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1 What are “dual-career” couples?

The term “dual-career” was first coined in 1969 by a European academic couple (Rapoport & Rapoport 1969; Rapoport & Rapoport 1971). Since then this term has become quite established, other expressions are “coupled careers” (Bernasco 1994), “conjoint career couple” (Adler et al. 1989) or “coordinated career” couple (Butler & Paisley 1980). These last two terms, however, refer to couples where both partners pursue careers in the same field or whose work activities overlap (Butler & Paisley 1980), and who are, therefore, professional colleagues in addition to being partners (Adler et al. 1989). According to the Rapoorts, dual-career couples differ from dual-earner families/couples. In dual-career couples, both partners pursue an occupational career occupying or seeking jobs which are characterized by high professional standards, a high degree of commitment and a developmental sequence. On the contrary, in the dual-earner couples only one (or neither) partner has a career while the other holds an employment without career prospects and/or aspirations. Other expressions used for this arrangement are two-paycheck families, dual-worker families or two-person career (see for example Eby 1997; Sekaran 1986; Taylor & Lounsbury 1988). The rationale for such a distinction between dual-career and dual-earner couples is that a number of problems are particularly relevant to the situation when both partners have and want to pursue careers, thus of dual-career couples. These problems can be classified into two areas: geographical mobility and family responsibilities – which, according to the results presented in the remainder of the report, not only but to a higher degree affect careers of women more than careers of men in dual-career couples.

This might be indicated by the fact that also for women holding academic degrees it is true that: "although education does raise women’s pay, it does so less for women than for men" (Roos & Gatta 1999: 101). The general reason behind this very well-established fact is often attributed to gender differences in career paths. Different attitudes toward work and the struggle to balance work and family responsibilities, but also gender segregation of occupations and discrimination might "restrict women from attaining the highest positions, compared to men with similar backgrounds and education" (Stroh & Reilly 1999: 310). Specifically for the ‘academic world’, there is strong evidence that married faculty women receive less prestigious positions and institutional rewards (Bird & Bird 1987; Bryant et al. 1988; Ezrati 1983; Monk-Turner & Turner 1987).

Finally, an introductory remark on the socio-demographic composition of academic couples. Since women tend to enter homogeneous (Ferber & Huber 1979) or hypergamy (Marwell et al. 1979) marriages/partnerships (e.g. marry men of higher or at least not lower status), the majority of academic women have husbands or partners who are also pursuing careers. Since many of them meet during graduate school, the probability of being in the same field
increases (Monk-Turner & Turner 1987). In addition, usually women have older partners who are, therefore, ahead on the career ladder (Bryson & Bryson 1980; Gappa 1980; Matthews & Matthews 1980; McNeil & Sher 2001).

2 General problems

Before exploring the two main problem areas of dual-career couples more deeply, it is first useful to present some stylized facts on the general problems connected to them. The review of the literature reveals different causes for the disadvantageous situation of women in academic dual-career marriages/partnerships: women’s preference for less demanding positions during childrearing years, covert anti-nepotism rules, different standards in hiring women faculty (Bryson & Bryson 1980; Maitland 1990; Monk-Turner & Turner 1987) and ‘inbreeding’ (Dagg 1993; Ezrati 1983). All these reasons, but especially anti-nepotism rules and in-breeding, limit the professional prospects of married academic women because, as they are often members of a dual-career couple, they are less free to seek a professional job outside their locale (Dagg 1993; Marwell et al. 1979). Empirical results suggest that geographical limitations are an important factor for the choice of postdoctoral appointments for the majority of academic married women (Matthews & Matthews 1980; Monk-Turner & Turner 1987). Women are often concerned about “meshing” their careers with those of their (mostly older and therefore advanced) partners and often choose professions and positions which maximize this aspect instead of deciding on the basis of interest, satisfaction, long-term scholarly contributions (Bird & Bird 1987).

In addition, the literature suggests that women and men give a different weight to dual-career issues when they have to decide whether to relocate/move to a different place for professional reasons. Married faculty women, also when reporting to have supportive husbands, are less willing to relocate for their own careers unless their husbands are able to find satisfactory jobs before moving. Differently, the grand majority of the (supportive) husbands are willing to move even if their wives have no jobs in the new location (Ezrati 1983). Studies on psychologist couples (Heckman et al. 1977) and on Ph.D. graduates in general (Ferber & Huber 1979) come to similar conclusions: highly educated women are more willing than their partners to put their careers in secondary positions for family needs and for their husbands’ careers. Universities are aware of this pattern and, thus, often view married faculty women as ‘captive’ employees: either they accept employment under whatever conditions in the ‘local’ university or other institutions, or they must face unemployment. In such a situation, mar-

1 E.g. the opposition of one university of hiring its own Ph.D.’s.
ried women have only a limited bargaining power because of their limited mobility. As a consequence they are often expected to work part-time, for less salary, for less or without benefits and promotion prospects (Bird & Bird 1987; Dagg 1993; Ezrati 1983; Heckman et al. 1977; Smart & Smart 1990). Moreover, departments that are not willing to offer tenure-track positions to these women sometimes treat them as "extensions of their husbands" and appoint them only for temporary teaching assignments and not for research (Adler et al. 1989; Bird & Bird 1987).

In this literature there is a general consensus that geographical mobility is a greater obstacle for women than men in pursuing an academic career. On the contrary, Teevan, Pepper and Pellizzari (1992) argue that there are only few gender differences in geographical mobility. According to their research², in which they asked for the rank order of reasons in deciding on job offers, both men and women most frequently mention the "reputation of the department or university" as the reason for accepting a position, followed by the "compatibility of the job with family needs" (including also dual-career issues).³ Similarly, "dissatisfaction with job offer" and "incompatibility of the position with family needs" are the reasons most frequently mentioned by both men and women for refusing or resigning from a position. Though, their results show that, in general, there are only few gender differences in decision rules on job offers, their analyses have as well revealed that "accommodating dual-career family" is more important for females than males (Teevan et al. 1992).

Finally, the acceptance of – even only temporary – part-time appointments (by married women) are neither a good solution for geographical mobility nor for the termination of family needs. Most employers view part-time and professional careers "as mutually exclusive" and there is a lack of support for and promotion of part-time options (Swiss & Walker 1993). Part-time jobs do not count for tenure decision and limit the probability of transitions back to full-time tenure-track positions. Analyses by Smart and Smart (1990) have shown that young academic couples have become aware of these negative consequences of working part-time and, thus, more consequently than older generations try to avoid part-time and temporary contracts. Yet, today as well as in the past it is not easy to find two satisfactory jobs. In fact it has been shown that even if female graduates are aware of the detrimental consequences of part-time employment the majority had accepted it – at least for a period of time – trying to balance work and family responsibilities (Swiss & Walker 1993).

² They focus on factors influencing accepting or rejecting job offers at one Canadian university.
³ At third position: job offer and personal opportunities, whereby job offer (e.g. type and length of contract, salary) was more important for men and personal opportunities (e.g. personal growth/challenge) for women.
What kinds of "solutions" academic couples prefer, how they arrange dual-careers, and what the problems of these arrangements are, are described in the following sections.

3 Theoretical explanations of career mobility in academic couples

In the literature, there are three theories commonly used to explain mobility decisions in academic couples: neoclassical market model of family migration, social exchange theory, and gender-role ideology.

In short, the neoclassical explanation (Becker 1981; Mincer 1978) assumes that decisions are driven by the aim to maximize family gains. Thus, each partner places family well-being ahead of his/her personal well-being and private interests. According to this model, either partner could be the mover: if the gains in earning of one partner’s job offer exceed the absolute value of the loss in earning of the other partner, the family will move to the new location. Since wives usually earn less and are employed in lower positions than their partners – because either they are younger, still in a lower career stage or in lower-paid professions –, the husband’s gains when moving to a (new) job generally exceed the wife’s losses and, in addition, wife’s gains related to (new) job offers and requiring moving seldom exceed the husband’s losses. As a consequence women will frequently relocate according to their husbands’ work exigencies.

The social exchange theory (Emerson 1976) comes to similar conclusions, but while the former is based on utility maximization, this theory invokes "the notion of power as the mechanism through which decisions are made" (Hood 1983). Within the couple, the partner with more resources (mostly the man) is able to "impose outcomes that further his or her own goals, often to the detriment of the partner's goals" (Hood 1983).

These two theoretical approaches help explain what the causes are for "one-career" arrangements even of academically educated partners and why one might find only few "dual-career" couples compared to dual-earner couples or the patterns of single careers of academic women.

However, based on these two theories the explanation of career patterns of academic couples is incomplete because both of them ignore the mediating role of gender-role ideology in the decision-making of couples. Although there is ample empirical evidence consistent with

---

4 In regard to gender-role ideology it is quite interesting to compare different types of couples. Blumstein and Schwartz (1983) compared attitudes among married, cohabiting heterosexual couples and homosexual couples. Their study shows that married couples believe to a lesser extent than cohabiting partners that both partners should work. Differently the great majority of same-sex couples believe that both partners should work. Under some circumstances same-sex couples are ready to
predictions of the two theories mentioned above, there is also empirical evidence which sugg-
est that family decisions not always follow this ‘gender-neutral’ pattern. Previous research
has found the existence of two arrangements: either couples try to give equal weight to each
partner’s professional career and, consequently, try to maximize the career development of
both; or they give major consideration to one career (usually the male one) (Berger et al.
1978; Matthews & Matthews 1980). The fact that whether or not husbands and wives occupy
different household roles and believe in different gender roles with respect to family and ca-
reer, affects “both the process as well as outcome of couples decision making” (Bielby &
Bielby 1992: 1245). There is empirical evidence that in cases where it would be “rational” to
move (or stay) because of the wife’s gains, couples do not move but, nonetheless, follow the
career line of the husband (Bielby & Bielby 1992). And vice versa, even if more rarely in case
of the husband’s gains, they do not move but stay. If couples have traditional gender role
beliefs, e.g. the man is seen as the main breadwinner in the family, husbands will not accept
interference of their wives’ careers in their own job advancement, and wives will be more
prone to sacrifice their own careers. Male careers are considered to be predominant and,
therefore, the family and spouse have to adapt to ‘his’ work exigencies. In these families
women support their husbands’ careers by focusing on the family and eventually providing a
supplementary, secondary and even dispensable source of income. As a consequence, the
family’s geographical location is established according to the demands of the male career. If
relocation is required, the wife follows her spouse and, in case she is employed, she quits
her job. Eventually she might (try to) find new employment in the new location. In contrast, if
couples have non-traditional or egalitarian gender-role beliefs, e.g. they see each other as
co-providers and partners having equal rights, they will give an equal weight to ‘her’ career in
their mobility decisions. Thus, dual-career couples have to find a location where both can
have a satisfying employment or educational training (for those still in higher education, e.g.,
in doctoral or post-doctoral programs). Yet, once the couple has (luckily) managed to get two
good positions in the same location, each time one partner is offered a better position or op-
portunity elsewhere, the problem arises anew. Given it is still an egalitarian partnership, the
decision will be less driven by a calculation earning gains and losses or asymmetric resource
distribution between the two, but by the job opportunities for the other partner under the new
situation.

The challenges of realizing “dual-careers” might provoke tension or even major family crises.
One of these challenges or one problem is that there are no well-established decisions’
accept a period of non-employment: for example for further education or ‘taking turns’. For gay men
the importance of labor force participation is associated to male identity: “each is expected to work,
because this is part to what it means to be a man”. For lesbians, the importance of work is closely
‘rules’ in society. Both the dual-career family structure as well as the egalitarian ethos are relatively new, there are no (or only few) “socially accepted precedents and norms related to them” (Kilpatrick 1982: 364). Moreover, how couples deal with such challenges depends on three aspects: values, previous experiences and marriage contract (Kilpatrick 1982). Often dual-career couples give great value to equity of opportunities and constraints, yet during a crisis one (or both) partner(s) might tend to return to traditional values. Furthermore, previous experiences and unresolved conflicts might come up. For example, on a previous occasion the wife has agreed to put ‘his’ career first, but she might have done so assuming that the next time would be ‘her’ turn. Finally, every marriage or partnership entails hidden and open expectations. A husband might in ‘words’ support an egalitarian style, but might assume from his earlier socialization that the wife will follow him, while her expectations might be different (Kilpatrick 1982).

Of course relocation problems are very common for a number of occupations and also for couples with "normal occupations" – not requiring an academic degree. However, they are especially salient for academic careers which particularly require moves, especially in the early stages of one’s career in order to achieve upward mobility (Deitch & Sanderson 1987). Moreover, while academic couples face many of the same problems as dual-career couples in other occupations, additionally they are confronted with a highly competitive job market\(^5\) and a geographical dispersion of job opportunities (Bird & Bird 1987; Marwell et al. 1979; Monk-Turner & Turner 1987). In sum, which kind of career arrangements academic couples prefer largely depends on the gender-role beliefs of the two partners. If they both stay in the traditional model and are not explicitly bound to gender equity in their partnership, resource differences might lead to power differences in the partnership – increasing the probability of living a dual-earner or one-career arrangement. Only if the partnership is based on gender-equity beliefs, dual-career patterns might emerge given externally favorable or supportive circumstances. The following description of career strategies in academic couples will reveal these different baseline models of gender-role arrangements in the household and its consequences for male and female academic careers. The connection between the different coping strategies and the three theoretical explanations is so obvious that an explicit reference to them is not necessary.

---

\(^5\) Some authors point out the highly competitive academic job market of the 1980s (Monk-Turner & Turner 1987).
4  **Coping strategies in terms of geographical mobility**

Studies on academic couples mention four different strategies to cope with geographical mobility, in particular, and job seeking problems, in general. These different strategies reflect different arrangements within the couple:

(a)  ‘Tied mover’: one goes, the other follows
(b)  ‘Tied stayer’: both stay and one turns down a better opportunity
(c)  ‘Joint’ seekers: both move only if both are offered or find something appropriate
(d)  ‘Commuter’ partnership: one goes, the other stays

When partners give equal weight to each career they will be more likely to be joint seekers or commuters. If partners give priority to one career, one spouse will be likely a ‘tied’ mover or stayer. Such strategies might not be an ‘either-or’ alternative, couples might use different strategies at different stages of their career and family cycle.

"Tied mover" and "tied stayer"

One common strategy of academic couples is to follow the partner who first has an exceptionally good career opportunity and who will then have the primary career during a significant proportion of the life course (Becker & Moen 1999). Typically, women fall in the ‘tied’ categories, also when they are highly committed to their careers. The ‘tied’ pattern is often a result of age differences between the partners and of the gender-role predominance within the partnership.

*Early career stage*

Since men are usually older, they will graduate first and, thus, be the ones who get a job offer first\(^6\) (Deitch & Sanderson 1987). Women who are still in education either stay until they finish graduation or follow their partner and pursue their degrees in the new location. Once these women have achieved their degrees and are themselves in the stage in which they should move in order to enhance their careers, they are ‘trapped’ because they are not geographically mobile as their male partners had been. In favor of "residential re-union" they have limited opportunities for searching for ‘regular’ and similarly good professional positions (Dagg 1993; Deitch & Sanderson 1987). Moreover, ‘tied’ moves or stays are encouraged through childbearing and/or care responsibilities for pre-school children. As a consequence,

\(^6\) Typical moves are for his post-doc or first appointment (Deitch & Sanderson 1987).
these women might reduce their career commitment for family reasons. Older research, for example, reports a marked tendency for women with Ph.D. degrees to spend a prolonged period of time in postdoctoral grants. This strategy enables women to combine work and family and to develop their own career within the context of their husbands’ career commitments (Marwell et al. 1979). Some of them start their careers later when their partners are well-established and their children older (Deitch & Sanderson 1987). In cases where this strategy has been successful, e.g. wives have managed to start their careers later, most of those women do not (retrospectively) report these ‘tied’ moves as having been detrimental to their careers (Deitch & Sanderson 1987).

But also graduated, childless women, yet with older partners who are already moving to their ‘senior’ position, might follow this ‘tied’ pattern and thereby reduce their opportunities to find an adequate ‘junior’ position appropriate for further advancement (Adler et al. 1989; McNeil & Sher 2001).

Later career stages

Men in their 40s and 50s, who have reached a good position which allows them flexibility (tenured professors for example), might themselves ‘scale-back’ enabling their wives to concentrate on their careers after they have invested more in home and children in earlier phases (Becker & Moen 1999). It appears then that collaborative strategies are possible also within the traditional gender-role pattern. But even in this case, once their wives/partners have achieved their degrees and/or are themselves in the stage/situation in which they should move in order to enhance their careers, they might be ‘trapped’ because they are not geographically mobile. Regardless of children (thus even for childless women), the main problem is that high-level positions are generally scarcer than entry-level ones and it is, therefore, difficult to coordinate job search. If the ‘junior’ partner (typically women) move in order to take up an advantageous job offer, it might be difficult for the ‘senior’ partner (mostly the man) to find adequate employment. If they reject the offer, women as “tied stayers” are the consequence.

A successful ‘version’ of this junior-senior relationship is found when older ‘senior’ men re-marry, or marry much younger women. In this case, the ‘senior’ partner is already professionally well-established and has, possibly, children from a first marriage. Such couples might, therefore, feel less the exigency of having their own children, and the ‘senior’ partner might be more willing to compromise allowing his younger partner to pursue an own career. In addition, these couples will feel less competition (Gappa 1980).

Another situation where men might be the “tied mover” or “tied stayer” is when the woman is the ‘senior’ partner. In these families there is more equity in mobility decisions (Bird & Bird
1987) or, in other words, these women have more bargaining power (Hawkes et al. 1980). Yet, empirical research has also shown that women who are professionally more successful than their partners have a higher risk of marital disruption. In order to avoid family (husband) tensions, some of these successful women "over-benefit" their husbands at home, downgrade their own skills and accomplishments, find legitimate excuse to leave the labor market (illness, pregnancy) (Bird & Bird 1987) or experience occupational downward mobility (Sekaran 1986). It appears that husbands adapt best when they are successful in their professional field, even if they earn less than their wives (Barnett & Rivers 1998).

Many of these partnerships – which finally followed the "tied mover" or "tied stayer" model – often start on an egalitarian basis. As a result of childbearing and mobility decisions both of which have a negative impact on women’s careers, they end up to reflect more traditional patterns, at least for some central years in the life course (Berger et al. 1977; Gilbert 1985; Hawkes et al. 1980; Hensel 1991). Often such decisions are not a result of conscious planning, they just happen "as a series of small steps, each taken without considering their cumulative effects" (Bryson & Bryson 1980: 257). Frequently they occur in order to accommodate the birth of a child (Adler et al. 1989; Becker & Moen 1999; Berger et al. 1977), as a 'forced' decision because a job offer was made only to one partner, usually the man (Berger et al. 1977), or as "rational decisions" because men hold higher-paying positions (Berger et al. 1978).

In general, this strategy of academic couples to follow the ‘senior’ career prospects has some self-reinforcing effects on reproducing gender differences in academic careers: women have usually secondary careers for different reasons. They start after their partners, earn less, find only (or choose) part-time jobs. Thus, in the majority of cases “the woman is the junior partner in terms of status, perceptions, rewards” (Gappa 1980: 3). Once women have scaled back for some years (either by dissociating from an own career or working part-time or in lower positions) and male careers have become predominant, it is quite difficult to break this process. First of all, returning to a career might not be that simple (Ferber & Huber 1979; Smart & Smart 1990). Secondly, in order to succeed women have to start at lower positions which are generally unsure and less paid. As a consequence, male careers remain predominant for household finances and decision making (for example family location decisions) (Becker & Moen 1999; Berger et al. 1978).

A possible alternative within this "tied" pattern is "taking turns" (Moore 1980; Nock 1998; Smart & Smart 1990), that is, if possible, alternating which career takes precedence, thus alternating who is the "tied" partner (Berger et al. 1977). This might be the case especially when the woman is the ‘senior’ partner, since when wives have a high income and job status and their husbands present an egalitarian role preference, there is more equity in mobility decisions (Bird & Bird 1987). This strategy can be quite successful as there is some evi-
idence that ‘following’ the male spouse can have positive effects on the wife’s career if she gets co-employed at the same university⁷ and the two partners then agree to stay on campus – instead of later moving caused by the husband’s next career step – and to cooperatively use the educational resources available there for upward mobility of both (Bryant et al. 1988). Another more positive strategy for both partners within the patterns of tied mover/stayer is to view/define each other as a "unit", where the benefits gained by one are regarded to be profits for the other (Bird & Bird 1987). A last arrangement, within this ‘tied’ pattern, is when the partner who has the opportunity to move narrows his/her choices in order to allow the other partner to keep an own career. Yet, frequently the ‘trailing’ spouse has to face discrimination: he – but more often she – is not considered a "serious academic" (Barnett & Rivers 1998: 170).

"Joint" job seeking

Major difficulties of joint job seeking are labor market constraints: for example, finding two satisfactory job openings in the same location at the same time (Matthews & Matthews 1980), having to take the decision in a particular point of time, eventually "need to juggle two sets of offers" (Berger et al. 1977: 35). Two aspects of the academic job market are especially troublesome: geographic dispersion of appropriate academic jobs and the lengthy and sometime segmented nature of job screening. Often one partner must declare his/her willingness to take an appointment before the other knows which job opportunities he/she will have (Monk-Turner & Turner 1987). Moreover, if partners are at the same stage and have similar backgrounds and training they might compete for the same job (Matthews & Matthews 1980).

More and more academic couples make compromises in order to be together and more institutions try to accommodate them. Yet, ‘couple’ considerations present some difficulties for both the institutions as well as the individuals. Employers might be in a difficult situation because often, in order to accommodate both partners, they have to deal with two different departments. One department might feel forced to employ the ‘trailing’ partner and does not collaborate (Barnett & Rivers 1998; Wilson 1996). From the couple point of view, being a ‘trailing’ partner can be experienced as very frustrating because one might feel an "add-on" and would have preferred to be hired independently (Wilson 1996). Moreover, there is some evidence that when couples apply for two distinctive job openings at the same institution, institutions offer less money than for two comparably trained but unrelated professionals (Matthews & Matthews 1980).

---

⁷ Yet the research cited did not focus exclusively on academic positions and/or tracks.
If employers do not have enough money to pay for a new (second) position, they might allow ‘job-sharing’. Couples might use this strategy as an edge in a tight labor market, especially when they work in the same field. Shared positions represent an advantage for institutions because they get two academics for the price of one (Wilson 1996), decrease the personnel turnover, increase the availability of more jobs and increase the productivity (Moore 1980). Yet, often employers are worried about the consequences that an eventual divorce might have (Arkin & Dobrofsky 1978). For couples this strategy increases the time available for family, research and/or other interests (Arkin & Dobrofsky 1978; Moore 1980; Wilson 1996). Yet, sharing a position might have some disadvantages: actual working hours (which often exceed those contracted for), loss of personal recognition for the work accomplished, jealousy of colleagues about the higher amount of free time, risk of being seen as less professional than full-time workers (Arkin & Dobrofsky 1978; Barnett & Rivers 1998; Moore 1980; Swiss & Walker 1993). Another problem for couples who work (collaborate) together – regardless of the type of position – is the division of merit: often males are given the most merit for conjoint work (Sekaran 1986; Smart & Smart 1990).

Some scholars point out the detrimental effects of competition between partners. Competition occurs more frequently when partners are in the same stage and work in the same field, because this allows direct comparison (Sekaran 1986), especially if they are employed by the same institution. In the academic world this might be especially true when both are considered at the same time for tenure (Bird & Bird 1987).

Finally, it must be noted that once couples succeed in their ‘conjoint’ efforts (either in two separate positions or in a shared one), the problems might not be over (Adler et al. 1989; Bird & Bird 1987; Wilson 1996). They will start anew if one gets offered a better opportunity elsewhere, or if one gets tenure and the other not. They then have to decide if the non-tenured partner should leave and search for a better opportunity elsewhere and/or if the tenured partner should give up his/her position in order to follow the other.

Joint job seeking is closely connected to different coordination patterns between partners’ careers. These coordination patterns relate to the opportunities partners have in working with each other, but also with their wish to do so. According to Butler and Paisley (1980), couples might desire and strive for alter ego coordination (e.g. side by side collaboration on the same tasks), institutional coordination (e.g. work in same the institution, but not on the same tasks), specialty coordination (e.g. work on the same tasks or fields, but not at the same institutions), complementary roles coordination (whereby, it is of secondary importance whether they work in the same field or institution, what is important is the "contribution of each career to the success of the partner's career or to the success of a joint venture") (Butler & Paisley 1980: 209). These different forms of coordination might change over time, and some arrangements might be used as a launching point for the achievement of closer forms of coordination. Each
of these different forms presents a variety of advantages and disadvantages. It appears, however, that couples who give greater value to institutional aspects of coordination (the first two categories) are more vulnerable to mobility requirements and have greater difficulty in finding two jobs in the same location (Butler & Paisley 1980; Sekaran 1986). In their study on psychologists’ dual-career couples, these authors come to the conclusion that the requirements of positions and institutions draw couples apart and that during the early stages partners’ careers are more coordinated than later on (Butler & Paisley 1980).

Finally, older as well as more recent research report a geographically, instead of professionally or institutionally, favorable “joint job seeking” strategy adopted by highly educated married women, namely: to live in large metropolitan communities which provide a large labor market (Costa & Kahn 2000; Marwell et al. 1979). The joint co-location problem accounts for a great proportion of this trend. Costa and Kahn’s study on college-educated couples provides some evidence that the tendency to live in large metropolitan areas rose sharply between 1940 and 1990, especially for those couples in which wives work full-time and in non-traditional occupations. As a consequence, small communities – and particularly universities – lose valuable human resources (Costa & Kahn 2000). According to a study on Ph.D. women’s careers in Academia (Marwell et al. 1979), women are less prone to move because they are members of a dual-career family and they limit their employment searches in locations with a large labor market. In these areas the chances of finding two satisfactory employments are greater and job shifts within a location do not require a complementary spouse’s job change. Yet, this strategy might have also some career advancement costs. The same authors have found that “the common pattern for men was to move up by moving around” (Marwell et al. 1979: 1229). Thus, academic women and men geographically limiting their job searches might also reduce their career chances.

"Commuter" marriage/partnership

Another alternative to ‘tied’ decisions is to commute. Yet for partners with children or low (and/or only one) income this might not be a solution (Gappa 1980; Hileman 1990) and if, it is very stressful and costly (Austin & Pilat 1990). A commuter lifestyle is quite expensive: two rents, travel expenses, telephone, emotional costs (separation from partner and eventually children, loneliness, fear of infidelity and divorce) (Farris 1978; Hileman 1990). Some scholars characterize commuter partnerships as being “female determined” (Hileman 1990). Women in commuter marriages value their career as much as their personal relationship. Although their partners share these values, there is some evidence that commuting presents more advantages for women (Hileman 1990) and couples recognize that living apart is a response to “her” needs (Gross 1980). Moreover, it appears that women are happier than men with this lifestyle (Hendershott 1995).
According to previous research, commuter couples report many positive aspects: chance for personal and professional growth (Kilpatrick 1982), freedom for both partners to pursue their careers, possibility to work for long uninterrupted hours (Farris 1978; Gross 1980), chance of establishing solid professional reputations which might facilitate/increase the chance of finding two jobs in the same locality in the future (Bird & Bird 1987; Moore 1980). Furthermore, research shows that in commuter marriages/partnerships women increase their work-related productivity and have less household duties (Hileman 1990). Yet, of course, in order to nonetheless succeed in having a (good) partnership, it is important to have a supportive partner, strong commitment to marriage/partnership, basic trust, and the ability to communicate openly (Farris 1978).

Yet, there are also disadvantages to this strategy. Research shows that women miss the “emotional protection” and feel the burden of having to take on also typical ‘husband’ duties (Gross 1980). If they have children, one partner will become the primary caretaker (Moore 1980) whereby the challenges related to children vary with career and family stages, as well as generation. There is some evidence that older couples with children face different problems (conflicts) than younger couples without children (Farris 1978; Gross 1980). In younger couples, the main issue arising before the birth of a child is whose career should predominate. If they decide to commute, young wives are satisfied because they can pursue their career, but feel guilty because they think this arrangement might hinder their husband’s career and are unsatisfied about the time spent with their families. On the other hand, husbands are proud of their wives, but feel deprived in respect to ‘traditional’ husbands. Younger couples are more vulnerable to such a situation because their marriages are still young and they are still not firmly established professionally. Moreover, if they plan to have children the issue of whose career should predominate and who should be the primary caretaker becomes more and more critical. For older couples the career/marriage conflict is not so strong because they know that they can count on their marriage. In these older couples, ‘her’ career has often started later after she had supported his career (and in the case of children, had reduced her work commitment while the children were very young), so husbands often see living apart as the right thing or a kind of payment for the sacrifices wives had to make for ‘his’ career. For these older couples, the main problem is how to share/manage household and children responsibilities rather than to progress on the career ladder. Especially, when the wife goes away and the husband has to take on typically ‘wife/mother’ roles (Gross 1980).

As a final point, though academic couples have agreed on living in a "commuter partnership", external perceptions of this coping strategy might reduce nonetheless their career opportunities. There is some evidence that employers have prejudices toward commuter mar-
riages/partnerships. Employers believe that such persons might not give the best performance at work, might be unhappy, might leave the company as soon as they get a job closer to the partner, and might have a higher risk of divorce (Hendershott 1995; Taylor & Lounsbury 1988). Thus, sometimes hiring decisions of employers are negatively affected by this residential arrangement of the couple.

5 Family responsibilities

A great challenge and, frequently, source of stress is the balance between work and personal/family responsibilities. Maximum tensions are experienced when couples are establishing careers and the children are small (Austin & Pilat 1990; Sekaran 1986). Careers require a lot of time, commitment, extra work, but women often have also an overload of family responsibilities (Bird & Bird 1987; Maitland 1990; Sekaran 1986). The balance is often achieved through women’s sequential career pattern (closely connected to the tied mover/stayer strategy). They alternate employment periods with time outside the labor force (Stroh & Reilly 1999). Such a career pattern is mostly to the disadvantage of female academics. The academic career system is highly competitive (Hochschild 1975). In order to build a professional reputation individuals must show an extensive effort in the early years, minimizing family life or leaving family responsibility to the partner. Female faculty face different options than men in regard to the decision of marrying (or not), to the choice of which partner, and of having (or not) children. And, in fact, there is some evidence that during the early career stages faculty women are much more likely to be unmarried, childless, or to have fewer children (Austin & Pilat 1990; Gappa 1980). Many of them feel that they are forced to choose between marriage and career (Monk-Turner & Turner 1987). Academic women with children, in some cases, have only two solutions: either they become ‘superwomen’ committed to both career and family with energy for both, or they work part-time during the early years of childrearing (Smart & Smart 1990), with the consequences previously discussed.

There is some evidence that "successful" marriages occur when the timing of marriage and childbearing does not interrupt the wife’s preparation and practice, e.g. when women delay family and children after the establishment of their careers. A number of studies report that careers of childless couples progress more or less parallel, thus a possible strategy for those who aim to pursue continuous careers is to remain childless (Gilbert 1985) or, at least, to keep their family size small (Costa & Kahn 2000; Ferber & Huber 1979; Gappa 1980). The

---

8 These studies cited did not specifically focus on universities.
9 Not all of the research cited focused specifically on academic couples.
majority of women in dual-career families, however, choose the "less"-favorable strategy: they give birth to a child after the completion of education, but before establishing their professional status (Gappa 1980) – resulting in all the problems described above.

Interestingly, previous research has noted, though not specifically for academic couples, that when wives’ education is equal or exceeds that of their husbands these women are able to negotiate a somewhat more equal division of labor (Sekaran 1986). Moreover, income differential between spouses decreases in "symmetrical families“, e.g., in which the man increases his attention to the family and the woman to her job outside the family (Bryson & Bryson 1980). Nonetheless, these scholars had to note as well that professional couples are very often not egalitarian, especially with respect to the division of household and childcare duties and to mobility decisions. Partners still react to external and domestic pressures on the base of traditional sex-roles which regard male employment as predominant\(^\text{10}\) (Bryson & Bryson 1980).

6 Concluding remarks – besides the "couple"

According to a report on gender equality in higher education (Hensel 1991), especially women with careers in the "academic world” and who show the same level of productivity as men, have cut their leisure and sleep time because at home there is no equality between the partners. As a consequence, time constraints – which are part of the everyday life in academia – are especially stressful for women (Hensel 1991; Sekaran 1986). Moreover, besides all the "trouble" trying to manage dual-career opportunities in their partnership, female academics then still face the obstacle that professorships still reflect male dominance and traditional role division (Hensel 1991): search committees are dominated by men, rules pertaining to appointment, retention, promotion and tenure are male-driven (Maitland 1990). In addition, there is some empirical evidence that even the strategy of postponing maternity does not free ‘late’ mothers from all negative consequences. Swiss and Walker\(^\text{11}\) come to the conclusion that “the bias imposed by the maternal wall follow women all the way up the corporate ladder” (Swiss & Walker 1993: 6). In fact, so long as women’s careers follow the male track it

\(^{10}\) A more recent research on attitudes of university male students has revealed that compared to 1980 in 1990 men held less traditional views toward work and family. Yet, within this pattern there is still reluctance to restructure male’s working roles and female child caring roles. In fact, many report little support for exchanging provider roles and taking on child care duties. Men appear to accept their wives’ employment and success especially when there are no children. The majority considers their wife’s career as being equal important to the own one, but in response to dual-career dilemmas they believe that women should be the one to turn down an opportunity. However, over the period considered the acceptance toward a commuter lifestyle increased (Willinger 1993).

\(^{11}\) Their research focused on women graduates in Harvard Business, Law and Medical school.
is no problem, yet as soon as they propose somewhat different agendas and strategies the "doors in the profession begin to swing shut" (Swiss & Walker 1993: 4).

In conclusion, dual-career couples in academia face several dilemmas. On one side they have to decide which strategies are best in order to achieve professional fulfillment for both partners. This, as previously discussed, is usually related to a number of sacrifices and compromises such as, for example, ‘tied’ or ‘commuting’ decisions and/or the postponement or renunciation of children. On the other hand, some universities – and more generally employers – make the situation even more difficult treating, for example, the ‘trailing’ partner as an ‘add-on’, not offering adequate positions, or having a prejudice against commuter partnerships. The efforts made in recent years by a number of institutions to accommodate dual-career partners (such as spousal hiring programs and joint-appointments) are, therefore, very welcome.

7 Overview of the methods used in the literature

In the last part of the report a number of empirical studies on American dual-career couples will be schematically presented (see Appendix B). Especially in perspective of future investigations, it is quite important to reassume the focus, unit of analysis and methods used by previous research. Apart from giving important suggestions, a synopsis might also disclose which aspects have been neglected so far.

The review of American literature on dual-career couples is quite impressive. Since the mid ‘70s this has been a topic of empirical research. Most of the studies cited have focused on married heterosexual couples, on their strategies to combine work and family responsibilities, on mobility decisions and the effect of dual-career partnerships on the professional career pattern and development. Very often the focus was directed toward the female partner, while ‘atypical’ couples – such as same sex and/or cohabiting partners – have been included only very rarely. The methods used are disparate, a considerable number of scholars have adopted both a quantitative as well as qualitative research design. Longitudinal studies – especially with a panel design – are, however, an absolute exception.

8 What is missing and what is necessary in future research?

Older and more recent studies have pointed out the need for longitudinal research and the importance of a life cycle perspective when studying dual-career couples (Berger et al. 1977; Moen & Wethington 1992). In fact, there should be a general consent that "marriages are
fluid arrangements [...] At some stages of a relationship (e.g. during career-building), the allocation of tasks and responsibilities is very different from other stages (e.g. during the early years of child rearing). The shifts from more to less traditional types among married couples, however, are understandable when viewed within a long temporal framework.” (Nock 1998: p.243) Only few scholars, however, have adopted such a research design when studying the dual-career couple/family.

In the life course perspective, the different strategies adopted by couples can be related to the different dilemmas partners face at different stages of their careers and family cycles. In this report it has been argued that, for example, ‘tied’ decisions are closely linked to family events (such as childbirth and the presence of small children) and career stages. Yet, arrangements within couples can change over time and a longitudinal research design might help understand under which circumstances these settlements become (or not) irreversible. Moreover, in the literature there is a wide evidence that managing dual-careers is stressful. Only few studies, however, distinguish between different life phases and consequently sources of stress. Young couples at the beginning of their relationship and profession might be more at risk of either marital disruption or of becoming a dual-earner couple (e.g. one partner gives up his/her career). Later on the dilemmas might be different and, possibly, if they ‘survive’ as a dual-career couple they might have adjusted and this arrangement might not be a source of particular tension anymore.

At last, a research design which focuses exclusively on couples has some limitations. Some strategies might get ‘lost’: some persons might decide to not enter a partnership, because they are aware of the difficulties of combining two careers and balancing family and work responsibilities. Moreover, since a considerable number of highly educated women experience marital disruption, it would be very interesting to discover whether and to what extent the incompatibility with dual-career has played a role. Finally, also ‘atypical’ cases – such as women as ‘senior’ partner and same-sex couples – should be included in the unit of analysis. Age differences are often called upon to explain ‘tied’ decisions, a comparison between male and female ‘senior’ partners might help discover whether they apply also when women are further on the career ladder than their partners. Similarly, a comparison with same-sex couples could be very useful to test the importance of gender-role ideology in the decision making of couples.
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Appendix A: Statistical annex

Tab 1. Percentages of marriages by couple type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-power</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-power</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A power couple is defined as one in which both spouses are college graduates, a part-power couple as one in which only one spouse is a college graduate, and a low-power couple as one in which neither spouse is a college graduate. All numbers are estimated from the integrated public use census samples and are for households in which the husband was age 25 to 39 and the wife 23 to 27.

(Source: Costa & Kahn 2000: 1290)

Tab 2. Median annual earnings and earning ratios by race and education, 1990 (in $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>W/M ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>28,887</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>37,172</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data refers to year-round full-time workers

(Source: U.S. census microdata in Roos & Gatta 1999: 101)
### Tab 3. Academic rank distribution by sex and marital status, 1977 (column percentages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Married once</td>
<td>Married twice or more</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>Married once</td>
<td>Married twice or more</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data were compiled by the Carnegie Commission and represent 12094 male and 1559 female faculty members at universities and colleges classified as "Quality I" or high quality institutions.

(Source: Ezrati 1983: 106)

### Tab 4. Average salaries and differences by academic rank and sex, 1985-86 (in $)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public 4-year institutions</th>
<th>Private 4-year institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>43,400</td>
<td>40,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>31,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant</td>
<td>27,800</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>21,600</td>
<td>20,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>25,200</td>
<td>22,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No academic rank</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>22,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four-year institutions are undergraduate colleges. Data reported by the U.S. Department of Education, Center for Education Statistic (February 1987)

(Source: Maitland 1990: 248-249)
### Appendix B: List of studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Unit of analysis (number of cases)</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adler et al. 1989</td>
<td>Married couples (3)</td>
<td>Conjoint career in academia</td>
<td>Case study (personal reports of the authors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkin &amp; Dobrofsky 1978</td>
<td>Married couples (21)</td>
<td>Job-sharing (clergy, academia, journalism)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barnett &amp; Rivers 1998</td>
<td>Married couples (300)</td>
<td>Two-earner couples Their roles as workers, partners and parents</td>
<td>Quantitative: 3 sets of interviews within 2 years (panel) Qualitative: in-depth, open-ended interviews with 4 couples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becker &amp; Moen 1999</td>
<td>Married couples (117)</td>
<td>Dual-earner couples Work-family strategies</td>
<td>Quantitative: Cornell Couples and Career Study. In half of the sample both partners were separately interviewed, in the rest only one partner. Open-ended semi-structured interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blumstein &amp; Schwartz 1983</td>
<td>Couples (6382)</td>
<td>Married or cohabiting couples, both heterosexual and homosexual Attitudes toward work, money and sex</td>
<td>Quantitative: 6000 close-ended questionnaires + 382 personal interviews. After 1 year follow-up questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant et al. 1988</td>
<td>Married couples (123)</td>
<td>Employment characteristics of co-employed spouses in the same university (not only academics)</td>
<td>Quantitative: personnel data set</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryson et al. 1976 Heckman et al. 1977 Bryson &amp; Bryson 1980</td>
<td>Married couples (200) + control group</td>
<td>Psychologists couples Scientific productivity, salary and job performance</td>
<td>Quantitative: matching questionnaires for husband and wife and a third questionnaire to be fill out as couple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler &amp; Paisley 1980</td>
<td>Married couples (3 different studies)</td>
<td>Coordinated-career couples Coordination strategies</td>
<td>Quantitative (296): couples which were previously identified via 1973 APA Directory were followed via the 1978 APA Directory and their careers classified. Qualitative (45): case histories prepared by couples themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Unit of analysis (number of cases)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagg 1993</td>
<td>Married couples (78) + Faculty members (304)</td>
<td>Academic couples Status of academic faculty wives at one Canadian university. Discriminatory policies</td>
<td>Quantitative: personnel data on couples’ careers Qualitative: opinion about hiring spouses and inbreeding (yes/no plus comment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deich &amp; Sanderson 1987</td>
<td>Faculty spouses (275 wives + 50 husbands)</td>
<td>Spouses of faculty members Geographical mobility and effects on the spouse’s (wife’s) career</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire for faculty spouse Qualitative: 38 wives with own career; open-ended questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durnovo 1990</td>
<td>Women (212)</td>
<td>Women’s careers as administrators in one college</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire Qualitative: follow up interviews with 21 respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eby et al. 1997</td>
<td>Married couples (503)</td>
<td>Dual-income couples Job-related and counseling-related services experienced and desired by relocation</td>
<td>Quantitative: one questionnaire for employee and one for spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farris 1978</td>
<td>Married couples (10)</td>
<td>Commuting couples</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferber &amp; Huber 1979</td>
<td>Married Ph.D.’s (1053)</td>
<td>Effect of the spouse’s educational level on the own career</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire for Ph.D.’s recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbert 1985</td>
<td>Married men (51)</td>
<td>Men in dual-career families Career aspirations and development, husband-wife relationship, strategies for combining work and family roles</td>
<td>Qualitative: interview guide (open-ended questions) and Work and Family Orientation Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross 1980</td>
<td>Married couples (28)</td>
<td>Commuting couples</td>
<td>Qualitative: open-ended interviews with either both (15) or only one partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallet &amp; Gilbert 1997</td>
<td>Women (174)</td>
<td>Female undergraduate students’ views upon their future marital patterns of work and family integration</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire with different scales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hammer et al. 1997</td>
<td>Couples (399)</td>
<td>Dual-earner couples Work-family conflict</td>
<td>Quantitative: matching questionnaires for bank employees and their spouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Unit of analysis (number of cases)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensel 1990</td>
<td>Affirmative Action Officers (16 colleges)</td>
<td>Maternity issues</td>
<td>Quantitative: ten-item questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertz 1986</td>
<td>Married couples (21)</td>
<td>Dual-career couples Men’s and women’s paths to their careers, marital equity, work-family coping strategies</td>
<td>Qualitative: semi-structured in depth interviews for both partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseknecht &amp; Spanier 1980</td>
<td>Women (1249)</td>
<td>Risk of divorce for highly educated women</td>
<td>Quantitative: 1/1000 subsample of the 1970 USA census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houseknecht &amp; Macke 1981</td>
<td>Married women (346)</td>
<td>Effect of female employment on marital adjustment of highly educated women</td>
<td>Quantitative: from sample of high-level graduate women from one university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al. 1975</td>
<td>Married women (86)</td>
<td>Effect of dual-career marriage on the professional career of female sociologists married to departmental colleagues.</td>
<td>Quantitative: 5-year longitudinal analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews &amp; Matthews 1980</td>
<td>Married couples (250)</td>
<td>Psychologist couples. Job-seeking issues</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moen &amp; Yu 1999</td>
<td>Married individuals (1670)</td>
<td>Dual-earner couples Success in work and family life and the balancing of the two</td>
<td>Quantitative: sub-sample of the 1992 National Survey of the Changing Workforce Qualitative: in-depth interviews of the Cornell Couples and Career study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poloma et al. 1981</td>
<td>Married women (45)</td>
<td>Impact of the family life cycle on the careers and family patterns of professional women, who in 1969 were members of dual-career families</td>
<td>Qualitative: in 1969 in-depth interviews with 53 dual-career couples, in 1977 a qualitative questionnaire was sent to the wives of the original sample (45 answers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeborg 1990</td>
<td>Married couples (101)</td>
<td>Two-career faculty household (at least one spouse faculty member). Impact of work schedules; division of labor</td>
<td>Quantitative: 2 matching questionnaires for each spouse and one household questionnaire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekaran 1982</td>
<td>Married couples (127)</td>
<td>Dual-career families Career salience for members of DC families</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekaran 1986</td>
<td>Married couples (166)</td>
<td>Different types of coordination, dilemmas and rewards of dual-career couples, sex-roles orientations and asymmetry within couples</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire to be filled independently by each spouses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Unit of analysis (number of cases)</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swiss &amp; Walker 1993</td>
<td>Women graduates (902)</td>
<td>Strategies to balance work and family responsibilities</td>
<td>Quantitative: detailed six-page questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative: in-depth interview with 52 women representative of the wider sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teevan et al. 1992</td>
<td>Academics (115)</td>
<td>Factor motivating the decision to accept, decline or resign fulltime positions at one university.</td>
<td>Qualitative: open-ended question about their employment decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Quantitative: rating scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker &amp; Kuk 1990</td>
<td>Women (113)</td>
<td>Attitudes toward family and work life</td>
<td>Quantitative: questionnaire and different scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Follow-up study after graduation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yogev 1981</td>
<td>Married faculty women (106)</td>
<td>Reality and perceptions of division of labor within couples</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>