \)-levels of the directional \( t \)-test pairwise comparisons indicates a situation in which the obtained group mean order was reversed from the expected order for two adjacent groups.

In the following sections, findings for Hypotheses 1-10 (Chapter IV, pp. 161-162), descriptions of the occupational and marital groups on the 19 background variables (Chapter IV, p. 211), and the results
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(group mean scores transformed to Z-scores).
depicted in Figure 4 are combined to summarize the findings for the occupational and marital groups on depression, on the vulnerability variables, and on the background variables.

Professionals were found to be less depressed than clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers, but did not differ significantly from homemakers on the three depression measures. On the vulnerability variables, professionals perceived their partners as less dominant than did the clerical/sales workers and semi/unskilled workers, but did not differ significantly from the homemakers. Professionals reported the highest direct and total achieving styles; homemakers reported the lowest. No differences were found in relational achieving style and perceived dominance of self among the four occupational groups. Semi/unskilled workers scored lowest in mastery; professionals scored highest. Positive attitudes toward feminism ranged from low to high, in the order of: semi/unskilled workers < homemakers < clerical/sales workers < professionals. Despite fairly positive attitudes toward feminism, clerical/sales workers perceived their partners as most dominant. Unexpectedly, semi/unskilled workers perceived themselves as relatively dominant in their relationships.

No significant differences were found between never-married and married women in the three depression measures. However, divorced/separated women were significantly more depressed than were never-married and married women. On the vulnerability variables, the married, never-married, and divorced/separated women did not differ significantly in achieving styles, perceived dominance of self and of
partner, in mastery orientations (with the exception of behavioral mastery), or in attitudes toward feminism.

As expected, professionals were least depressed when compared with the other groups. The apparent depression protective cluster consisted of low perceived dominance of partner, high power direct and contributory relational achieving styles, high mastery, and high positive attitudes toward feminism. Professionals reported a fairly high family income, the highest personal income, highest levels of education and occupational prestige, were most satisfied with their social life and fairly satisfied with their general life, and reported the highest level of confiding relationship with partner.

Unexpectedly, homemakers reported fairly low levels of depression, an average sense of mastery, and viewed their partners as fairly egalitarian. As predicted, they reported the lowest levels of direct and total achieving styles, and fairly negative attitudes toward feminism. Homemakers had the highest family income--slightly higher, though not statistically significant, than that of the professionals--the highest number of children under age 14 and under age 6, and a fairly low level of education. They were most satisfied with their general life and fairly satisfied with their social life. They reported rather high confiding relationships with their partners, when compared to clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers.

For the clerical/sales workers, the suggested cluster of vulnerability variables was mixed. Though fairly high, when compared to semi/unskilled workers and homemakers, in direct and total achieving styles, behavioral mastery, and in positive attitudes toward feminism,
the clerical/sales workers viewed their partners as most dominant, reported fairly low levels of attitudinal, global, and total mastery, and fairly high levels of depression. The family income of the clerical/sales workers did not differ from the low family income of the semi/unskilled workers, and their personal income was slightly lower, though not statistically significant, than that of the semi/unskilled workers. Their educational and occupational levels were rather high, and their social and general satisfaction with life were fairly low when compared to the homemakers. Clerical/sales workers reported low confiding relationships with their significant person.

Semi/unskilled workers, as expected, were most depressed, reported lowest levels of mastery, and the most negative attitudes toward feminism when compared to the other groups. Unexpectedly, they viewed their partners as fairly low in dominance, and their relationships as fairly egalitarian. Their personal income was slightly higher, and their family income slightly lower, not statistically significant, than that of the clerical/sales workers. Semi/unskilled workers reported the lowest educational level, and they scored lowest of the employed women on occupational prestige. They were most dissatisfied with their social and general life when compared with the homemakers and professionals, though they did not differ significantly from the clerical/sales workers.

When controlling for undesirable life events through use of a two-way analysis of covariance, professionals were least depressed. Divorced/separated, semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers were most depressed. Divorced/separated professionals were slightly less
depressed, though not statistically significant, than the other married and never-married occupational groups.

In the following section, results for Hypotheses 11-16 are summarized. Depression was found to be positively related to both viewing one's partner and oneself as dominant, needing others for achievements (reliant-relational achieving style), lacking a confiding relationship, and feeling dissatisfied with life. Depression was inversely related to mastery, occupational prestige, educational level, and family income. Black women were more depressed than were other minority or white women. Strongest predictors for depression were attitudinal mastery, which accounted for 12.4% of the variance, general life dissatisfaction (29.4%), absence of a confiding relationship (10.7%), global mastery (9.2%), and reliant-relational achieving style (5.7%). The combination of occupational group membership, the proposed vulnerability variables, and selected background variables accounted for 60.1% of the variance on depression.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Occupational levels need to be differentiated when examining the relationship of women's employment and depression. Employment per se was not related to lower levels of depression. However, among the employed women, higher occupational levels were related to lower levels of depression. Women with low-income jobs, little previous education, low sense of mastery, and who lacked a confiding relationship with their significant person, were severely depressed. The combination of work which fosters mastery, a confiding relationship,
neither perceiving oneself nor one's partner as dominant, and positive attitudes toward feminism appeared to be the protective package against depression. Gaining access to higher-level occupations may protect against hard economic consequences of divorce and may decrease women's epidemiological depression.

High depression in divorced/separated women could not be explained as a function of the proposed vulnerability factors. Instead, economic conditions and employment status need to be taken into consideration. Occupational roles are at least as important as is marital status in their impact on depression in women. The study supported the social status hypothesis regarding women's depression: professionals and homemakers in this sample were women of higher social status who reported low levels of depression, whereas semi/unskilled workers and clerical/sales workers, having low family income and personal income, reported higher levels of depression.

It was recommended that future studies on women's roles and depression include mediating variables of career-homemaker-orientation, stages in life-cycle, part-time employment, and long-term stressful life conditions. Differentiation of homemakers according to social status and community involvement is suggested when examining levels of depression in homemakers.
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APPENDICES
Appendix A

Instructions to Research Assistant Concerning
Phone Contact of Subjects
Contact 60 women in each of the four occupational groups by phone, resulting in a total of 240 subjects. Contact subjects during the period of 5/27/80 to 6/12/80, for 4 hours per weekday, and for 6 hours during Saturdays, resulting in a total of 64 contact hours. On weekdays, do not call later than 8:30 p.m. It is expected that four subjects will volunteer per each hour of phone contact.

Use the following format when contacting potential subjects. Slight variations in the wording are permissible.

"Hello, do I have the X residence? My name is X, and I am working with Monika Haussmann on a research project on women's roles and lives. I am calling you because you are one of the women who have been selected to participate. Do you have a minute? Monika is doing a research project out of the Counseling and Personnel Department at Western Michigan University. Her research involves women between the ages of 25 and 50. Do you fall in this age category? And are you currently employed? Could you tell me what you do? Thank you. Monika is especially interested in getting the opinions of (substitute subject's occupational status) on women's roles, feelings about self, about others, and general life questions. She has a questionnaire that is not short, it has taken other women anywhere from 20 to 45 minutes to finish it. The study is a legitimate one, and all participants are fully protected. The information you would be sending us will be treated confidentially, and the results of the study will be reported in a group format only,
so that it will be impossible to identify any individual participant. I'm wondering whether you might be willing to participate in the study? ___ Great. I'd just like to verify your address. Is it X? ___ And the zip code? ___ We'll mail you the questionnaire this week (on Fridays and Saturdays: next week) with a stamped return envelope. Monika is asking that you try to complete the questionnaire in 2-4 days. ___ Great. Thank you very much. Before I hang up, let me give you my name again. I'm X, and the main researcher is Monika Haussmann. You can reach us by phone at 385-4384 in case you have any further questions. Thank you very much. Bye Bye."

If the potential subject refuses to participate, ask for reason of refusal. If the reason is given, note it and record the subject's occupational status. If another member of the household responds, ask when would be a good time to contact the potential subject. If a certain subject cannot be reached by phone on the first trial, attempt to reach the subject up to five times and vary the times of contact to include days, evenings, and Saturdays. Subjects who cannot be reached after five trials, and subjects who refuse to participate, will be substituted with subjects from the group sample of 234 women in the appropriate occupational status group by selecting the subject next in sequence.

Continue the phone contacts until a total of 240 women between the ages of 25 and 50 have agreed to participate, and until 60 volunteers are found for each of the four occupational status groups. In case a subject's occupational status is ambiguous and cannot easily be placed in one of the four groups of (a) professional, (b) clerical/
sales worker, (c) semi/unskilled worker, (d) homemaker, follow through with the above specified instructions and contact the main researcher to make a decision about inclusion or exclusion of the subject in the study.

Follow-up contacts: Call those subjects after 8 days past the mailing date whose questionnaires have not been returned. Ask whether the subject has received the questionnaire. If not, say that another copy will be mailed the next day. Ask whether the subject is still willing to participate in case the questionnaire had been received. If not, thank the subject for her time. No further follow-ups are planned.
Appendix B

The CES-Depression Scale—Original (Radloff, 1977)
(p. 339 in dissertation)

The CES-Depression Scale—Revised
(p. 340 in dissertation)
Appendix C

Scoring Key for the CES-Depression Scale
(Radloff, 1977)
Circle the number for each statement which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way—DURING THE PAST WEEK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the past week</th>
<th>Item weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me ..........................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor ......................................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends .</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt that I was just as good as other people .........................................</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing .................................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt depressed ............................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt that everything I did was an effort ..............................................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt hopeful about the future .............</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I thought my life had been a failure ....</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I felt fearful ...............................</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Circle the number for each statement which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way---DURING THE PAST WEEK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>During the past week</th>
<th>Item weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My sleep was restless</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I was happy</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I talked less than usual</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I felt lonely</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>People were unfriendly</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I enjoyed life</td>
<td>3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I had crying spells</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I felt sad</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I felt that people disliked me</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I could not get &quot;going&quot;</td>
<td>0 1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Score is sum of 20 endorsed item weights.

Possible range: 0-60
Appendix D

The PERI Life Events Scale
(Dohrenwend, Krasnoff, Askenasy, & Dohrenwend, 1978)

(pp. 337-338 in dissertation)
Appendix E

The PERI Life Events Scale With Arithmetic Means of Subgroup Ratings and Desirability
(Undesirability, -, desirability, +, neutral, ?)
(Dohrenwend et al., 1978)
In the following list, please mark the major events in your life during the past 6 months that, for better or for worse, interrupted your usual activities:

1. started school or a training program after not going to school for a long time (+340)
2. changed schools or training programs (?257)
3. graduated from school or training program (+323)
4. had problems in school or in training program (-268)
5. failed school, training program (-302)
6. did not graduate from school or training program (-300)
7. started work for the first time (+386)
8. returned to work after not working for a long time (?348)
9. changed jobs for a better one (+472)
10. changed jobs for a worse one (-359)
11. changed jobs for one that was no better and no worse than the last one (?251)
12. had trouble with a boss (-322)
13. demoted at work (-379)
14. found out that was not going to be promoted at work (-345)
15. conditions at work got worse, other than demotion or trouble with the boss (-316)
16. promoted (+374)
17. had significant success at work (+350)
18. conditions at work improved, not counting promotion or other personal success (+318)
19. laid off (-325)
20. fired (-407)
21. started a business or profession (+471)
22. expanded business or professional practice (+478)
23. took on a greatly increased work load (?289)
24. suffered a business loss or failure (-510)
25. sharply reduced work load
26. retired
27. stopped working, *not* retirement, for an extended period

28. became engaged
29. engagement broken
30. married
31. started a love-affair
32. relations with spouse changed for the worse, without separation or divorce
33. married couple separated
34. divorce
35. relations with spouse changed for the better
36. married couple got together again after separation
37. marital infidelity
38. trouble with in-laws
39. spouse died

40. became pregnant
41. birth of a first child
42. birth of a second or later child
43. abortion
44. miscarriage or stillbirth
45. found out that cannot have children
46. child died
47. adopted a child
48. started menopause

49. new person moved into the household
50. person moved out of the household
51. someone stayed on in the household after he/she was expected to leave
52. serious family argument other than with spouse
53. a change in the frequency of family get-togethers
54. family member other than spouse or child died
55. moved to a better residence or neighborhood
56. moved to a worse residence or neighborhood
57. moved to a residence or neighborhood no better or no worse than the last
58. unable to move after expecting to be able to move
59. built a home or had one built
60. remodeled a home
61. lost a home through fire, flood, or other disaster
62. assaulted
63. robbed
64. accident in which there were no injuries
65. involved in a law suit
66. accused of something for which a person could be sent to jail
67. lost drivers license
68. arrested
69. went to jail
70. got involved in a court case
71. convicted of a crime
72. acquitted of a crime
73. released from jail
74. didn’t get out of jail when expected
75. took out a mortgage
76. started buying a car, furniture, or other large purchase on installment plan
77. foreclosure of a mortgage or loan
78. repossession of a car, furniture, or other items bought on installment plan
79. took a cut in wage or salary without a demotion
80. suffered a financial loss or loss of property not related to work
81. went on welfare
82. went off welfare
83. got a substantial increase in wage or salary without a promotion
- 343  84. did not get an expected wage or salary increase
+ 517  85. had financial improvement not related to work

+ 274  86. increased church or synagogue, club, neighborhood, or other organizational activities
+ 273  87. took a vacation
- 221  88. was not able to take a planned vacation
+ 281  89. took up a new hobby, sport, craft, or recreational activity
- 182  90. dropped a hobby, sport, craft, or recreational activity
+ 163  91. acquired a pet
- 196  92. pet died
+ 247  93. made new friends
- 328  94. broke up with a friend
- 457  95. close friend died

? 406  96. entered the Armed Services
? 360  97. left the Armed Services
? 249  98. took a trip other than a vacation

+ 562  99. physical health improved
- 668  100. physical illness
- 560  101. injury
- 611  102. unable to get treatment for an illness or injury

Using arithmetic means of subgroup ratings—ranges:

Total life events:  0-40,691
Total desirable life events:  0-12,112
Total undesirable life events:  0-22,279
Total nondirectional life events:  0-6,300
Appendix F

The Achieving Styles Inventory (Handley-Isaksen, Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies, Kofodimos, Brunner, & Reynolds, Note 13)

(pp. 341-342 in dissertation)
Appendix G

Scoring Key for the Achieving Styles Inventory
(Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale #</th>
<th>Scale Name</th>
<th>Relevant Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Intrinsic Direct</td>
<td>1, 8, 17, 33, 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Competitive Direct</td>
<td>4, 11, 14, 22, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Power Direct</td>
<td>7, 10, 21, 28, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Instrumental Direct</td>
<td>6, 13, 27, 30, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Instrumental Relational</td>
<td>2, 20, 26, 35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reliant Relational</td>
<td>5, 18, 25, 31, 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Collaborative Relational</td>
<td>9, 15, 24, 36, 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Contributory Relational</td>
<td>3, 16, 23, 34, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Vicarious Relational</td>
<td>12, 19, 29, 32, 42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Score:
- **Direct Domain** = Sum of 1, 2, 3, and 4, divided by 4
- **Relational Domain** = Sum of 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, divided by 5
- **Total** = Sum of all 9 divided by 9

Raw Scores, Ranges:
- **Direct Domain** = 140 - 20
- **Relational Domain** = 175 - 25
- **Total** = 315 - 45

Mean Scores, Ranges:
- **Direct Domain** = 35 - 1
- **Relational Domain** = 35 - 1
- **Total** = 35 - 1
Appendix H

Descriptions of the Achieving Styles Inventory Scales
(Handley-Isaksen et al., Note 13, pp. 4-5)
**Direct Styles**

These styles are characterized by a propensity to select, initiate, and/or seek out activities which permit direct confrontation with one's environment and entail the use of personal efforts of mind and body to accomplish goals.

**Scale 1: Intrinsic Direct.** This style is characterized by a propensity to be highly task oriented; to experience the thrill of accomplishment for its own sake by pitting self against task rather than against others; whether working in a group or alone, to maintain a strong orientation toward the task; to evaluate one's own performance against standards largely independent of comparisons with others.

**Scale 2: Competitive Direct.** This style is characterized by a tendency to select activities which permit one to evaluate one's own performance against the performance of others; to try not only to carry out tasks but also to do so better than selected others; whether working in a group or alone, a tendency to define others as competitors; to rank order one's own contribution in relation to others'; to experience competitive situations as exciting and as spurs to achievement; to define situations in ways that permit clear comparisons of accomplishments with relevant others.

**Scale 3: Power Direct.** This style is characterized by a tendency to select, initiate, or seek out situations which permit control
and/or organization of others to accomplish tasks; to dominate and use personal control over others as a means to achieve ends; to exercise close control over all factors in the situation that affect accomplishment of the task; to experience enjoyment from the exercise of power.

Scale 4: Instrumental Direct. This style is characterized by a tendency to use personal accomplishments as gateways to further ends; to evaluate one's own achievements in terms of their usefulness as instruments for gaining access to other achievements or achieving arenas, or to relationships resulting from the recognition of achievements.

Relational Styles

These styles are characterized by the seeking of success or achievement through the medium of relationships. Individuals who utilize relational styles establish, contribute to, act through, depend on, or manipulate relationships to achieve their goals.

Scale 5: Instrumental Relational. This style is characterized by a tendency to use relationships as a mechanism to access achievement arenas, either direct or relational; to establish or develop relationships primarily as an intervening step toward other accomplishments; to evaluate relationships in terms of their usefulness in achieving goals; to use relationships as currency with which to purchase other ends.
Scale 6: Reliant Relational. This style is characterized by a tendency to seek situations in which others achieve for self; to expect other members of a relationship to take responsibility for one's success and/or accomplishments; to perceive self as in need of help in order to meet one's own achievement needs.

Scale 7: Collaborative Relational. This style is characterized by a tendency to achieve through group effort. The achiever expects a proportionate share of the responsibility and credit for the achievement, and believes one's best accomplishments occur in a group setting. There is a definite valuation of smooth working relationships among team members during periods of team activity and achievers using this style experience positive stimulation from synergistic effects of jointly attacking a common task.

Scale 8: Contributory Relational. This style is characterized by a tendency to achieve through contributing to another's achievements or well being; to facilitate/contribute to the other's successful performance; to accept both goals and means defined by others; to perceive task accomplishment as belonging to the other (as the other is also likely to perceive it); to acknowledge one's own contribution as helpful but secondary.

Scale 9: Vicarious Relational. This style is characterized by a tendency to achieve indirectly through identification with others or with an institution; to perceive the accomplishments of the other as the accomplishments of both; to take pleasure in the other's
achievements as though they were one's own; to accept the other's
goals rather than to select own goals.

From: Handley-Isaksen, Lipman-Blumen, Leavitt, Patterson, Bies,
Kofodimos, Brunner, & Reynolds. The achieving styles inventory--
Form 10; preliminary manual; to be published; pp. 4-5.
Appendix I

Original Lu-Dominance-Submission Scale with Scoring Key
(Lu, 1950, pp. 54-55)
1. "I have a need for someone who lets me have my own way"
2. Do you usually try to avoid arguments?
3. Do you lose your temper easily?
4. Do you try to get your own way even if you have to fight for it?
5. In your relations with the opposite sex do you tend to be dominant and have your own way?

If answers "yes," +2 to self
If answers "no," +2 to self
If answers "yes," +2 to self
If answers "yes," +2 to self
If answers "yes," +2 to self

Compare on the scale which follows the personality traits of your parents, your wife (or husband), and yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Very much so</th>
<th>Considerably</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Angers easily</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stubborn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dominating</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you could, what things would you change in your fiancee (or fiance) in mental or temperamental or personality characteristics?

If stubbornness etc., +2 to spouse
If lack of self-confidence, -2 to spouse
| Item | Description | "A (absent)" | "0 (occurred)" | "1 (made marriage less happy)" | "2 (done most to make marriage unhappy)"
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My wife (or husband) is argumentative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My wife (or husband) is quick-tempered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>My wife (or husband) criticizes me</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. If you could, what things would you change in your wife (or husband)? and in yourself? If would change spouse's stubbornness, etc., +2 to spouse, if timidity etc. -2 to spouse; if would change self stubbornness, etc., +2 to self, if timidity etc. -2 to self.

14. What things does your wife (or husband) do that you do not like? If "temper" or "try to take the lead" etc., +2 to spouse; if "lack of self-confidence" etc., -2 to spouse.

15. What things do you do that your wife (or husband) does not like? If "insisting on own way" etc., +2 to self; if "lack of initiative" etc., -2 to self.

16. When disagreements arise between you and your wife (or husband) they usually result in (check): you giving in (-4 to self, +4 to spouse); your wife (or husband) giving in (+4 to self, -4 to spouse); agreement by mutual give and take (0) The score for the person from this item is the sum of the points of self-rating and those rated by spouse.

Appendix J

Revised Dominance-Submission Scale

(p. 343 in dissertation)
Appendix K

Scoring Key for the Revised Dominance-Submission Scale
(Lu 1.a.) -- 1. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 2.a.) -- 2. 4 - 9 to self (reverse sequence of scores)
(Lu 3.a.) -- 3. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 4.a.) -- 4. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 5.a.) -- 5. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 6.a.) -- 6. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 7.a.) -- 7. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 8.a.) -- 8. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 10.a.) -- 9. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 11.a.) -- 10. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 12.a.) -- 11. 4 - 0 to self
(Lu 1.b.) -- 12. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 2.b.) -- 13. 4 - 0 to significant person (reverse sequence of scores)
(Lu 3.b.) -- 14. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 4.b.) -- 15. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 5.b.) -- 16. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 6.b.) -- 17. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 7.b.) -- 18. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 8.b.) -- 19. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 10.b.) -- 20. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 11.b.) -- 21. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 12.b.) -- 22. 4 - 0 to significant person
(Lu 13.a.) -- 23. +4 for stubbornness, etc., -4 for timidity, etc., to self
(Lu 15.) -- 24. +4 for takes lead, etc., -4 for dependent etc., to self
(Lu 13.b.) -- 25. +4 for stubbornness, etc., -4 for timidity etc., to significant person
(Lu 14.) -- 26. +4 for takes lead, etc., -4 for dependent etc., to significant person
(Lu 16.) -- 27. "I usually give in" = -8 to self, +8 to significant person

"My significant person usually gives in" = -8 to significant person, +8 to self

"We agree by mutual give and take" = 0 to self, 0 to significant person
Scores range for Self: -16 to +60

Scores range for Significant Person: -16 + 60

Range Self minus Significant Person: -10 to +10 = "Egalitarian"

Range Self minus Significant Person: +11 to +60 or more = "Self dominant, Significant Person submissive"

Range Self minus Significant Person: -11 to -60 or less = "Self submissive, Significant Person dominant"
Appendix L

The Mastery/Powerlessness Scale

(pp. 344–345 in dissertation)
Appendix M

Scoring Key for the Mastery/Powerlessness Scale
(Frank et al., 1978, pp. 204-206)
The M/P Scale is composed of three separate sections: (1) assessment of situational/behavioral aspects of mastery/powerlessness; (2) assessment of attitudinal aspects of mastery/powerlessness; (3) a global bipolar rating scale to indicate degree of control experienced. All items are scored "0" or "1." A single index is comprised of the sum of the subtotals of the three sections.

(1) Assessment of situational/behavioral aspects of mastery/powerlessness

1. a.--1; b.--0
2. a.--1; b.--0
3. a.--0; b.--1
4. a.--0; b.--1
5. a.--1; b.--0
6. a.--1; b.--0
7. a.--1; b.--0
8. a.--1; b.--0

Total Range: 0 - 8

(a) Assessment of attitudinal aspects of mastery/powerlessness

1. a.--0; b.--1
2. a.--1; b.--0
3. a.--0; b.--1
4. a.--1; b.--0
5. a.--1; b.--0
6. a.--0; b.--1
7. a.--0; b.--1

Total Range: 0 - 7
(3) Global bipolar rating scale

(Scorer's Key)

6 □ Complete control
5 □
4 □
3 □ Total Range: 0 - 6
2 □
1 □
0 □ No control

Single Index, Combined Score, Total Range: 0 - 21
Appendix N

The FEM-Scale (10-Item Version)
(Smith, Ferree, & Miller, 1975)

(p. 345 in dissertation)
Appendix 0

Scoring Key for the FEM-Scale (10-Item Version)
(Miller et al., 1975, pp. 52, 54-55)
The FEM-Scale, 10-item Form, is a summated rating scale with five response options for each item, ranging from "strongly agree"—1 to "strongly disagree"—5.

High scores indicate positive attitudes toward feminism, and low scores indicate negative attitudes toward feminism.

Total Score Range: 10 - 50
Appendix P

Letter to Participants
Dear Participant:

Thank you for talking with my research assistant the other day. First of all, I want to thank you very much for agreeing to spend some of your time assisting us in this study on women's roles and lives. All in all, 240 women between the age of 25 and 50 are participating. We are confident that this study will enhance people's understanding of women.

The person mainly responsible for the research is myself, Monika Haussmann. I work as a psychologist and am a doctoral candidate in Counseling Psychology, Department of Counseling and Personnel, at Western Michigan University. This research is approved and supervised by Dr. Edward L. Trembley, Chairperson of the Department of Counseling and Personnel. Financial support for the study is provided by the Awards and Fellowships Committee at Western Michigan University.

Your rights to confidentiality will be fully respected. My research assistant and I will be the only persons who know your name and address so that we can follow up on questionnaires in the event of delayed returns or missing information. Once we have the complete information, we will record it by code numbers only, and all lists relating names and code numbers will be destroyed. The information will be reported in a group format, and it will be impossible to identify any individual participant.

As you know, the questionnaire takes about 20 to 45 minutes to complete. It consists of questions about your background and present life, major life events over the past six months, your attitudes toward women's roles, and other areas.

Before you fill out the questionnaire, please read and initial the "Informed Consent" sheet on the next page. The "Informed Consent" assures you of your right to confidentiality. Please read the instructions under the title of the questionnaire. In case you have any further questions, you can reach me at home at (616) 385-4384, after 6 p.m.

Thank you for your time. I greatly appreciate your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Monika Haussmann
3835 Oakland Drive
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Appendix Q

Women's Roles Questionnaire with Informed Consent Form
INFORMED CONSENT:

I answer the Women's Roles Questionnaire with the understanding that my responses will be used confidentially for a research project by Monika Haussmann on women's roles and lives. If I have any questions, I have been notified that my questions will be answered.

Initials: __________________

Your present occupation: ________________________________

WOMEN'S ROLES QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions honestly and frankly. In order to assure your complete privacy, please do not give any name, address, or identification of any kind.

On the next page, in question 2 (your marital status), please circle the letter which applies to you currently. If you are not married presently, please specify, in question 3, the relationship that your significant person has to you. Your "significant person" is a person who is very important to you in your present life and with whom you have regular contact; this person might be a relative, friend, colleague, neighbor, or any other person.

Most items have multiple choices of a, b, c, etc. Please circle the letter of the response that is closest to your own answer. Some of the items require a brief written response; please print or write your response clearly in the space provided.

Please feel free to take a break, but make sure that you complete the questionnaire in two days after you started.

THANK YOU.

NOW PLEASE BEGIN ON THE NEXT PAGE.
BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. Your birthdate: ___ ___ ___ mo day yr

2. Your marital status:
   a. now married
   b. never married
   c. divorced/separated
   d. widowed

3. If you are not currently married, please specify your significant person's relationship to you:

4. Are you employed at the present time?
   a. yes
   b. no

5. Which of the following best describes the work that you do?
   a. homemaker
   b. student
   c. semi/unskilled worker
   d. skilled worker
   e. clerical/sales worker
   f. professional
   g. other (specify) _____________

6. On your job, how many people do you supervise?
   a. none
   b. 1 - 2 people
   c. 3 - 6 people
   d. 6 or more people

7. To what extent is what you do on your job decided by others who work with you?
   a. totally
   b. a lot
   c. somewhat
   d. not at all

8. Your education:
   a. grades 9 or less completed
   b. grades 10 or 11 completed
   c. high school completed
   d. one year college completed
   e. B.A. degree
   f. M.A. degree
   g. Specialist
   h. Doctorate

9. Children living with you, ages: __ __ __ __ __ __ __

10. Total annual gross income available: $____________________

11. Your gross annual income: $____________________

12. Did you lose your mother before you were eleven years of age?
   a. no
   b. yes

13. How satisfied are you with your social life over the past six months?
   a. extremely satisfied
   b. satisfied
   c. somewhat satisfied
   d. dissatisfied
   e. very dissatisfied

14. To whom can you talk about things that are troubling you? Mention more than one person by specifying their relationship to you:
   1. ______________________
   2. ______________________
   3. ______________________
   4. I don't have someone to confide in
15. How often do you get together with friends and neighbors?
   a. 0 times per month
   b. 1 - 2 times per month
   c. 3 - 6 times per month
   d. 7 - 10 times per month
   e. 11 times or more per month

16. To what extent is your significant person interested in what matters to you?
   a. totally
   b. a lot
   c. somewhat
   d. not at all

17. How available is your significant person when you want to talk to him/her?
   a. very available
   b. often available
   c. seldom available
   d. never available

18. All in all, how satisfied would you say you are with your life?
   a. very satisfied
   b. satisfied
   c. somewhat satisfied
   d. dissatisfied
   e. very dissatisfied

19. When you grew up, how did you expect your economic needs as an adult would be met?
   a. expected to support myself
   b. expected others to support me
   c. never really thought about it
   d. other (specify)

20. Please check below the attitude which best reflects your view about combining career- and homemaker roles:
   a. mainly interested in homemaker
   b. mainly interested in career
   c. interested in both; in case of conflict, homemaker takes precedence
   d. interested in both; in case of conflict, career takes precedence
   e. interested in both; no conflict anticipated or experienced
   f. interested in both; unsure how to resolve conflict

21. If you could start all over again, which of the following would you do differently?
   a. education
   b. career
   c. marriage
   d. parenting
   e. other
   Please specify briefly: ____________

22. Optional Item:
   What is your ethnic background?
   a. White
   b. Black
   c. Spanish American
   d. Mexican American
   e. Native American/Indian
   f. Oriental
   g. Other (specify) ____________
The PERI Life Events Scale

In the following list, please mark the major events in your life during the past six months that, for better or for worse, interrupted your usual activities:

1. started school or a training program after not going to school for a long time
2. changed schools or training program
3. graduated from school or training program
4. had problems in school or in training program
5. failed school, training program
6. did not graduate from school or training program
7. started work for the first time
8. returned to work after not working for a long time
9. changed jobs for a better one
10. changed jobs for a worse one
11. changed jobs for one that was no better and no worse than the last one
12. had trouble with a boss
13. demoted at work
14. found out that was not going to be promoted at work
15. conditions at work got worse, other than demotion or trouble with the boss
16. promoted
17. had significant success at work
18. conditions at work improved, not counting promotion or other personal success
19. laid off
20. fired
21. started a business or profession
22. expanded business or professional practice
23. took on a greatly increased work load
24. suffered a business loss or failure
25. sharply reduced work load
26. retired
27. stopped working, not retirement, for an extended period
28. became engaged
29. engagement broken
30. married
31. started a love-affair
32. relations with spouse changed for the worse, without separation or divorce
33. married couple separated
34. divorce
35. relations with spouse changed for the better
36. married couple got together again after separation
37. marital infidelity
38. trouble with in-laws
39. spouse died
40. became pregnant
41. birth of a first child
42. birth of a second or later child
43. abortion
44. miscarriage or stillbirth
45. found out that cannot have children
46. child died
47. adopted a child
48. started menopause
49. new person moved into the household
50. person moved out of the household
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51. someone stayed on in the household after he/she was expected to leave
52. serious family argument other than with spouse
53. a change in the frequency of family get-togethers
54. family member other than spouse or child died
55. moved to a better residence or neighborhood
56. moved to a worse residence or neighborhood
57. moved to a residence or neighborhood no better or no worse than the last
58. unable to move after expecting to be able to move
59. built a home or had one built
60. remodeled a home
61. lost a home through fire, flood, or other disaster
62. assaulted
63. robbed
64. accident in which there were no injuries
65. involved in a law suit
66. accused of something for which a person could be sent to jail
67. lost drivers licence
68. arrested
69. went to jail
70. got involved in a court case
71. convicted of a crime
72. acquitted of a crime
73. released from jail
74. didn't get out of jail when expected
75. took out a mortgage
76. started buying a car, furniture, or other large purchase on installment plan
77. foreclosure of a mortgage or loan
78. repossession of a car, furniture or other items bought on installment plan
79. took a cut in wage or salary without a demotion
80. suffered a financial loss or loss of property not related to work
81. went on welfare
82. went off welfare
83. got a substantial increase in wage or salary without a promotion
84. did not get an expected wage or salary increase
85. had financial improvement not related to work
86. increased church or synagogue, club, neighborhood, or other organizational activities
87. took a vacation
88. was not able to take a planned vacation
89. took up a new hobby, sport, craft, or recreational activity
90. dropped a hobby, sport, craft, or recreational activity
91. acquired a pet
92. pet died
93. made new friends
94. broke up with a friend
95. close friend died
96. entered the Armed Services
97. left the Armed Services
98. took a trip other than a vacation
99. physical health improved
100. physical illness
101. injury
102. unable to get treatment for an illness or injury
### CES-D

Please circle the number for each statement which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way—DURING THE PAST WEEK:

- Rarely or none of the time (less than 1 day)
- A little or some of the time (1 - 2 days)
- A moderate amount of time or occasionally (3 - 4 days)
- Most or all of the time (5 - 7 days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Past Week:</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt depressed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I felt fearful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I was happy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I felt lonely.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I had crying spells.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I felt sad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I felt that people disliked me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I could not get &quot;going&quot;.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CES-D—Revised

Please circle the number for each statement which best describes how often you felt or behaved this way--DURING THE PAST SIX MONTHS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the Past Six Months:</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>A Little</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I was bothered by things that usually don't bother me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I did not feel like eating; my appetite was poor.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I felt that I could not shake off the blues even with help from my family or friends...</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I felt that I was just as good as other people.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I had trouble keeping my mind on what I was doing.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I felt depressed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I felt that everything I did was an effort.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I felt hopeful about the future.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I thought my life had been a failure.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I felt fearful.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My sleep was restless.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I was happy.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I talked less than usual.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I felt lonely.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. People were unfriendly.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I enjoyed life.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I had crying spells.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I felt sad.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I felt that people disliked me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I could not get &quot;going&quot;.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ASI - Form 10

This material was previously copyrighted, and permission was not granted to include the full scale in the dissertation. Pages 341-342 are available for consultation at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan.

Copies of the Achieving Styles Inventory - Form 10 may be obtained from:

Dr. Harold Leavitt
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

Sample items from the Achieving Styles Inventory - Form 10, are:

- For me the most gratifying thing is to have solved a tough problem.
- I want to be the leader.
- The more competitive the situation the better I like it.
- Real team effort is the best way for me to get a job done.
- I achieve my goals through contributing to the success of others.
Copies of a new revised form of the instrument, L-DIA Achieving Styles Inventory - Form 13, may be obtained from:

Dr. Jean Lipman-Blumen
6803 Greywood Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20034

In this dissertation, the Achieving Styles Inventory - Form 10, was employed.
Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the statements by circling 4 = strongly agree; 3 = agree; 2 = neutral; 1 = disagree; 0 = strongly disagree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I have a need for someone who lets me have my own way.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I try to avoid arguments.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I lose my temper easily.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try to get my own way even if I have to fight for it.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my relationships, I get my own way by being dominant.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I get angry easily.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am stubborn.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am dominating.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am argumentative with my significant person.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am quicktempered with my significant person.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I criticize my significant person.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My significant person has a need for someone who lets him/her have his/her own way.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My significant person tries to avoid arguments.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My significant person tries to get his/her own way even if s/he has to fight for it.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My significant person loses his/her temper easily.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In his/her relationships, my significant person gets his/her own way by being dominant.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My significant person gets angry easily.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My significant person is stubborn.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My significant person is dominating.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My significant person is argumentative with me.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My significant person is quicktempered with me.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My significant person criticizes me.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I wish I would change in myself the following personality characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I do the following things that my significant person does not like:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I wish my significant person would change in him/herself the following personality characteristics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My significant person does the following things that I don't like:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. When disagreements arise between me and my significant person (check one):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] I usually give in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] My significant person usually gives in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] We agree by mutual give and take.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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We would like to know how you handle certain situations which most people face at some time during their lives. Each question can be answered by one of the two statements which follow it. Place a checkmark before either statement "a" or statement "b", whichever is closest to describing what you would usually do in that situation. Be sure to check the one you believe best describes what you would actually do most often, and not necessarily the one you think you should do.

Please answer all items.

1. If you had a job that did not have automatic pay raises, would you
   \[ \] a. ask for one when you thought you deserved it, or
   \[ \] b. wait until it was offered to you?

2. When you buy new clothes, do you usually prefer to
   \[ \] a. shop alone
   \[ \] b. ask someone to help you decide?

3. When you have an accident at home or at work, do you usually blame it on
   \[ \] a. bad luck or the carelessness of others, or
   \[ \] b. your own negligence?

4. At a social gathering, who usually takes the lead in choosing the topics of conversation?
   \[ \] a. the person I'm talking with
   \[ \] b. myself

5. If, at a gathering of friends, someone shows up whom you do not know but would like to meet, do you
   \[ \] a. introduce yourself, or
   \[ \] b. hope that one of your friends introduces you?

6. When you have a problem of some kind, do you first
   \[ \] a. try to handle it by yourself, or
   \[ \] b. ask for help from friends, family members or others?

7. If you heard that some people where you work were going to be laid off permanently, would you
   \[ \] a. begin to look for a new job right away, or
   \[ \] b. wait until you were sure you would be one of the people laid off?

8. Do you regularly save money for things you may want in the future?
   \[ \] a. yes
   \[ \] b. no

Now place a checkmark beside the one statement of each pair (and only one) which is closest to what you believe to be the case. Be sure to check the one you believe to be closer to the truth, rather than the one you would like to be true.

1. \[ \] Whether or not my plans work out is usually a matter of luck.
   \[ \] When I make plans, I am fairly sure that I can make them work out.

2. \[ \] I usually feel that I have control over the direction my life is taking.
   \[ \] Sometimes I feel that I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking.

3. \[ \] What is going to happen will usually happen, no matter what I do.
   \[ \] Taking definite actions has usually worked out better for me than trusting to fate.

4. \[ \] In my case, getting what I want has little or nothing to do with luck.
   \[ \] Whether or not I get what I want is usually a matter of luck.
5. [ ] Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.
   [ ] Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.
6. [ ] People don't realize that most of the things that happen to them are the result of chance.
   [ ] Chance happenings hardly ever have a big influence in people's lives.
7. [ ] Many times I feel that I have hardly any influence over the things that happen to me.
   [ ] I do not believe that chance and luck are very important in my life.

How much control do you have over your life and what happens to you? Please place a check in one of the seven boxes which comes closest to describing how much control you feel you have.

Complete control

No control

FEM

Please indicate below the degree to which you agree or disagree with the below-listed statements by circling 1 = strongly agree; 2 = agree; 3 = neutral; 4 = disagree; 5 = strongly disagree.

1. It is all right for women to work but men will always be the basic breadwinners.
2. A woman should not expect to go to the same places or have the same freedom of action as a man.
3. Realistically speaking, most progress so far has been made by men and we can expect it to continue that way.
4. A woman should be expected to change her name when she marries.
5. As a head of the household, the father should have final authority over his children.
6. A woman who refuses to give up her job to move with her husband would be to blame if the marriage broke up.
7. Profanity sounds worse generally coming from a woman.
8. A woman who refuses to bear children has failed in her duty to her husband.
9. Women are basically more unpredictable than men.
10. The "clinging vine" wife is justified provided she clings sweetly enough to please her husband.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT.

Would you like to receive a summary report of this project? [ ] yes [ ] no

NOW PLEASE MAIL THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED AND SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE BY _____ date ___. THANK YOU VERY MUCH!
Appendix R

Differences in the Nine Achieving Styles Subscales
Among Four Occupational and Three Marital Status Groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Intrinsic Direct</th>
<th>(2) Competitive Direct</th>
<th>(3) Power Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Protected LSD     |                      |                        |                 |
| Comparisons      | P vs. C/S            | ns                     | * (C/S < P)     |
|                  | P vs. H              | * (H < P)              | * (H < P)       |
|                  | P vs. S/U            | * (S/U < P)            | * (S/U < P)     |
|                  | C/S vs. H            | ns                     | * (H < C/S)     |
|                  | C/S vs. S/U          | ns                     | * (S/U < C/S)   |
|                  | H vs. S/U            | ns                     | ns              |

| One-way ANOVA    | .04*                 | .00*                   | .37              |
| Occupational     |                      |                        |                 |
| Groups           |                      |                        |                 |
| Professionals    | N                    | Mean                   | SD              |
| Professionals    | 57                   | 3.46                   | 1.70            |
| Professionals    | 58                   | 2.79                   | 1.01            |
| Professionals    | 57                   | 2.43                   | .86             |
| Clerical/Sales   | 55                   | 3.26                   | 1.15            |
| Clerical/Sales   | 55                   | 2.28                   | .98             |
| Clerical/Sales   | 55                   | 2.42                   | .93             |
| Homemakers       | 53                   | 2.86                   | 1.24            |
| Homemakers       | 54                   | 1.90                   | .71             |
| Homemakers       | 53                   | 2.63                   | 1.01            |
| Semi/Unskilled   | 46                   | 3.40                   | 1.12            |
| Semi/Unskilled   | 47                   | 2.42                   | .97             |
|                  | 47                   | 2.68                   | 1.00            |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected LSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. C/S</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td><em>(C/S &lt; P)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. H</td>
<td><em>(H &lt; P)</em></td>
<td><em>(H &lt; P)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. S/U</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td><em>(S/U &lt; P)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. H</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td><em>(H &lt; C/S)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. S/U</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H vs. S/U</td>
<td><em>(H &lt; S/U)</em></td>
<td><em>(H &lt; S/U)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7) Collaborative Rel.</th>
<th>(8) Contributory Rel.</th>
<th>(9) Vicarious Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Mean SD</td>
<td>N Mean SD</td>
<td>N Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>57 4.10 1.25</td>
<td>58 4.54 1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55 3.93 1.33</td>
<td>55 4.10 1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>53 4.07 1.34</td>
<td>51 4.29 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>45 4.08 1.35</td>
<td>47 3.89 1.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Protected LSD         |                        |                       |
| Comparisons           |                        |                       |
| P vs. C/S             | *(C/S < P)*            |                       |
| P vs. H               | ns                     |                       |
| P vs. S/U             | *(S/U < P)*            |                       |
| C/S vs. H             | ns                     |                       |
| C/S vs. S/U           | ns                     |                       |
| H vs. S/U             | ns                     |                       |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>(1) Intrinsic Direct</th>
<th>(2) Competitive Direct</th>
<th>(3) Power Direct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA Prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA Prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>(7) Collaborative Rel.</th>
<th>(8) Contributory Rel.</th>
<th>(9) Vicarious Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One-way ANOVA Prob.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. Appendix R reports the results for 18 one-way analyses of variance for the four occupational groups and the three marital groups on the subscales of the Achieving Styles Inventory: (1) intrinsic direct, (2) competitive direct, (3) power direct, (4) instrumental direct, (5) instrumental relational, (6) reliant relational, (7) collaborative relational, (8) contributory relational, and (9) vicarious relational. Results for Protected LSD pairwise comparisons are reported when the overall F-test was significant at or below $\alpha = .05$. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at $\alpha = .05$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Rel.</th>
<th>Contributory Rel.</th>
<th>Vicarious Rel.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected LSD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married vs. never-married</td>
<td>$^*$ (NM &lt; M)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married vs. divorced/separated</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married vs. divorced/separated</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix S

Differences Among Occupational and Marital Groups on 19 Background Variables
OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1) Occupational Prestige</th>
<th>(2) Age</th>
<th>(3) Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58  62.09  9.23</td>
<td>57  36.93  7.71</td>
<td>54  27.82  14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55  42.80  6.92</td>
<td>55  34.91  8.10</td>
<td>47  22.77  13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>54  14.63  1.17</td>
<td>54  36.52  8.90</td>
<td>41  29.54  18.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>48  30.10  8.41</td>
<td>48  37.96  8.43</td>
<td>41  16.56  8.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(4) Personal Income</th>
<th>(5) Education</th>
<th>(6) Social Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>55  17.64  7.23</td>
<td>58  5.60  .90</td>
<td>58  2.48  1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>47  11.87  4.08</td>
<td>55  3.73  .76</td>
<td>55  2.29  1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>53  ---  ---</td>
<td>54  3.57  1.02</td>
<td>54  2.41  1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>39  13.26  4.90</td>
<td>48  2.81  .81</td>
<td>48  1.88  1.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected LSD Comparisons</th>
<th>(4) Personal Income</th>
<th>(5) Education</th>
<th>(6) Social Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P vs. C/S</td>
<td>* (C/S &lt; P)</td>
<td>* (C/S &lt; P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. H</td>
<td>* (H &lt; P)</td>
<td>* (H &lt; P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. S/U</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; P)</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; P)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. H</td>
<td>* (H &lt; C/S)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. S/U</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; C/S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H vs. S/U</td>
<td>* (H &lt; S/U)</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># Confiding Relationships</th>
<th># People Supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protected LSD Comparisons</th>
<th>(7) # Confiding Relationships</th>
<th>(8) Lack of Freedom on Job</th>
<th>(9) # People Supervised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P vs. C/S</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (C/S &lt; P)</td>
<td>* (C/S &lt; P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. H</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (H &lt; P)</td>
<td>* (H &lt; P)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. H</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (H &lt; C/S)</td>
<td>* (H &lt; C/S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. S/U</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; C/S)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (S/U &lt; C/S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Protected LSD Comparisons**

- P vs. C/S: ns
- P vs. H: * (P < H)
- P vs. S/U: ns
- C/S vs. H: * (C/S < H)
- C/S vs. S/U: ns
- H vs. S/U: * (S/U < H)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(13) Life Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>(14) Absence of Confid. Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>2.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Protected LSD Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(13) Life Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>(14) Absence of Confid. Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P vs. C/S</td>
<td>* (P &lt; C/S)</td>
<td>* (P &lt; C/S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P vs. H</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>* (P &lt; H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. H</td>
<td>* (H &lt; C/S)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C/S vs. S/U</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H vs. S/U</td>
<td>* (H &lt; S/U)</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHI-SQUARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation Groups</th>
<th>(15) 3 or More Children &lt; 14</th>
<th>(16) Loss of Mother &lt; 11</th>
<th>(17) Expectation of Source of Support as Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>98.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/Sales</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi/Unskilled</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{chi}^2 = 12.75; \quad \text{chi}^2 = 1.58; \quad \text{chi}^2 = 26.27; \]

\[ df = 3; \quad df = 3; \quad df = 9; \]

\[ \alpha = .01* \quad \alpha = .66 (ns) \quad \alpha = .00* \]
### Occupational Groups

#### Professionals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Clerical/Sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Homemakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Semi/Unskilled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Groups</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 50.18;
\]

\[
df = 9;
\]

\[
\alpha = .00^* 
\]

### Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(19) Ethnic Background</th>
<th>(18) Career-Homemake-Orientaion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>Row %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>(1) Occupational Prestige</th>
<th>(2) Age</th>
<th>(3) Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>20.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42.85</td>
<td>15.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>17.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Protected LSD Comparisons

- M vs. NM: ns
- M vs. DS: ns
- NM vs. DS: * (NM < DS)
- NM vs. M: * (NM < M)
- M vs. DS: * (DS < M)
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### Personal Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14.60</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

- **N vs. NM**: *(M < NM)*
- **M vs. DS**: *(M < DS)*
- **NM vs. DS**: ***ns***

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

- **M vs. NM**: *(M < NM)*
- **M vs. DS**: *(M < DS)*
- **NM vs. DS**: ***ns***

### Social Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

- **M vs. NM**: *(M < NM)*
- **M vs. DS**: *(M < DS)*
- **NM vs. DS**: ***ns***
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(10) # Children &lt; 6</th>
<th>(11) # Changes Desired</th>
<th>(12) Social Dissatisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

M vs. NM * (NM < M) ns
M vs. DS * (DS < M) * (M < DS)
NM vs. DS ns ns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(13) Life Dissatisfaction</th>
<th>(14) Absence of Confid. Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One-way ANOVA</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
<td>Prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Groups</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Comparisons

M vs. NM * (M < NM)
M vs. DS * (M < DS)
NM vs. DS ns
### CHI-SQUARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>(15) 3 or More Children &lt; 14</th>
<th>(16) Loss of Mother &lt; 11</th>
<th>(17) Expectation of Source of Support as Adult</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div./separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 5.77; \quad \chi^2 = 2.00; \quad \chi^2 = 12.39;
\]

\[
df = 2; \quad df = 2; \quad df = 6;
\]

\[
\alpha = .06 \text{ (ns)} \quad \alpha = .37 \text{ (ns)} \quad \alpha = .05^* 
\]

---

### (18) Career-Homemaker-Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Career</th>
<th>No Conflict</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div./separated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 13.25; \quad df = 6; \quad \alpha = .04^* 
\]

### (19) Ethnic Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Groups</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never-married</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Div./separated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row %</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\chi^2 = 4.58; \quad df = 4;
\]

\[
\alpha = .33 \text{ (ns)}
\]

---

**Note.** Appendix S reports results of 14 one-way ANOVAS for the occupational groups, 14 one-way ANOVAS for the marital groups, and Protected LSD pairwise comparisons at \( \alpha = .05 \). In addition, 5 chi-squares are reported for the occupational groups, and 5 chi-squares for the marital groups for the categorical background variables. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below \( \alpha = .05 \); "ns" indicates nonsignificance at \( \alpha = .05 \).
Appendix T

Differences in Depression by Marital Status;
Results for Three Analyses of Variance for
the Marital Status Groups on the
Three Depression Measures
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>CES-D--Past Week</th>
<th>CES-D--Past 6 Mo.</th>
<th>CES-D--Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.00*</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>9.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced/separated</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.98</td>
<td>11.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protected LSD Pairwise Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M vs. NM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>M vs DS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NM vs. DS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Appendix T reports the results for three analyses of variance for the marital status groups on the three depression measures, and for follow-through Protected LSD pairwise comparisons. An asterisk (*) indicates significance at or below $\alpha = .05$; "ns" indicates nonsignificance at $\alpha = .05$. 
Appendix U

Debriefing of Subjects—Letter to Participants
Dear Participant:

About 6-8 months ago, you completed a 12-page questionnaire on women's lives and roles. I want to thank you for your participation. You indicated that you wanted to receive a summary of the findings. That's why I'm writing to you today. I've included a summary of my study titled "Women's Roles and Vulnerability to Depression." We couldn't tell you in the beginning that the study was also about depression as this might have influenced the results.

In this study, I was interested in finding out whether women in four broad occupational groups would differ in depression, in their achievement-orientation, in how they describe themselves and their significant person, in their sense of mastery, and in their attitudes toward women's roles. The four groups were (a) professionals, (b) clerical/sales workers (secretaries included), (c) full-time homemakers, and (d) semi/unskilled workers. There are, of course, many individual differences within each of these groups—and in the study, I can only talk generally about the "average" clerical/sales worker, homemaker, etc., as they responded in this sample in Kalamazoo County. I also took a look at differences between married, never-married, and divorced/separated women.

If you are interested in receiving a more detailed technical report (30 pages), please let me know by filling out the form below. Since by now I'm running in the red financially, I'd appreciate a contribution of $1 to help defray the expenses of photocopying and mailing the longer report if you have the money easily available. If not, please don't hesitate to ask for the report; I'd be glad to send it to you either way.

I welcome any reactions you might have regarding the study—critical and otherwise. Also, if you might be interested in getting together sometime in the next few months with other participants and myself to discuss the study, the results, and possible implications, please indicate this on the form below. If other participants want to get together also, I'll contact you and suggest dates and times for a meeting.

Let me thank you again for your participation.

Sincerely, Monika Haussmann

Please return

[] Please send me the 30-page report.
[] I'm interested in a meeting with other participants to discuss the study.

My name: Current address: Phone No:

Reactions:
Appendix V

Debriefing of Subjects—Summary of Results
WOMEN'S ROLES AND VULNERABILITY TO DEPRESSION—Abstract

HAUSSMANN, Monika Johanna
Dissertation in progress; Western Michigan University, 1981.


In this study, social-psychological variables were viewed as important factors in the etiology of depression in women. Depression was examined as a function of (a) undesirable life events, (b) occupational and marital roles, (c) learned vulnerability variables of achieving style, relative dominance in relationship, mastery orientation, attitudes toward women's roles, and (d) selected background variables.

A stratified random sample of full-time workers and homemakers, age 25 to 50, was drawn from Kalamazoo County, MI. Of 240 contacted women, 90% responded (58 professionals, 55 clerical/sales workers, 54 homemakers, 48 semi/unskilled workers). The mailed questionnaire contained the (a) PERI Life Events Scale, (b) CES-Depression Scale, (c) Achieving Styles Inventory, (d) Lu-Dominance-Submission Scale, (e) Mastery/Powerlessness Scale, (f) FEM-Scale, and (g) background information. AOV-ordered means analyses, analyses of variance and covariance, and multiple regression analyses were employed.

Occupational groups did not differ in experience of undesirable life events. Divorced/separated women reported higher undesirable life events than married and never-married women. Professionals were less depressed than clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers. Homemakers reported lowest direct and total achieving styles, and professionals the highest. Professionals perceived their partners as less dominant than did clerical/sales and semi/unskilled workers. Semi/unskilled workers reported lowest mastery, and professionals the highest. Stereotypical attitudes toward women's roles ranged from high to low, in the order of: semi/unskilled workers > homemakers > clerical/sales workers > professionals. Divorced/separated women were more depressed than married and never-married women. However, the marital status groups did not differ in achieving styles, dominance, mastery, and attitudes toward women's roles.

When controlling for undesirable life events, professionals were least depressed. Divorced/separated semi/unskilled and clerical/sales workers were most depressed. Divorced/separated professionals were slightly less depressed than the other married and never-married occupational groups. As the family income of the homemakers was highest, most women worked because of economic necessity. Professionals reported higher levels of "protective" variables such as high power-direct achieving style, mastery, liberal attitudes toward women's roles, and had highest trusting relationships with significant person.

Depression was positively related to: viewing one's partner and oneself as dominant, needing others for achievements (reliant relational achieving style), lacking a confiding relationship, and feeling dissatisfied with life. Depression was inversely related to: mastery, occupational prestige, educational level, and family income. Black women were more depressed than white women and women of other ethnic background.

It was concluded that occupational levels need to be differentiated when examining the relation of women's employment and well-being. The combination of work which fosters mastery, close and trusting affiliation in relationship, neither perceiving self nor partner as dominant, and liberal attitudes toward women's roles appeared to be the protective package against depression. Gaining access to higher level occupations may protect against hard economic consequences of divorce and may well decrease women's epidemiological depression. Relations of "vulnerability" versus "protective" variables to depression in women are discussed. Implications for therapy and social programs and policies are suggested.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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