

# WOMEN, WORK AND CAREGIVING: HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DOES A GREAT JOB REALLY MAKE?

Anne Martin-Matthews  
Carolyn J. Rosenthal

IESOP Research Paper No. 5

September 1996

The Program for Research on the Independence and Economic Security of the Older Population is an interdisciplinary research program established at McMaster University with support from Health Canada's Seniors' Independence Research Program. The Research Paper series provides a vehicle for distributing the results of studies undertaken by those associated with the program. Authors take full responsibility for all expressions of opinion.

For further information about the research program and other papers in this series, see our web site at: <http://socserv2.mcmaster.ca/~iesop/>

*WOMEN, WORK AND CAREGIVING:  
HOW MUCH DIFFERENCE DOES A GREAT JOB REALLY MAKE?*

*by*

*Anne Martin-Matthews, Ph.D.<sup>1</sup>*

*and*

*Carolyn J. Rosenthal Ph.D.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>1</sup> *Professor, Department of Family Studies, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1.*

<sup>2</sup> *Professor, Department of Sociology and Office of Gerontological Studies, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L8S 4K1.*

*An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Annual Scientific and Educational Meetings of the Canadian Association on Gerontology, Winnipeg, Manitoba, October 15, 1994. The data reported in this paper were collected as part of a study of "Work and Family", conducted by the Work and Eldercare Research Group of CARNET (The Canadian Aging Research Network). Funding of the project was from the Canadian Ministry of Science and Technology through its Networks of Centres of Excellence Program. The authors acknowledge the technical assistance of Joanne Duncan-Robinson, M.A., and Suzanne Wakefield, B.A., B.A.Sc. in the analysis of data and writing of this paper.*

*This paper has been accepted for publication and will appear in a revised form in *Ageing and Society*, 27(3), pp.1-24, published by Cambridge University Press, copyright Cambridge University Press. See [http://www.cambridge.org/journals/journal\\_catalogue.asp?mnemonic=ASO](http://www.cambridge.org/journals/journal_catalogue.asp?mnemonic=ASO)*

## **ABSTRACT**

This paper examines whether type of job makes a difference in (a) the likelihood that individuals are providing assistance to elderly relatives, (b) the 'costs' associated with this provision, in terms of both job-related and personal costs, and (c) whether observed relationships differ for men and for women. Data are derived from a sample of Canadian employees who participated in a study of work/family balance conducted by the Work and Eldercare Research Group of CARNET: The Canadian Aging Research Network, based at the University of Guelph. The analysis compared full-time employees in three job categories: managerial/professional (n = 1,996); semi-professional (n = 1,270) and clerical, sales, service, craft and trades (n = 2,112).

The data indicate no differences between the three occupational groups in the likelihood of providing assistance to elderly relatives. The relationship between job type and both job and personal costs was found to vary in relation to the extent of involvement in the caregiver role. Job costs include lateness, absenteeism, foregoing promotions, missed meetings, and so forth, while personal costs include the perception of work interference with family life, and perceived levels of stress. Among employees providing between 1 and 4 hours of assistance on average per week, women in the managerial/professional job classifications were more engaged in fewer hours of care, gender is associated with significant differences in job and personal costs. This is not true for those providing more hours of care. For both men and women, there appears to be a threshold (5 or more hours of care on average per week) beyond which neither gender nor job type makes a difference in terms of job and personal costs.

## INTRODUCTION

Because of changing demographics and patterns of female labour force participation, increasing numbers of Canadian women face the demands of trying to balance responsibilities for employment and for older relatives.

Men also face the responsibilities emanating from paid work and having older parents who need assistance. Our major focus in this paper, however, is on women, since responsibility for the care of family members of all ages, including older relatives, tends to fall to women to a far greater degree than to men.

While interest in the topic of work and providing assistance to older relatives has grown in recent years (Scharlach, 1989; Martin Matthews and Rosenthal, 1993; Gottlieb et al., in press; Brody, 1990, etc.), in such studies "work" is typically operationalized as employed/not employed. Differentiations may be made as to whether the employment is full-time or part-time. Little attention, however, has been directed toward examining the impact of the type of job, that is, where the job falls in terms of socio-economic status. Higher socio-economic status jobs are ones we refer to as "great jobs". The many studies which refer to the "glass ceiling" preventing women's career advancement and to women's under-representation at the managerial, professional and corporate level, all suggest - implicitly or explicitly - that such jobs have the potential to enhance women's lives. While this is a broader social question, it is a question we can, nevertheless, address in relation to the balancing of responsibilities to paid work and to the needs of elderly family members.

One assumption is that these jobs carry more resources (such as income) than lower socio-economic status jobs and, thus one might well expect these resources to facilitate

a woman's ability to combine responsibilities for work and helping older family members. While there might be some trade-offs (for example, a recent report suggested that women in higher socio-economic status occupations work considerably longer hours than do those in lower socio-economic status groupings), overall the question with which we grappled in this analysis was whether these higher socio-economic status jobs generally facilitate the work/family balance? Our purpose in this paper, therefore, is to examine the impact of having a "great job" on combining paid work and responsibilities to older relatives.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

The work role demands as well as level of work commitment in higher socio-economic status jobs are usually thought to be higher than demands in lower socio-economic status jobs. In terms of work-family conflict, however, this is thought to be more than offset by the increased income which enables persons of higher socio-economic status to purchase helpful services. As well, such jobs are associated with greater control over the conditions of work, including time allocation -- i.e. greater flexibility (Galinsky, 1986), than lower socio-economic status jobs. Job autonomy is also greater in higher socio-economic status jobs, and is related to less stress and a reduced likelihood of feeling that work interferes with family life (Galinsky et al., 1987).

Women are still greatly under-represented in the highest ranking jobs. Labour force statistics for 1992 show that, when one combines the highest ranking jobs (managerial and professional) with the next rank that includes what we would call semi-professional (teachers, nurses), the proportions of men and women are almost equal (50.3% versus

49.7%) (Committee on Women and Economic Restructuring, 1994: 20). However, representation "at the top" is dramatically less equal. In 1986, men occupied 90.9% of executive and senior management positions in government and virtually all of the top 500 corporations in Canada had male CEOs (Peitchinis, 1989). A recent Financial Post (1993) survey found that only .7% of top management jobs (chairman, president, CEO) in Canada, and only 1.6% of second level management jobs (corporate vice presidents) are held by women.

Nevertheless, despite their comparative rarity, women in professional or managerial jobs do appear to have somewhat unique attributes. One study, for example, found that "the women most likely to remain in full-time work, even with a young child, are of professional or managerial status. Not only do they have most to lose, career-wise, in not continuing, but they are the highest paid and thus the ones most able to pay for child-minding and have enough pay left over to make it worthwhile to work" (East Anglian Economic Newsletter, Autumn, 1992).

Jobs which rank higher in the prestige hierarchy are ones we call "better" jobs. These typically correlate with higher SES (Pineo et al., 1985), income and education. Moreover, they may also correlate with greater economic security, with incumbents in such jobs being better able to protect themselves from job loss and to exploit new job opportunities than are less skilled workers (Betcherman et al., 1994). In the workplace, higher ranking jobs are associated with better access to benefits which facilitate meeting family responsibilities. MacBride-King (1990:38) found that over half of managers and employees at the supervisor-foreman level felt their employer "does enough" in the work-family area, but those in the "skilled-manual" category were least likely to feel their

employer does enough in this respect. Lero (1992) studied the combination of paid work and child care, but her findings may have relevance to eldercare as well. She found that access to paid family-responsibility leave was available to 41% of senior and middle managers, compared to only 10% of unskilled workers; similarly, the opportunity to work flexible hours was available to 43% of senior and middle managers, compared to 28% of unskilled workers. Lero also found that employees with access to flexible work arrangements reported less work-family tension. Similarly, The Committee on Work and Economic Restructuring also found that persons in professional or managerial jobs were much more likely to be on "flexitime" than persons in processing, machining or fabricating. While higher level jobs may have greater flexibility, a negative feature is that they are not viewed by employers as "9 to 5" jobs and thus frequently make greater time demands than lower level jobs (MacBride-King, 1990: 22).

A comparison of men and women in higher level (professional/managerial) jobs with those in lower ranking jobs was conducted by Duxbury et al. (1991). That study focused primarily on combining work and responsibilities for children rather than for older relatives, but the findings may be relevant to the issue of helping older family members. Duxbury et al. compared four groups: married women who had children and were in higher ranking jobs (they called these "dual career" women); married women with children and who had lower ranking jobs ("dual earner"); married men with children and who had higher ranking jobs ("dual career") and married men with children and who were in lower ranking jobs ("dual earner"). Overall, dual-career women had more difficulty than did dual-earner women managing their family time and are more likely to perceive that family responsibilities have a negative impact on their career advancement. Dual-earner women,

on the other hand, had greater work-family conflict than dual-career women. Dual-career men and women were more involved with their jobs than dual-earner men and women, and dual-career women were the most involved of any of the four groups. Dual-career men and women also missed fewer days of work than dual-earner men and women. Dual-career women were the most satisfied of all groups with their lives and are best able to cope with problems, while dual-earner women are at the other extreme, experiencing poorer physical and mental health and having greater absenteeism than any other group.

There is also some evidence that supervisor support or sensitivity may be less available to employees in lower level compared to upper level jobs (Galinsky, 1986). Research suggests that the employee-supervisor relationship as a factor that influences the degree to which employees are able to balance work and family. Indeed, a supervisor who is not sensitive or flexible regarding family demands may even exacerbate difficulties in combining work and family (MacBride-King, 1990:8). Lurie, Galinsky and Hughes (1988) found that a "supportive culture" at work, i.e. one which was "family-friendly", was the most significant of all job conditions assessed in predicting stress-related health problems, worrying about one's children while at work and feeling child care problems impair productivity.

Finally, a note on gender. Women's dominance in family caregiving, whether to older or younger members, has been extensively documented. Attention is only beginning to be directed toward men who provide care. While some researchers suggest that the provision of care by men is essentially gender non-normative (Arber and Ginn, 1990), other research shows that many men with intensive involvement in caring for elderly



relatives experience similar 'costs' as do many women. Martin Matthews and Campbell (1995), in an analysis of the CARNET Work and Family Survey of employed Canadians, found that 6.7% of the men helped elderly relatives with the activities of daily living. Compared to men without these care responsibilities, men providing these kinds of 'personal' care (bathing, feeding, dressing, toileting), reported a number of adverse effects of combining work and the care of older relatives. These included the use of vacation time to take care of family responsibilities, interrupted work days, missing meetings and job-related social events, declining extra projects, experiencing stress, and having reduced time for leisure and sleep. Interestingly, these men who were helping older relatives did not report any more interference between work and family life than did other men not providing such care. Therefore, this paper will also examine the relationship between gender and the having of "a great job" in terms of how individuals' balance work and family responsibilities.

A note on terminology: we generally employ terms such as "helping" and "providing assistance" rather than "caregiving" or "eldercare". We feel that the term "caregiving" is appropriate when referring to persons who are helping a highly dependent older relative as is typically the case when the help consists of help with ADLs. Lower levels of help do not necessarily imply dependence, and indeed may be characterized by high levels of reciprocity, and therefore the term "caregiving" may inappropriately portray the older relative as in need of and receiving "care".

Our research questions are:

1. Does having a "great job" (i.e. type of job) make a difference in the likelihood of women providing help to older relatives? If so, how? Is the pattern for men the same or different? If so, how?
2. Among women who provide help to older relatives, does type of job make a difference in:
  - a) job-related costs (promotions, missed meetings, lateness, absences, etc.)?
  - b) personal costs (work interference with family, stress, etc.)?
3. Among men who provide help to older relatives, does type of job make a difference in:
  - a) job-related costs?
  - b) personal costs?
4. How does the impact of type of job differ for men and women?

## **METHODS**

The data for this study are drawn from the Work and Family Survey conducted by the Work and Eldercare Research Group of CARNET: The Canadian Aging Research Network. The survey was conducted in nine Canadian organizations representing five employment sectors (government agencies, financial services, manufacturing, health services, and educational institutions). Four of the organizations were public sector employers, the remainder were private sector.

In six of the organizations, the sample was restricted to employees over the age of 35, whereas no age restrictions were placed on the sample in the remaining three

organizations. We chose to oversample this older age group in order to optimize the likelihood of identifying employees who were helping older relatives.

A variety of methods were used to distribute and collect the survey in accordance with the constraints and preferences expressed by the participating organizations. With the exception of three organizations, the surveys were distributed to pre-designated employees through the internal mail system. Respondents were given the option of returning the completed survey in a sealed pre-addressed stamped envelope either through the same internal mail system or through the public postal system. In the remaining three organizations, the surveys were not sent to specific employees, but were mass distributed at one location.

Of the 10,219 surveys distributed, 5496 usable surveys were returned, yielding an overall response rate of 54%, which is virtually identical to the response rate of 52% that Scharlach et al. (1991) obtained in their recent survey of employees of Transamerica Life Companies. It compares quite favorably with the overall response rates obtained in other large dependent care surveys of employees. For example, of the 27,832 employees recently surveyed by Neal et al. (1993), 9,573 returned their surveys, yielding an overall response rate of 34%. In our study, response rates vary widely by organization, ranging from 23% to 73%. This is a function of a number of different factors, including the importance assigned to the subject by the organization, as reflected in the cover letter written by the employer, the method of distribution, whether or not permission was granted to complete the survey on company time, the company's adherence to the plan for issuing reminder notices, the length of the survey (14 pages), and the respondent's personal interest in the survey's subject matter.

### Respondent Characteristics:

From the larger study, we drew a subsample of respondents who were employed full-time and who had provided an average of at least one hour of help per week to a relative aged 65 or older in the past six months. This yielded a sample of 1087 women and 812 men. Of the women, 67% (n=732) provided an average of 1-4 hours of help per week, and 33% (n=355) provided an average of 5 or more hours of help per week. Among men, the comparable figures were 81% (n=658) and 19% (n=154). Other characteristics of this subsample appear in Table 1 (such as occupational category, marital status, mean age, personal income, household income, and education).

[Table 1 About Here]

### Measures:

Job type: Respondents were asked to describe the kind of work they did. Answers were coded into occupational categories according to the Pineo, Porter and McRoberts' (Pineo, 1985) classification which yields a socio-economic status ranking. In the analysis, these rankings are collapsed into three categories: managerial/professional; semi-professional; and clerical, sales, service, crafts and trades occupations.

Full-time: Respondents were asked how many hours they worked each week. Those who said they worked 35 hours or more were coded as working full-time.

Provision of help: These employees rated the frequency with which they provided 18 kinds of assistance to a relative aged 65 or older during the prior 6 months. The 6-point Likert-type response scale ranged from "never" to "daily". Specifically, they were asked..."how often have you done each of the following for your older relative(s) during

the past 6 months, because of their age or health"? In addition to the 5 items tapping Activities of Daily Living (dressing, personal hygiene, toileting, eating, medication use), and the 7 items tapping Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (laundry, transportation, home maintenance, meal preparation, shopping, household chores, mobility inside and outside the home), the checklist included 6 additional items: assisting with money management, arranging community services, completing forms, providing financial assistance, dealing with serious memory problems, and dealing with mood swings due to mental changes. Respondents were also asked whether they had helped in a crisis. Following all these questions, individuals were asked how many hours per week, on average, they had spent helping their elderly relative during the last six months.

Personal opportunity costs: Respondents were asked whether, in the past 6 months, their family responsibilities had caused them to reduce the amount of time they devoted to: volunteer work; leisure activities; socializing with friends, continuing education classes; sleeping/resting. The response format was dichotomous; individuals could reply in the affirmative or the negative. Responses were summed to create an index ranging from 0 to 5, reflecting the total number of personal opportunity costs (Cronbach's alpha = .87). (For further information on this measure, see Gottlieb et al., 1994).

Job opportunity costs: These costs were measured by asking respondents whether, in the past 6 months, their responsibilities outside work had caused them to miss meetings or training sessions, decline business travel, extra projects, or promotions, and to be unable to attend job-related social events that were scheduled outside regular work hours. A dichotomous response format was used for these items as well, and an index

was created in the same manner as for the personal opportunity costs (Cronbach's alpha =.62). (For further information on this measure, see Gottlieb et al, 1994).

Work-family conflict: Following Gutek, Searle and Klepa (1991), two 4-item scales were used to measure Work Interference with Family (Cronbach's alpha =.81) and Family Interference with Work (Cronbach's alpha = .79), rather than a single scale measuring work-family conflict. The authors' wording was slightly altered to improve item clarity, but the nature of the integrity of the measure was retained. Each construct taps time restriction, fatigue, mental preoccupation, and the quality of involvement caused by the demands of the other role. For example, the time restriction item in the Work Interference with Family (WIF) Scale states that: "My job prevents me from spending as much time as I would like with family members", while the reciprocal item in the Family Interference with Work (FIW) scale states that: "My family responsibilities take up time that I'd like to spend working on my job". A four-point Likert-type response format reflecting strength of agreement/disagreement was used, yielding scores that range from 4-16.

Stress: Cohen and Williamson's (1988) Perceived Stress Scale (PSS) is a 14-item global measure of perceived stress that has been widely used in field surveys. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert-type response format, ranging from "never" to "very often", yielding scores between 0 and 56. The authors offer evidence for the validity and reliability of the scale. In the current study, the scale demonstrated adequate internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha=.83).

Analysis:

The central focus of this paper is on women. However, in order to reach an understanding of the relationship between gender, work and eldercare, it is important to understand those experiences which are unique to, and shared by, women and men. We adopt this comparative strategy in this paper. In addition to gender, a second dimension of comparison is between persons who provide relatively lower levels of assistance (1-4 hours per week) and those who provide greater assistance (5 or more hours per week). Research by Arber and Ginn (1990) has confirmed the appropriateness of a distinction between those providing less than five hours of care per week as 'helpers' and those providing more than five hours per week as 'carers'.

## **RESULTS**

### Research Question 1: Does having a "great" job make a difference in the likelihood of women providing help to older relatives?

This initial research question was designed to enhance our understanding of the overall context for the intersection of work and family responsibilities in women's lives. We wished to ascertain whether there was a differential pattern of likelihood (by occupational classification) that women would be involved in the care of elderly family members. To this end, we compared the occupational distribution of the women providing 1-4 and 5 or more hours of care, to their distribution in our sample population overall.

[Table 2 About Here]

Table 2 illustrates our findings. While the chi square for the relationship as a whole is significant (in that there are some differences by job type in terms of likelihood of having living parents available, for instance, the data indicate that overall having a "great job" does not make a difference in the likelihood of women providing help to older relatives. Women in full-time professional/managerial occupations are as likely as women in the sample as a whole to provide 5 or more hours of help per week. Indeed, they are and slightly more likely to do so than were women in clerical, sales and service occupations, but somewhat less likely to provide this higher amount of care than were women in semi-professional occupations. Overall, this is true also of men, although men in all job types overall were significantly less likely than were women to be providing assistance for more than five hours per week.



Research Question 2: Among women who provide help to older relatives, does having a great job make a difference with respect to work-family conflict, job-related costs and personal costs?

To answer this question, one-way ANOVAs were conducted, comparing the three "type of job" groups on the various dependent variables (Table 3). Column 1 of Table 3 presents results for women who provide relatively little assistance -- between 1 and four hours per week. Column 2 of Table 3 presents results for women who provide a lot of assistance -- 5 or more hours per week.

[Table 3 About Here]

#### **Impact of type of job among women who provide 1-4 hours of assistance per week:**

We look first at the impact of type of job among women who provide 1 to 4 hours of assistance per week.

With respect to **work-family conflict**, type of job makes a difference in the amount of Work Interference with Family (WIF), with women in the lowest occupational category feeling less interference than women in the two higher categories.

Turning to **job-related costs**, women in the highest occupational category report the greatest likelihood of experiencing job opportunity costs.

**Personal costs**, as indicated by stress and personal opportunity costs, do not vary significantly by occupational category.

#### **Impact of job type among women who provide 5 or more hours of help per week:**

Among women who provide 5 or more hours of help per week, occupational category does not make a difference in **work-family conflict** (neither the WIF nor the FIW was significant).

Nor does occupational category make a difference in job opportunity costs or in personal costs.

**Comparing the impact of job type among women who provide 1-4 hours of help with women who provide 5+ hours of help:**

Comparing the impact of job type among women who provide 1-4 hours and 5+ hours of help (columns 1 and 2 of Table 3) shows that, for work interference with family and job opportunity costs, the impact of job type disappears when the amount of help rises. As shown above, having a better job (categories 1 and 2) was associated with greater WIF among the 1-4 hours group, but no longer makes a difference once people provide 5 or more hours of assistance. The highest occupational group also reported the greatest job opportunity costs when those providing 1-4 hours of help was the group examined. Again, this effect is no longer seen when we examine the 5+ hours group. One might say, then, that having a "great job" makes a difference among persons providing relatively little assistance, but interestingly this difference might be counter-intuitive in that one might say women with higher status jobs actually have more difficulty -- at least on the two variables in question. But once high levels of assistance are undertaken, occupational category ceases to make a difference (presumably everyone has costs and interference).

Research question 3: Among men who provide help to an older relative, does type of job make a difference with respect to work-family conflict, job-related costs and personal costs?

Again, one-way analysis of variance was conducted, comparing these men in terms of their occupational classifications. Column 1 of Table 4 presents the results for men who provide relatively little assistance to their elderly family member -- between one and four hours per week. Column 2 of Table 4 presents the results of the analysis amongst men who provide considerable assistance -- five or more hours per week.

[Table 4 About Here]

#### **Impact of type of job amongst men who provide 1 - 4 hours of help per week:**

Once again we look first at the relationship between the type of job and selected outcome measures amongst a sample of men who provide between one and four hours of help per week.

In relation to the expression of **work-family conflict**, the type of job does indeed make a difference in the amount of Work Interference With Family (WIF) ( $F= 7.24$ ,  $p < .00$ ). Men in the lowest occupational category report feeling less work interference with family than do men in higher occupational categories. There were no significant occupational group differences in the perception of Family Interference with Work (FIW).

**Job opportunity costs** (as measured in terms of such factors as tardiness, absenteeism, etc.) did not differ significantly amongst the men in terms of occupational category.

In terms of **personal costs**, there were no differences by occupational category in terms of the levels of perceived stress. While there was an overall significant relationship between occupational classification and **personal opportunity costs** ( $F= 3.4, p < .05$ ), no one group was significantly different from the other.

#### **Impact of job type amongst men who provide 5 or more hours of help per week:**

Amongst men who provide 5 or more help of care per week, occupational category does not make a difference in **work-family conflict**, in **job opportunity costs** or in **personal costs**.

#### **Comparison of the Impact of Job Type among Men who Provide 1-4 hours of help and men who provide 5 or more hours of help per week:**

A comparison of the relative impact of job type amongst men who provide 1 - 4 hours of help per week and those who provide 5 or more hours of help (columns 1 and 2 of Table 4) reveals that, for all measures, the impact of job type disappears when the level of assistance rises. As shown above, having a "better" job (groups 1 and 2) was associated with higher scores on the WIF amongst men providing comparatively lower levels of assistance, but no longer makes a difference amongst men providing 5 or more hours. Similarly, the relationship between personal opportunity costs and occupational category, disappears amongst those providing higher levels of assistance. Again one might say that having a "great job" makes a difference amongst men providing relatively light amounts of assistance -- but this difference is in the opposite direction to what one would suppose (i.e., men in higher s-e-s occupations report more WIF and personal opportunity costs. But once higher levels of assistance are provided, occupational

category ceases to make a difference (presumably everyone has costs and interferences).

**Research Question #4: How does the impact of type of job differ for men and women?**

The fourth research question addresses the issue of gender differences in the relationship between job classification and the kinds of job and personal costs which we have considered in this analysis. For purposes of clarity in the discussion, let us again analyze the groups separately, in terms of those providing less than five hours of assistance to an elderly relative per week, and those providing more than five hours.

[Table 5 About Here]

In these tables 5a and 5b, we report the results of an analysis of variance of relationship between occupational type, gender, and our outcome measures (work/family interference; job costs and personal costs). In each case, the relationship between the dependent variable and (a) job type and (b) gender is reported, followed by the two-way interactions. These data depict fairly striking patterns amongst those men and women providing between one and four hours of help per week. Gender is a significant factor in all our outcome measures: the perception of Work Interference with Family (WIF), of Family Interference with Work (FIW), perceived stress, job opportunity costs, and personal opportunity costs. However, amongst men and women providing five or more hours of assistance per week, gender is significant only in relation to stress and personal opportunity costs, not to work - family interference.

Other gender comparisons of the data further suggest that amongst those providing 'lower' levels of assistance (1 - 4 hours on average per week), the men report no job opportunity costs while the women do. This finding has important implications for women's career advancement when they are involved in even moderate levels of care provision. In addition, the women's scores on the measure of Work Interference with Family (WIF) are considerably higher than those reported by men.

Gender comparisons amongst those individuals providing 5 or more hours of assistance per week reveal e, somewhat surprisingly, few gender differentials amongst those providing this level of care.

### Summary and Conclusions

In terms of our overall research question as to how much difference a great job really makes, we can but draw the social scientists' favourite conclusion: it depends. It seems, in general (with some very minor exceptions) that at lower levels of care, job type does make a difference. However, the direction of that difference is opposite to that which we had anticipated, with women in higher rather than lower ranking occupations expressing higher levels of perceived Work Interference with Family Life (WIF), and Job Opportunity Costs.

These data also suggest that involvement in higher levels of care to elderly family members generally "cancels out" the impact of job type, in terms of the measures of personal and job costs.

Our research questions also addressed the relationship between gender and job type in the negotiation of work and family responsibilities. Amongst those providing lower

levels of care, it does appear that gender is associated with significant differences in WIF, FIW, stress, job opportunity costs and personal costs. However, amongst those providing higher levels of care (5 or more hours per week), not only is the effect of job type largely eradicated, but so also is the effect of gender. Amongst women providing moderate levels of assistance to elderly relatives, a "great job" does make a difference. But, for both men and women, there is a threshold (5 or more hours) beyond which neither gender nor job type makes a difference in terms of the perceived interference between work and family, and of job and personal costs.

## REFERENCES

- Arber, S. and Ginn, J. (1990). The meaning of informal care: Gender and the contribution of elderly people. Ageing and Society, 10: 429-454.
- Betcherman, G., McMullen, K., Leckie, N. and Caron, C. 1994. The Canadian workplace in transition. Queen's University at Kingston: IRC Press.
- Brody, Elaine (1990). Women in the Middle: Their Parent-Care Years. New York: Springer.
- Cohen, S. and Williamson, G. 1988. Perceived stress in a probability sample of the United States. In S. Spacapan and S. Oskamp (eds.), The Social Psychology of Health (pp 361-382). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Committee on Women and Economic Restructuring, 1994. Women and economic restructuring. Ottawa: Canadian Labour Market and Productivity Centre.
- Duxbury, L., Higgins, C., Lee, C. and Mills, S. (1991). Balancing work and family: A study of the Canadian Federal Public Sector. London, Ontario: National Centre for Management Research and Development.
- East Anglian Economic Newsletter. 1992. Economics Research Centre, Norwich, UK: University of East Anglia.
- Financial Post Magazine, 1993. The Boys Club: No Girls Allowed. September.
- Galinsky, E. (1986). Family life and corporate policies. Pp. 109-145. In M. Yogma and T. Brazalton (eds.), In Support of Families. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Galinsky, E., Love, M., Bragonier, P.H., and Hughes, D. (1987). The family study. Foundation Report. New York, New York: Bank Street College of Education.
- Gottlieb, B.H., Kelloway, K., & Fraboni, M. (1994). Aspects of eldercare that place employees at risk. The Gerontologist, 34(6): 815-821.



- Gutek, B.A., Searle, S. and Klepa, L. (1991). Rational versus gender role explanations for work-family conflict. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(4): 560-568.
- Lero, D. (1992). Special tabulation. University of Guelph: Canadian National Child Care Study.
- MacBride-King, J. 1990. Work and family: Employment challenge of the '90s. Compensation Research Centre, Report 59-90. Ottawa: The Conference Board of Canada.
- Martin Matthews, Anne, and Rosenthal, Carolyn J. (1993). Balancing work and family in an aging society: The Canadian experience. Pp. 96-119 in George L. Maddox and M. Powell Lawton (eds.), Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics: Focus on Kinship, Aging and Social Change. Springer.
- Martin Matthews, Anne, and Campbell, Lori D. (1995). Gender, employment and informal care. Forthcoming in Sara Arber and Jay Ginn (eds.), Connecting Gender and Aging: Sociological Approaches to Gender Relations in Later Life. Milton Keynes, U.K.: Open University Press.
- Neal, M.B., Chapman, N.J., Ingersoll-Dayton, B. and Emlen, A.C. 1993. Balancing work and caregiving for children, adults and elders. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Peitchinis, S. 1989. Women at work: Discrimination and response. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart.
- Pineo, Peter, C. (1985). Revisions of the Pineo-Porter-McRoberts socioeconomic classification of occupations for the 1981 Census. QSEP Report No. 125. Hamilton: McMaster University.
- Scharlach, A.E. and Boyd, S.L. 1989. Caregiving and employment: Results of an employee survey. The Gerontologist, 29(3): 382-387.

TABLE 1

Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Full-time Employees

	<u>Women</u>			<u>Men</u>		
	Managerial/ Professional	Semi- Professional	C.S.S.*	M/P	S-P	C.S.S.
Age	42.9	42.8	42.6	44.8	42.2	42.4
No. of Children - 18 years	.89	.83	.82	1.2	1.2	1.1
Average Hours Worked Per Week	45.4	43.1	40.7	48.7	46.2	48.2
Proportion Married/ Common-Law	77%	75%	78%	92%	87%	86%
<sup>1</sup> Personal Income	6.9	6.5	5.1	8.9	8.1	7.1
<sup>2</sup> Household Income	8.2	7.5	5.9	8.9	8.2	6.9

\*Clerical - sales - services - crafts and trades

<sup>1</sup> Legend: Personal Income Categories:

5 = \$20,000 - \$29,999

6 = \$30,000 - \$39,999

7 = \$40,000 - \$49,999

8 = \$50,000 - \$59,999

<sup>2</sup> Legend: Household Income Categories

5 = \$40,000 - \$49,999

6 = \$50,000 - \$59,999

7 = \$60,000 - \$69,999

8 = \$70,000 - \$79,999

TABLE 2

Involvement in Care by Job Type

	Women In Total Sample		Managerial/ Professional		Semi- Professional		C-S-S	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Elderly Relatives	617	22.9	186	20.8	137	19.5	278	26.3
Elder, No Care	992	36.8	337	37.7	251	35.7	393	37.2
Elder, 1 - 4 Hours Care	732	27.2	252	28.2	205	29.1	267	25.3
Elder, 5+ Hours Care	355	13.2	118	13.2	111	15.8	118	11.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>2696</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>893</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>704</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1056</b>	<b>100.0</b>

$\chi^2 = 20.8, df = 6, p = .002$

	Men In Total Sample		Managerial/ Professional		Semi- Professional		C-S-S	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
No Elderly Relatives	420	21.2	178	18.0	94	21.5	140	26.4
Elder, No Care	752	37.9	402	40.6	175	40.0	168	31.7
Elder, 1 - 4 Hours Care	658	33.2	340	34.3	130	29.7	178	33.6
Elder, 5+ Hours Care	154	7.8	71	7.2	38	8.7	44	8.3
<b>Total</b>	<b>1984</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>991</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>530</b>	<b>100.0</b>

$\chi^2 = 22.6, df = 6, p = .0009$

TABLE 3

Female Carers

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Provide 1 - 4 Hours of Help</u>			<u>5+ Hours of Help</u>		
	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-prob.</u>	<u>Means</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-prob</u>	<u>Means</u>
<u>Work/Family Conflict</u>						
WIF	13.06	.000	1 = 11.21 2 = 11.42 3 = 10.39	n.s.		
FIW	n.s.			n.s.		
<u>Job Opportunity Costs</u>	6.35	.002	1 = 28.48 2 = 26.93	n.s.		
<u>Personal Costs</u>						
Stress	n.s.			n.s.		
Personal Opportunity Costs	n.s.			n.s.		

**\* Legend:**

1 = Managerial/Professional Occupations

2 = Semi-Professional Occupations

3 = Clerical, Sales, Service, Crafts and Trades Occupations

**TABLE 4**

**Male Carers**

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Provide 1 - 4 Hours of Help</u>			<u>5+ Hours of Help</u>		
	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-prob.</u>	<u>Means</u>	<u>F-Ratio</u>	<u>F-prob</u>	<u>Means</u>
<u>Work/Family Conflict</u>						
WIF	7.24	.0008	1 = 9.74 2 = 10.6 3 = 10.6	n.s.		
FIW	n.s.			n.s.		
<u>Job-Related Costs</u>						
Job Opportunity Costs	n.s.			n.s.		
<u>Personal Costs</u>						
Stress	n.s.			n.s.		
Personal Opportunity Costs	3.5	.03		n.s.		

**\* Legend:**

1 = Managerial/Professional Occupations

2 = Semi-Professional Occupations

3 = Clerical, Sales, Service, Crafts and Trades Occupations

TABLE 5a

Helpers

1 - 4 Hours

Intersection of Gender and Job Type in Analysis of Outcomes

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Occupation</u>		<u>Gender</u>		<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	
	F	p	F	p	F	p
WIF	F = 17.3	(.000)	22.5	(.000)		n.s.
FIW	occ.	n.s.	8.02	(.005)		n.s.
PSS (Stress)	occ.	n.s.	10.1	(.002)		n.s.
Job Opportunity Costs	F = 5.5	(.004)	5.1	(.022)		n.s.
Personal Opportunity Costs	F = 5.8	(.003)	17.4	(.000)		n.s.

TABLE 5b

Helpers

5 + Hours

Intersection of Gender and Job Type in Analysis of Outcomes

<u>Variable</u>	<u>Occupation</u>		<u>Gender</u>		<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	
	F	p	F	p	F	p
WIF	n.s.		n.s.		n.s.	
FIW	3.4	(.03)	n.s.		n.s.	
PSS	n.s.		4.02	(.045)	n.s.	
Job Opportunity Costs	n.s.		n.s.		4.1	(.018)
Personal Opportunity Costs	n.s.		7.2	(.007)	n.s.	

IESOP RESEARCH PAPERS

Number	Title	Author(s)
(1996)		
No. 1:	Public Pensions in Canada	J.B. Burbidge
No. 2:	How Old Is Old? Revising the Definition Based on Life Table Criteria	F.T. Denton B.G. Spencer
No. 3:	The Future Population of Canada and Its Age Distribution	F.T. Denton C.H. Feaver B.G. Spencer
No. 4:	Caught in the Middle? Occupancy in Multiple Roles and Help to Parents in a National Probability Sample of Canadian Adults	C.J. Rosenthal A. Martin-Matthews S.H. Matthews
No. 5:	Women, Work and Caregiving: How Much Difference Does a Great Job Really Make?	A. Martin-Matthews C.J. Rosenthal