

1993

## **Interrole Conflict as a Function of Gender, Gender Role Orientation and Life Stage**

Christine E. Herbert

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/honors\\_etd](https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/honors_etd)



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

---

Interrole Conflict as a Function of Gender,  
Gender Role Orientation and Life Stage

Christine E. Hebert

Louisiana State University

## Interrole Conflict as a Function of Gender, Gender Role Orientation and Life Stage

What is interrole conflict? According to role theory, interrole strain or conflict will occur when conflicting and competing expectancies are perceived from two or more roles enacted by an individual (Gross, Manson, & McEachern, 1958; Kahn, Wolf, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964; Secord & Backman, 1974). Individuals in today's world often occupy a number of social statuses simultaneously, each with its own set of role expectations. The more statuses one occupies and the more roles in which one is expected to engage, the more difficult it is for the individual to fulfill the obligation of each status and role set (Goode, 1960).

Past research on the topic of interrole conflict has shown that the advent of the dual career marriage has been accompanied by a greater expansion of sanctioned roles for the female partner than for the male (Bernard, 1975; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969). Taking this finding into consideration, most of the literature on interrole conflict has examined the roles of career women and the role conflict they experience between the competing demands of work and family (Bardwick, 1971; Hall, 1972; Holahan & Gilbert, 1979 a,b; Morgan, 1962). Many researchers who have included females and males in their role studies have demonstrated that there are gender differences in interrole conflict. Two studies (Greenglass, Pantony & Burke, 1988; Yogev, 1986) found that the

negative correlation between interrole conflict and marital satisfaction was significantly higher for women than for men. Findings in another study by Wiersma & Van Den Berg (1991) showed that, for women, nonwork time spent on domestic responsibilities is an important correlate of interrole conflict, and that nonwork time spent on job activities is an important correlate for men.

The previously mentioned studies have simply examined the effects of competing roles on the individual. But it is important to consider that the impact of interrole conflict on the individual may not simply reflect an additive effect on the well-being of the individual. In other words, simply adding up the amounts of interrole conflict experienced between multiple pairs of roles that one possesses may not accurately account for the total effect which interrole conflict has on an individual. It has been shown that the amount of interrole conflict may be the result of a more complex interaction between many different aspects of the interrole conflict context such as the quality of one's roles and the quality of one's relationships (Baruch & Barnett, 1986).

Life stage has been shown to be one variable that may interact with a number of roles to produce an effect on one's level of interrole conflict. As mentioned in the above studies, one's family role which is related to life stage has been shown to be an important aspect of interrole conflict. With this in mind, the idea proposed by Cain, (1964) that the nature of interrole conflict may be related more to a person's life stage

than to his or her age, has become important to this area of study.

Life stage variations in interrole conflict for women have been found in relation to the cycle of child-rearing. Lopata (1966) found a rise in home pressures through the peak child-rearing years, with a drop thereafter. Lopata's findings also indicated that work pressures are at their lowest in the peak child-rearing years and then rise thereafter. On the contrary, Hall's (1975) findings did not show an eventual drop in home pressures for females, but a continuous increase in home pressures with each subsequent life stage.

The importance of life stage in relation to interrole conflict in males has also been demonstrated. It has been shown that the occupational role constitutes the primary concern of young adult males, while the roles of husband and father are secondary, leaving less room for interrole conflict (Erikson, 1968; Gilligan, 1982; Levinson, 1978). But the same studies indicate that, for men, interrole conflict does appear to occur later in life when they may not have developed the interpersonal skills necessary for forming relationships.

In addition to life stage, gender role orientation has been linked to interrole conflict and may be another important variable affecting the amount of interrole conflict one experiences. In general, females have been shown to rate higher on feminine gender role orientation factors (i.e. femininity) and males have been shown found to rate higer on masculine gender

role orientation factors (i.e. masculinity) (Bem, 1974). In addition, some developmental research has been done concerning differences related to one's gender role orientation throughout the adult lifespan. Research by Gutmann (1975) involved a developmental study looking at the pattern of androgyny in adults. Gutmann's role reversal theory asserted that traditional gender role orientations are most rigidly maintained during the active parenting years and then wane during old age. In support of his theory, he found that older men rated higher on feminine factors measuring gender role orientation than younger males. Given that gender role orientation is indeed a variable affecting one's interrole conflict, these developmental findings could have important implications in examining interrole conflict across the life span.

Since the present study examined the relationship between gender role orientation and interrole conflict, at this point it is important to address some methodological issues on the measurement of gender role orientation. Although Bem's (1974) gender role orientation measure, the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI), and similar scales have been popular instruments in assessing gender role orientation, recent studies have suggested that these scales fail to represent several important variables related to gender role orientation (Marsh & Meyers, 1986; Ashmore & Del Beca, 1986). Both Spence (1984a) and Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Rousell, & Hertzog (1992), suggest that the BSRI and similar scales measure only a set of gender-related personality

attributes, and do not reflect two global gender-related personality characteristics, masculinity and femininity. They also point out that some personality attributes commonly related to gender may have been omitted from the BSRI, along with certain aspects of emotionality which may be inadequately represented by factors of the scale. Ashmore and colleagues (Ashmore, 1990; Ashmore & Del Boco, 1986) also support the idea that the BSRI is too simplistic and does not account for many social contextual factors that may affect gender such as stereotypes, attitudes, behaviors, social relationships, and interests and abilities. Results of these studies also indicate that there may be a qualitative difference in the way females and males construe the meaning of masculinity and femininity which may also affect the validity of such scales. This research suggests that gender identity should perhaps be defined in terms of the individual rather than by an experimenter-imposed scale construction. Gender schema theory (Bem, 1981b, 1983) also suggests that the way an "individual" organizes information about his or her gender role is an important component of gender role orientation. One's gender schema is a knowledge structure which influences the way one perceives, evaluates, and regulates both his or her own behavior and the behavior of others in accordance with cultural definitions of gender appropriateness.

In summary, a review of the literature on interrole conflict studies suggests that one's gender, life stage and gender role orientation may influence the amount of interrole conflict one

experiences. However, the majority of studies on interrole conflict have studied interrole conflict in women only. Another problem with the existing literature on interrole conflict is that very limited measures of gender role orientation have been used. Also, there are very few studies which have examined interrole conflict in individuals from an adult developmental perspective.

This study tried to compensated for some of the short comings in the existing literature on interrole conflict. In order to provide a thorough examination of interrole conflict from an adult developmental perspective, this study examined married individuals across five different life stages. The sample consisted of both males and females in order that gender differences in interrole conflict might also be detected. In addition, this study took into consideration the findings suggesting the inadequacy of the two factor model of the BSRI as a measure of gender-role orientation. Thus, it utilized two dimensions for assessing gender role orientation, the three factor model of the BSRI (Blanchard-Fields et al, 1992) and a procedure assessing gender schema in relation to the way one perceives and evaluates others.

The purpose of this of this study was to investigate the relationships between interrole conflict, gender, gender role orientation and life stage; thus, the following hypotheses were tested: a) females experience more interrole conflict than males, b) for all adults, the most interrole conflict is



experienced during the middle life stages, c) females experience the most interrole conflict during the peak child-rearing years, while males experience the most interrole conflict in later life stages, d) females rate higher on feminine factors related to gender role orientation (i. e., interpersonal sensitivity), and, likewise, males rate higher on masculine factors related to gender role orientation (i.e., instrumentality and self-sufficiency), e) males in later life stages rate higher on feminine factors related to gender role orientation than males in earlier life stages.

#### Method

##### Participants

A total of 246 adults living in a southeastern metropolitan area of Louisiana participated in this study. All of the participants were community dwelling and interviewed in their own homes. The mean age of the participants was 38, and the mean educational level was 15 years of education. The sample consisted of approximately 20 adults (10 females and 10 males) in each of 5 life stage categories (see Table 1). The participants in this study consisted of mostly caucasian individuals who were of a middle class socioeconomic status. Participants with children did not have children older than 35 years of age. Life stage categories were defined as follows:

Life Stage 1: Individuals with no children

Life Stage 2: Individuals with 1 or more children under the age of 6 and all children living at home.

Life Stage 3: Individuals with all children over the age of 6 and all children living at home.

Life Stage 4: Individuals with all children over the age of 6 with some children living at home and some children living away from home.

Life Stage 5: Individuals with children, but with no children living at home

### Instruments

In addition to a brief demographic questionnaire, the following measures were administered to all participants.

Role Conflict Scales. Six scales developed by Holahan & Gilbert (1979) were used to measure interrole conflict between pairs of the four major life roles of Professional, Spouse, Parent and Self as Self-Actualized Person. Each scale measures a potential conflict between a pair of the four roles (e.g., Professional vs. Parent). The six interrole conflict subscales are: Professional vs. Spouse, Professional vs. Parent, Professional vs. Self, Spouse vs. Self, Spouse vs. Parent, and Parent vs. Self.

The items for the scales were randomly mixed and presented to all participants in the same order. Only the three nonparent scales were scored for the participants with no children.

Participants were asked to respond to items using a 5 point Likert scale which ranges from 1 (causes no internal conflict) through 3 (causes some internal conflict) to 5 (causes high internal conflict). Thus, high scores were associated with

greater interrole conflict. The total interrole conflict score was computed for all participants as well as separate scores for each of the six interrole conflict subscales. An example of one of the 34 items on the interrole conflict questionnaire is:

Putting yourself first in terms of your work versus your spouse putting himself or herself first in his or her work.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory was used to assess dimensions of gender role orientation in each participant. The BSRI consists of 20 masculine characteristics (e.g. assertive, independent, ambitious), 20 feminine characteristics (e.g. affectionate, understanding, sensitive to the needs of others) and 20 neutral characteristics (e.g., sincere, friendly, cooperative). Participants were asked to indicate on a 7 point Likert scale the extent to which each of the 60 trait adjectives described them. The scale is anchored with 1 (never or almost never) and 7 (always or almost always true). Three factors including Instrumentality, Interpersonal Sensitivity, and Self-sufficiency were determined by a Confirmatory Factor Analysis conducted by Blanchard-Fields et al (1992). Blanchard-Fields and colleagues found that these factors provided a better fit to the gender role orientation model than the Masculine/Feminine dimensions, proposed by Bem (1974); thus, this method of scoring was used for the BSRI items in place of Bem's method.

Gender Schema Assessment. One vignette describing a typical male stereotyped situation was presented to each participant (see

Appendix 1). The target character of the vignette was varied producing two separate vignettes, one gender-congruent with a male as the main character, and one gender-incongruent with a female as the main character. The vignette was structured such that it was ambiguous to the participant as to what factors (dispositional, situational, or a combination of both) resulted in the outcome of the situation. One half of the participants in each life stage (approximately 10 males and 10 females) were exposed to the gender-congruent vignette while the other half were exposed to the gender-incongruent vignette (see Table 1). Participants were then instructed to fill out a second BSRI based on their perception of the target character in the vignette they had just read, endorsing those adjectives that described personality characteristics of the target character. The method of scoring used for the BSRI items was the same as the method described in the above section.

The vignettes used in this study were constructed for use in a study by Blanchard-Fields in press (1993). These vignettes were shown to elicit gender role stereotyped responses. In addition, the vignettes were validated in that there was ambiguity as to which factors contributed to the result of the situation described in the vignette.

## Results

### Life Stage and Gender Differences in Interrole Conflict Between Specific Pairs of Roles

In order to assess overall life stage and gender differences

in interrole conflict between specific pairs of roles, a 5 (Life Stage)  $\times$  2 (Gender) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) design was used. This analysis was conducted on the six interrole conflict subscales. Overall, a main effect was found for life stage [ $F(24,772)=11.07$ ,  $p<.001$ ] and gender [ $F(6,221)=4.05$ ,  $p<.01$ ]. In order to determine specific significant life stage differences in interrole conflict between specific pairs of roles, a separate univariate analyses of variance (ANOVA's) were conducted on each of the six interrole conflict subscales. In this case, five out of the six subscales produced a significant effect for life stage, these included: professional vs. parent [ $F(4,239)=19.99$ ,  $p<.001$ ], spouse vs. parent [ $F(4,240)=41.70$ ,  $p<.001$ ], parent vs. self [ $F(4,240)=23.91$ ,  $p<.001$ ], professional vs. spouse [ $F(4,236)=2.86$ ,  $p<.05$ ], professional vs. self [ $F(4,238)=3.15$ ,  $p<.05$ ]. In addition, there was a significant gender effect for the professional versus self subscale [ $F(1,226)=15.27$ ,  $p<.001$ ].

In general, examination of the means of the three subscales containing the parent role (i.e., professional vs. parent, spouse vs. parent, and parent vs. self) across life stage indicates the most interrole conflict for the peak child-rearing life stages (2 and 3) (see Table 2). Student Neuman-Keul's (SNK) post hoc analyses were conducted with significance at the .05 level. On the professional vs. self subscale, participants in life stages 2 and 3 scored significantly higher in interrole conflict than those in life stages 1, 4, and 5, and, in turn, those in life

stage 4 scored significantly higher than those in life stages 1 and 5. Similarly, on the parent vs. self subscale, participants in life stages 2 and 3 scored significantly higher in interrole conflict than those in life stages 1 and 5, and those in life stages 4 and 5 scored significantly higher than those in life stage 1. In addition, on the spouse vs. parent subscale, participants in life stage 2 scored significantly higher in interrole conflict than those in life stages 1 and 5, and those in life stage 5 scored significantly higher than those in life stage 1. In contrast to the three subscales containing the parent role, for the professional vs. self subscale, participants in life stage 1 scored significantly higher on interrole conflict than those in life stages 3, 4, and 5 (see Table 2).

Examination of the means of the interrole conflict subscales that were significant across gender showed that males experience more interrole conflict than females between the roles of professional vs. self [mean(standard deviation) for male= 9.65(4.15) and for female= 7.62(4.02)] and professional vs. parent [mean(standard deviation) for male= 7.21(4.47) and for female= 6.38(4.10)].

#### Life Stage and Gender Differences in Participants' Gender Role Orientation

In order to assess overall life stage and gender differences in participants' gender role orientation, a 5 (Life stage) x 2 (Gender) MANOVA design was used. This analysis was conducted on the three gender role orientation factors measured by the BSRI.

A main effect was found for gender only [ $F(3,230)=16.31, p<.001$ ]. All three gender role orientation factors produced a significant effect, they were: instrumentality [ $F(1,232)=24.91, p<.001$ ], interpersonal sensitivity [ $F(1,232)=13.25, p<.001$ ], and self-sufficiency [ $F(1,232)=12.37, p<.01$ ].

Examination of the means of the three gender role orientation factors across gender shows that males scored significantly higher than females in both instrumentality and in self-sufficiency. SNK post hoc analyses were conducted with significance at the .05 level. Females scored significantly higher than males in interpersonal sensitivity (see Table 3).

In order to assess life stage differences in male participants' gender role orientation, separate ANOVA's were done on each of the three gender role orientation factors measured by the BSRI (see Hypothesis e). No main effect of life stage was found for males for any of the three gender role orientation factors.

#### Life Stage and Gender Differences in Gender Role Orientation Ratings of a Hypothetical Other

In order to assess overall life stage and gender differences in gender role orientation ratings of a hypothetical other, a 5 (Life stage) x 2 (Gender) x 2 (Vignette) MANOVA was conducted on the three gender role orientation factors of the main character in the vignette as measured by the BSRI. Vignette 1 was the gender-congruent vignette with a male as the main character and vignette 2 was the gender-incongruent vignette with a female as

the main character. Although an overall interaction of life stage and vignette was not found, such an interaction was found for two of the gender role orientation factors, they were: instrumentality [ $F(4,207)=2.99, p<.05$ ] and self-sufficiency [ $F(4,207)=2.60, p<.05$ ]. In addition, there was also a main effect of vignette [ $F(3,205)=6.60, p<.001$ ]. All three gender role orientation factors, instrumentality [ $F(1,207)=13.15, p<.001$ ], interpersonal sensitivity [ $F(1,207)=8.80, p<.01$ ], and self-sufficiency [ $F(1,207)=8.73, p<.01$ ], showed a significant effect for vignette.

Separate ANOVA's were done on the three gender role orientation factors in order to determine specific differences between them for each of the two vignettes. Participants rated the character in vignette 2 (female character, gender incongruent) significantly higher than the character in vignette 1 (male character, gender congruent) on all three gender role orientation factors (see Table 4).

#### Predictors of Interrole Conflict

To determine whether life stage, gender, or the gender role orientation factors (instrumentality, self-sufficiency, and interpersonal sensitivity) predict interrole conflict, separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted for each of the six interrole conflict scales and for the measure of total interrole conflict. For each analysis, life stage and gender were controlled for by entering them in the first step. The three gender role orientation factors were entered in the second



step.

Total Interrole Conflict. In general, the three gender role orientation factors measured by the assessment of self on the BSRI were the best predictors of total interrole conflict. Specifically, increasing instrumentality was associated with increased total role conflict, and decreasing interpersonal sensitivity was also associated with increased total role conflict (see Table 5).

Professional vs. Parent Interrole Conflict Subscale. As on the measure of total interrole conflict, in general, the three gender role orientation factors were the best predictors of interrole conflict between the roles of professional and self. Specifically, increasing instrumentality was associated with increased interrole conflict, and decreasing interpersonal sensitivity was associated with increased interrole conflict between these roles (see Table 5).

Spouse vs. Parent Interrole Conflict Subscale. Life stage was the only predictor of interrole conflict between the roles of spouse and parent. Increasing life stage was associated with increased interrole conflict (see Table 5).

Parent vs. Self Interrole Conflict Subscale. As on the spouse vs. parent subscale, life stage was the only predictor of interrole conflict between the roles of parent and self. Also similarly, increasing life stage was associated with increased interrole conflict between these roles (see Table 5).

Professional vs. Self Interrole Conflict Subscale. Both

gender and life stage predicted interrole conflict between the roles of professional and self. In addition, decreasing life stage was associated with an increase in interrole conflict. In general, the three sex role orientation factors predicted increased interrole conflict above and beyond life stage and gender. Specifically, increasing instrumentality was associated with increased interrole conflict between these two roles (see Table 5).

Professional vs. Spouse Interrole Conflict Subscale. Life stage was a predictor of interrole conflict between the roles of professional and spouse. Decreasing life stage was associated with increased interrole conflict. In general, the three gender role conflict factors were predictors of interrole conflict above and beyond life stage. Specifically, increasing instrumentality was associated with increased interrole conflict (see Table 5).

Spouse vs. Self Interrole Conflict Subscale. None of the variables utilized in the hierarchical regression predicted interrole conflict between the roles of spouse and self. (see Table 5).

### Discussion

The overall findings of this study support the hypotheses that: 1) married adults experience the most interrole conflict during the peak child-rearing life stages and 2) females rate higher on interpersonal sensitivity and males rate higher on instrumentality and self-sufficiency. Therefore, this study demonstrated that it is important to look at interrole conflict

across gender, gender role orientation factors, and life stage.

It is logical that the most interrole conflict was found in life stages 2 and 3 on the subscales which contained the parent role. Life stages 2 and 3 are the peak child-rearing life stages and the demands of the parent role are highest during these stages, leaving room for conflict with other roles. It is also interesting to note that individuals in life stage 1 experienced the most interrole conflict on the professional vs. self subscale. It is during the first life stage, before children become the main focus of the marriage, that individuals still put a lot of energy into their role as a professional. In turn, one's self role or self identity is probably very closely defined by one's work role during this life stage, whereas, in later life stages, one's self role may tend to be more closely defined by one's parent role.

There was a main effect of gender for the professional vs. self and professional vs. parent subscales across life stage. Males may have been shown to have more interrole conflict between the roles of professional and self than women do, because the men may have more difficulty than women in separating the two roles of professional and self. In other words, men may more closely defined their self role by their professional role than women do. In addition, the recent advent of the "men's movement" has influenced males to become more involved in their interpersonal roles such as parent, self and spouse. Societal role changes such as this may be making it harder for men to find a balance

between their role as a parent and their role as professional.

The lack of support for the hypothesis that females experience more interrole conflict than males may also be due to changing attitudes toward sanctioned male and female roles. Roles for males and females may be becoming more equal as far as domestic and out of home work responsibilities are concerned. If this is indeed true, this would lead to the perception of a lower amount of interrole conflict for males and females alike.

The findings of this study in relation to gender role orientation support previous studies (Bem, 1974) which showed that overall, men score higher on masculine factors related to gender role orientation and females rate higher on feminine factors related to gender role orientation. The lack of support for the hypothesis that males in later life stages rate higher on feminine factors related to gender role orientation than males in earlier life stages may be due to the limited age range of the males subjects in the sample studied or it may be due to a cohort effect. In order to obtain supportive results, it may be necessary to test a sample of males that extends much higher into the older age ranges. These same limitations may also account for this study's inability to support the hypothesis that females experience the most interrole conflict between the peak child-rearing life stages, while males experience the most interrole conflict in later life stages.

Another interesting finding is that participants rated the female character in the gender-incongruent vignette higher than

the male character in the gender-congruent vignette on the gender role orientation factors of instrumentality and self-sufficiency. The participants may have given the female character extra high ratings on instrumentality and self-sufficiency simply because these characteristics were perceived as fitting for a female involved in a male stereotyped situation. In other words, the female was perceived as having more masculine gender role characteristics, because she was taking on the role of a man in her situation.

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses yielded some interesting patterns. For all three interrole conflict subscales that contained the professional role and for the measure of total role conflict, increasing instrumentality was associated with increased interrole conflict. Persons with more instrumental characteristics are typically very career and achievement oriented; therefore, they would put a great deal of energy into their professional role, creating high interrole conflict between this role and other roles. This is further supported in that an increase in both total interrole conflict and professional vs. parent interrole conflict was associated with both a decrease in interpersonal sensitivity along with increased instrumentality.

Some interesting findings related to life stage as a predictor of interrole conflict were also revealed in this study. For two of the interrole conflict subscales that contained the parent role, spouse vs. parent and parent vs. self, increasing

life stage was associated with increased interrole conflict. This finding may be attributed to an increase in the importance of interpersonal issues as one's life stage increases. People in later life stages tend not to focus as much on their professional role as do people in lower life stages. In support of this argument, for two interrole conflict subscales containing the professional role, professional vs. self and professional vs. spouse, decreasing life stage was associated with an increase in interrole conflict. The earlier life stages are seen as the achievement stage (Schaie, 1977), and thus, in these life stages one places a strong emphasis on one's work role, thus creating conflict between the professional role and other roles.

There are limitations to this study which suggest a need for future research in the area of interrole conflict. This was a cross sectional study, but in order to determine whether the results indicate an effect of life stage or a cohort effect, a longitudinal study would have to be done. There is also a need for future research on interrole conflict using better measures of gender role orientation, as stated before, problems have been found with the BSRI which was used in this study. The self report nature of the study is also a limitation in that it yields a subjective measure of interrole conflict; thus, future research utilizing more objective measures of interrole conflict is needed. This study also used a sample consisting of mainly caucasian individuals; therefore, there is a need for interrole conflict research done on minority individuals.

## References

- Ashmore, R. D. (1990). Sex, gender, and the individual. In L.A. Pervin (Ed.), Handbook of personality: Theory and research (pp. 486-526). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Ashmore, R.D., & Del Boca, F.K. (Eds.). (1986). Social psychology of male-female relations: A critical analysis of central concepts. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Bardwick, J. (1971). Psychology of women: A study of biocultural conflicts. New York: Harper & Row.
- Baruch, G.K., & Barnett, R. (1986). Role quality, multiple role involvement, and psychological well-being in midlife women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 578-585.
- Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.
- Bem, S.L. (1981b). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. Psychological Review, 88, 354-361.
- Bem, S.L. (1983). Gender schema theory and its implications for child development: Raising gender-aschematic children in a gender-schematic society. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8, 598-616.
- Bernard, J. (1975). Women, wives, and mothers. Chicago: Aldine.
- Beutell, N.J., & Greenhaus, J.S. (1983). Integration of home and nonhome roles: Women's conflict and coping behavior. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 43-48.

- Blanchard-Fields, F., Suhrer-Roussel, L., & Hertzog, C. (1992). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: Old questions, new answers. In Press.
- Cain, L.D. Jr. (1964). Life course and social structure. In R. Francis (Ed.) Handbook of modern sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally, 272-309.
- Epstein, C.F. (1970). Woman's place: Options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley; University of California Press.
- Erikson, E.H. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychology theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Goode, W.J. (1960). A theory of strain. American Sociological Review, 25, 483-496.
- Greenglass, E.R., Pantony, K.L., & Burke, R.J. (1988). A gender-role perspective on role conflict, work stress and social support. Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 3, 317-328.
- Gross, N., Mason, W.S., & McEachern, A.W. (1958). Explorations in role analysis. New York: Wiley.
- Gutmann, D.L. (1975). Parenthood: Key to the comparative psychology of life? In N. Daton & L. Ginsberg (Eds.), Life-span developmental psychology: Normative life crises (pp. 98-119). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.



- Hall, D.T. (1972). A model of coping with role conflict: The role behavior of college-educated women. Administrative Science Quarterly, 17, 471-489.
- Holahan, C.K., & Gilbert, L.A. (1979a). Interrole conflict for working women: Career versus jobs. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 86-90.
- Holahan, C.K., & Gilbert, L.A. (1979b). Conflict between major life roles: Women and men in dual career couples. Human Relations, 32, 451-467.
- Kahn, R.L., Wolfe, D.M., Quinn, R.P., Snoek, J.D., & Rosenthal, R.A. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: Wiley.
- Levinson, D.J. (1978). The seasons of a man's life. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Livson, F.B. (1976). Patterns of personality development in middle-aged women: A longitudinal study. International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 7, 107-115.
- Lopata, H.A. (1966). The life cycle of the social role of the housewife. Sociology and Social Research, 51, 5-22.
- Marsh, H.W., & Myers, M. (1986). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny: A methodological and theoretical critique. Sex Roles, 14, 397-430.
- Morgan, D.D. (1962). Perception of role conflict and self concept among career and non-career college educated women. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.

- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R.N. (1969). The dual career family. Human Relations, 22, 3-30.
- Secord, P.F., & Backman, C.W. (1974). Social psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Schaie, K.W., & Baltes, P.B. (1977). Intellectual development in adulthood. In J.E. Birren & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), Handbook of the Psychology of Aging (3rd ed.). (pp. 291-309). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Spence, J.T. (1984a). Gender Identity and its implications for the concepts of masculinity and femininity. In T.B. Sondregger (Ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation 1984: Psychology and gender. (Vol. 32, pp. 59-95). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Wiersma, U.J., & Van Den Berg, P. (1991). Work-home role conflict, family climate, and domestic responsibilities among men and women in dual-earner families. Journal of Applied Psychology, 21, 1207-1217.
- Yogev, S. (1986). Relationships between stress and marital satisfaction among dual-earner couples. Women and Therapy, 5, 313-330.

Table 1.

Sample Distribution

	Gender-congruent Vignette		Gender-incongruent Vignette	
	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
<u>Life Stages</u>				
1	12	13	13	13
2	13	15	14	14
3	10	15	10	14
4	14	16	12	10
5	10	09	09	10

N=246

Table 2.

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant Interrole Conflict Subscales Across Life Stage

<u>Life Stages</u>	<u>Interrole Conflict Subscales</u>				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
<hr/>					
<u>Interrole Conflict Subscales</u>					
<u>1 PROVPAR</u>	4.00(2.27)	9.25(3.91)	8.57(4.24)	6.76(4.24)	4.57(3.08)
<u>2 SPOVPAR</u>	.67(1.78)	6.47(2.81)	5.98(2.74)	5.21(3.22)	3.57(1.99)
<u>3 PARVSLF</u>	2.39(1.82)	6.33(2.41)	7.00(3.13)	5.92(3.16)	4.84(2.31)
<u>4 PROVSP0</u>	7.65(2.33)	7.74(3.54)	6.83(4.16)	5.98(3.48)	6.10(3.26)
<u>5 PROVSLF</u>	10.13(3.05)	9.01(4.03)	8.10(4.24)	7.74(4.69)	7.63(4.56)

Note. PROVPAR= Professional vs. Parent; SPOVPAR= Spouse vs. Parent; PARVSLF= Parent vs. Self; PROVSP0= Professional vs. Spouse; PROVSLF= Professional vs. Self

Table 3.

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant Gender Role  
Orientation Factors Across Gender

<u>Gender Role Orientation Factors</u>		
<u>Gender</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
<hr/>		
<u>Gender Role Orientation Factors</u>		
<u>INSTR</u>	5.43 (.798)	4.87 (.945)
<u>INTRPER</u>	5.45 (.792)	5.79 (.688)
<u>SLFSF</u>	5.71 (.701)	5.33 (.963)

Note. INSTR= Instrumentality; INTPER= Interpersonal Sensitivity;  
SLFS= Self-sufficiency

Table 4.

Means and Standard Deviations for Significant Gender Role  
Orientation Factors of Vignette Character Across Vignette

<u>Gender Role Orientation Factors</u>		
<u>Vignette</u>	<u>Vignette 1</u> (gender congruent)	<u>Vignette 2</u> (gender incongruent)
<hr/>		
<u>Gender Role Orientation Factors</u>		
<u>INSTR</u>	5.49 (.996)	5.90 (.667)
<u>INTRPER</u>	3.55 (.952)	3.91 (.830)
<u>SLFSF</u>	5.48 (.983)	5.76 (.666)

Note. INSTR= Instrumentality; INTPER= Interpersonal Sensitivity;  
SLFS= Self-sufficiency

Table 5.

Step Predictor Entered	Predictor	R <sup>2</sup>	F <sub>change</sub>	B
Total Role Conflict				
1	Life Stage			-.046
	Gender	.031	1.56	-.021
2	Interpersonal			-.136
	Self-sufficiency			-.169
	Instrumentality	.069**	4.51**	.312***
Professional vs. Parent				
1	Life Stage			-.027
	Gender	.011	1.36	-.007
2	Interpersonal			-.146*
	Self-sufficiency			-.161
	Instrumentality	.073**	5.16**	.324***
Spouse vs. Parent				
1	Life Stage			.217***
	Gender	.047**	5.91**	.065
2	Interpersonal			-.068
	Self-sufficiency			-.168
	Instrumentality	.067**	1.68	.162
Parent vs. Self				
1	Life Stage			.225***
	Gender	.051**	6.37**	.073
2	Interpersonal			-.123
	Self-sufficiency			-.130
	Instrumentality	.074**	1.98	.157

Note. Interpersonal= Interpersonal Sensitivity.

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001.

(table continued)

Table 5.

Step Predictor Entered	Predictor	R <sup>2</sup>	F <sub>change</sub>	B
Professional vs. Self				
1	Life Stage			-.210***
	Gender	.102***	13.40***	-.155*
2	Interpersonal			-.087
	Self-sufficiency			-.052
	Instrumentality	.146**	4.02**	.257**
Professional vs. Spouse				
1	Life Stage			-.203**
	Gender	.043**	5.30**	.017
2	Interpersonal			-.099
	Self-sufficiency			-.092
	Instrumentality	.082**	3.25*	.258**
Spouse vs. Self				
1	Life Stage			-.090
	Gender	.008	.95	.042
2	Interpersonal			-.110
	Self-sufficiency			-.059
	Instrumentality	.024	1.27	.130

Note. Interpersonal= Interpersonal Sensitivity.

\*p ≤ .05. \*\*p ≤ .01. \*\*\*p ≤ .001.



## Appendix 1.

### Vignette 1 (gender congruent):

Doug Boudreaux, age 45, who works at an industrial plant, was offered the position of manager in his department. He was forewarned that it would require long hours of work, and he knew it might affect his marriage, but he wanted the pay raise. He decided to work the additional hours in order to succeed in his new position and make more money to support his family. He and his wife grew apart, and they eventually divorced.

### Vignette 2 (gender incongruent):

Donna Boudreaux, age 45, who works at an industrial plant, was offered the position of manager in her department. She was forewarned that it would require long hours of work, and she knew it might affect her marriage, but she wanted the pay raise. She decided to work the additional hours in order to succeed in her new position and make more money to support her family. She and her husband grew apart, and they eventually divorced.