

Categorizing Married Couple Expected Employment Prioritization in the Post-Recession United States

Shannon N. Davis
George Mason University

ABSTRACT. This paper focuses on one possible influence of the Great Recession on family life, the expected level of support for relocation due to job opportunity. Using unique data from 116 married individuals in the United States, married couples are categorized by expectations for employment prioritization. Couples are categorized as egalitarian (reporting equal willingness to relocate in support of either spouse's employment), traditional (reporting greater willingness to relocate in support of the husband's employment), or non-traditional (reporting greater willingness to relocate in support of the wife's employment). Analyses reveal significant differences in the factors correlated with being categorized as egalitarian, traditional, or non-traditional. Couple history, measured as marital duration and previous career prioritization, and husband's human capital characteristics (education and occupational prestige) are the main factors that distinguish among the couple types. The analysis provides insight into the ways couples renegotiate gender and power vis-à-vis their interaction with structural constraints.

Keywords: family relocation; career prioritization; work-family decisions

Direct correspondence to Shannon N. Davis @ sdaviso@gmu.edu.

Categorizing Married Couple Expected Employment Prioritization in the Post-Recession United States

Career prioritization in American couples has been the topic of study for some scholars interested in the subtle ways gender inequality is manifested in relationships. Scholars have noted that dual-earner couples still tend to prioritize men's careers, although many couples note that during their relationship history, each person's career had at one time been prioritized (Moen and Huang, 2010; Pixley, 2008; Pixley and Moen, 2003). Career prioritization may reflect utilitarian approaches to a division of household labor, that is, where the spouse who has the most promise in the labor market has their employment prioritized (Becker, 1991). Given the gender gap in wages (Boushey, 2011), this human capital-based approach may explain why overall, married couples are more likely to prioritize men's employment options over women's (Pixley and Moen, 2003).

The Great Recession hit all sectors of the U.S. economy, but the predominant impact initially was felt by men, as more than half of job losses in the first half of the Recession were in manufacturing and construction (Goodman and Mance, 2011). Couples may have been dual-earner until this recession, yielding accidental prioritization on one person's employment if only because they remain employed. Previous research has also noted that when a wife's employment was prioritized, it was the result of an opportunity that had to be taken and lasted only for a short period of time (Pixley and Moen, 2003; Tichenor, 2005), where couples are creating their own informal career customizations (Moen and Huang, 2010). Given the Great Recession, it remains to be seen how contemporary American married couples may respond to future labor market prospects, especially if those prospects may challenge traditionally gendered norms in marriage.

The purpose of this paper is to examine expected employment prioritization in contemporary American married couples. More specifically, given the rapid job losses early in the Great Recession among men, did couples plan to prioritize men's employment over women's? If an opportunity arose to relocate for the wife's employment, which couples would be more likely to relocate? In families, what factors are correlated with expected employment prioritization? Using unique data from the 2010 Work and Family Survey on expected level of support for relocation, married couples are categorized based on reports of spouses' expected willingness to relocate for hypothetical job opportunities. A key contribution of this analysis is improved insight into the ways couples may have been renegotiating gender relations in a time of economic uncertainty.

Theoretical and Empirical Background

Previous research examining employment prioritization tends to utilize either human capital theory or bargaining theory. The human capital model assumes that decisions about employment prioritization, including family relocation in response to employment opportunities, will be based on the prospect of enhanced economic opportunities for the family unit (Challiol and Mignonac, 2005; Clark and Huang, 2006; Clark and Withers, 2002; Cooke, 2003; Rabe,

2011; Shihadeh, 1991). Couples employ a cost-benefit analysis of every household member's gains and losses based on their own accrued human capital (among other factors - (Mincer 1978)). Couples would prioritize employment based upon the person who has the greater labor market advantage relative to others in the labor market, i.e., the person holding more human capital. The typical application of this approach presumes that families are organized around the male breadwinner model, in which men are expected to provide for and support their families. As a result, men's jobs are more likely to be prioritized over the life course of the family, often at the expense of women's career aspirations and employment opportunities (Boyle et al. 2001; Jürges 2006). Further, couples weigh the potential impact of a move on both their own and their partner's employment opportunities, although each individual weighs their own hypothetical gains or losses more heavily (Abraham, Auspurg, and Hinz, 2010; Abraham and Nisic, 2012). Human capital theory would predict that married individuals would try to maximize spousal labor market advantages or opportunities and so would be more willing to relocate to support the spouse with the greater human capital (e.g., educational attainment, occupational prestige, and/or age (as a measure of future employment eligibility)).

Bargaining theory argues, and subsequent research has found, that the partner who has the best bargaining position within a couple (often measured as holding greater resources valued in the labor market) typically has greater power and ability to emphasize their own priorities, including their employment/career (Blau, Ferber, and Winkler, 2001; Blood and Wolfe, 1960; England and Farkas, 1986; Manser and Brown, 1980; Shihadeh, 1991; Tichenor, 2005). Because of the cultural construction of gender, this bargaining process can also reflect gendered privilege. Historically husbands have generally been able to mobilize their greater resources to prioritize their careers (encouraging specialization in the home), including relocating the family for job opportunities (Baldrige, Eddleston, and Veiga, 2006; Bielby and Bielby, 1992; Hardill et al., 1997; Shauman and Noonan, 2006). Bargaining theory would predict that married individuals' preferences would reflect the ability of the spouse holding greater relative resources (e.g., educational attainment, occupational prestige, and/or age), and thus more power, to achieve ends that benefit them.

The best known study of married couple employment prioritization, the 1998-1999 Cornell Couples and Career Study of middle-class couples in upstate New York, found that during their relationship history, each person's career had at one time been prioritized (Pixley and Moen, 2003). However, researchers have also found that when a wife's employment was prioritized, it was the result of an unexpected opportunity and was usually short-lived (Pixley and Moen, 2003; Tichenor, 2005). Two measures of relative resources, education and age, were related to the likelihood of prioritizing a spouse's career in the expected directions. When husbands were older than their wives or when they had more education than their wives when the relationship began, there was a decreased likelihood of prioritizing the wife's career over his. When the wife had more education when the relationship began, there was a decreased likelihood that the husband's career would be prioritized over hers (Pixley and Moen 2003; Tichenor 2005).

Much has changed in the United States in the time since the Cornell study was completed. For example, newly married couples in 2009 were older and more educated than were newly married couples in 1996 (compare Kreider and Fields (2002) and Kreider and Ellis (2011)). The economy has shifted dramatically; dual-earner couples in the late 1990s may have expected to be able to shift back and forth in their employment prioritization given the strength of the economy in most sectors. The Great Recession and slow recovery provides a unique researchable moment, as more women are likely to be in positions of power vis-à-vis earnings (Legerski and Cornwall, 2010; Mattingly and Smith, 2010). As such, married individuals may now make different determinations about which spouse's employment to prioritize.

Previous research has documented other factors that shape spousal preferences for career prioritization, beyond sex differences and the influence of human capital (as direct or relative measures). Two of these factors are years of marriage and previous career prioritization. Individuals who have been married longer are more likely to support relocation for spousal job opportunities (Davis, Jacobsen, and Anderson, 2012). Couples tend to develop trust, long-term understandings of reciprocity, and a shared interpretation of their family's best interest throughout marriages. Further, Pixley (2008) documents complicated career hierarchy decisions that scaffolded upon one another throughout the marital life course, highlighting the need to understand previous career prioritization when assessing thoughts about future relocation opportunities.

The Current Study

This study classifies married couples into categories based upon the expected levels of support for relocation for a hypothetical job opportunity. What factors influence whether the husband's or the wife's career will be prioritized – or whether both will be equally prioritized? A human capital approach would suggest that couples will work to maximize benefits for the couple and prioritize employment when individuals may hold a comparative advantage in the labor market. Spouses may try to maximize their labor force position by choosing to prioritize employment of either or both spouses who hold a possible advantage over others in the labor market. Thus, rather than specialize and putting most of the economic eggs in one basket (a risky decision in an uncertain economy), couples may desire to prioritize employment of individuals who possess possible advantages in the labor market, such as high levels of education, professional jobs (as they have taken relatively fewer losses in the Great Recession (Goodman and Mance, 2011)), and young age. If the premises of human capital theory are supported, wives' careers would be prioritized if they held high levels of human capital, husbands' careers would be prioritized if they held high levels of human capital, and both careers would be equally prioritized if both spouses possessed high levels of human capital.

Bargaining theory suggests that the spouse who holds greater resources would have an advantage in the social exchange and thus be able to influence the couple decision making in their favor. If the influence of relative resources on employment prioritization was not gendered

but strictly based on the power implied by the resources in the marital exchange, then we should expect couples to be more likely to prioritize wives' employment as they would husbands' employment if wives held greater relative power (measured by resources such as education and occupational prestige). This association is expected especially due to the precarious nature of men in the labor market during the Great Recession (Kochhar, 2011).

Method

Data

To address questions of employment prioritization, this paper utilizes national survey data collected through random digit dialing (RDD) in August and September 2010. The Work and Family Survey, approved by the author's university Institutional Review Board, was a telephone survey designed to investigate married individuals' attitudes and behaviors in the wake of the Great Recession, which officially began in December 2007 and ended in June 2009 (Boushey, 2011; Goodman and Mance, 2011; Kochhar, 2011). After providing verbal informed consent, respondents completed a questionnaire that included items regarding recent employment changes and expectations for future employment changes, demographic information, and responses to a vignette on hypothetical job opportunities. Only 116 of the 343 respondents who participated in the survey are included in the analysis (representing 116 couples) due to an overrepresentation of individuals who were retired or had retired spouses. (The small sample overall sample size and resulting small analytic sample represent a key limitation to this study. I discuss this limitation in the final section of the paper.) Table 1 presents the overall sample demographics. Only married individuals were participants in this telephone-based survey. As noted below, respondents were asked to respond for themselves and their spouses on a number of questions, including responses to the vignette on hypothetical job opportunities. These types of questions about spousal attitudes and behaviors asked of one spouse that yield couple categorization are consistent with classic family-focused research (e.g., the division of household labor and perceptions of fairness (Bianchi, et al., 2000; Greenstein, 1996)). See Table 1.

Expected Level of Support for Family Mobility. Level of support for prioritizing spouses' employment was measured as expected level of support for family mobility for a job opportunity, measurement that is consistent with previous research on career prioritization (e.g., Baldridge, Eddleston, and Veiga, 2006; Bielby and Bielby, 1992). Employed respondents were queried about the extent to which they would possibly relocate for their spouse's employment (or their spouse would relocate for their employment) using the prompt described below. Respondents were asked how likely they would be to respond as described:

Imagine that your spouse was offered a promotion, but you would be required to relocate to a city 500 miles from where you currently live. I am going to read a list of possible responses. Please rate each response on a scale from 1 to 7 where 1 = not a likely response and 7 = exactly how you would respond. (1) Be happy for her/him, (2) Be jealous of their accomplishment, (3) Start researching new places to live, (4) Refuse to move with her/him, and (5) Offer to find a new job once we move.

Items 2 and 4 were reverse coded prior to constructing an averaged index. Higher values reflect greater levels of expected support. Respondents were given the same prompt where they were asked to think of how their spouse would respond if they (the respondent) were offered a promotion/job. Cronbach's α for the respondent's expected level of support was .67 (women = .61, men = .71), while the Cronbach's α for the spouse's expected level of support was .60 (women = .56, men = .65).

The use of hypothetical situations to assess possible behavioral outcomes is not unique to this study. Previous research has found hypothetical situations to be valid predictors of actual future behavior, including relocation decisions (Blamey and Bennett, 2001; Brett and Reilly, 1988; Louviere, Hensher, and Swait, 2000).

Theoretically Derived Predictors. Three sets of predictors based on human capital theory were included: wives' and husbands' *age* in years, *educational attainment*, and *current occupation*. Respondents were asked to describe both their own and their spouse's educational background, ranging from having less than a high school education (1) to having a graduate degree (7). *Educational attainment* was treated in the analysis as a continuous measure (consistent with other social and behavioral research – see DeMaris (2004) for statistical examples); Table 2 notes the significant correlation between spouses' education levels (as well as all other predictor variables in the analysis). Each respondent was asked to provide the job title from their and their spouse's current primary job. Each occupation was mapped onto the ISCO (International Standard Classification of Occupations) occupational prestige scale. Dummy variables for the main occupational categories were constructed and then included in the analysis as one contrast: professional (manager, professional, technical – 64% of wives and 53% of husbands) versus non-professional (service and manual labor) respondents. Additional analysis determined that this comparison (professional vs. non-professional) was the only significant contrast. See Table 2.

Bargaining, or relative resources, theory argues for the relative importance of one spouse's human capital characteristics of the other. Therefore, sets of dummy variables were included in the model examining the influence of relative resources on employment prioritization category membership. *Relative education* is included as three dummy variables with husband having more education as the reference category. *Relative age* is included with husband was older as the reference category. *Relative occupational prestige* is included with husband holding professional job and wife not holding professional occupation as the reference category.

Control Variables. *Sex* of the respondent was included as a control variable (with men as the reference category), as subsequent analysis demonstrated the gendered nature of expected level of support for one's self and one's spouse. The Work and Family Study overall has racial variation (81% white); however, the sample used in this analysis yielded 91% white respondents. Alternative specifications showed no racial differences in employment prioritization category membership and no influence on the results overall by including race. Therefore, for parsimony (especially given the sample size), race was not included as a control variable in the analysis. (Neither spouse's hours employed were significant predictors, nor were number of children; therefore, those characteristics were not included in the analysis.)

Household characteristics that were included as control variables were *marital duration* in years and *previous career prioritization*. *Previous career prioritization* was measured by responses to the following question: “Think about all of the major decisions that you and your spouse have made since you have been together, such as changing jobs, having children, going back to school, or moving. Overall, whose career was given more priority in these decisions, yours or your spouse’s?” Responses were included as a set of dummy variables with “prioritized neither career” as the reference category. About 14% of the sample reported the couple having previously prioritized the wife’s career. The remaining 86% were almost equally split between those couples who had prioritized the husband’s career and neither career.

Findings

Categorizing Expected Employment Prioritization

Table 3 reports the averaged responses to the five items measuring expected level of support for relocation. Wife expected support level is the average of responses when the wife is the respondent or for spouse expected level of support when the husband is the respondent. Husband expected support level is constructed in a similar manner. Values are then presented by sex of respondent (wife or husband). The results suggest there may be some social desirability bias in responses, as male respondents report that they would be more supportive of relocating for their wives than they believe their wives would be of relocating for their job opportunities. Consistent with the concept of being a “tied partner” (Jürges, 2006), women report that they would be more likely to support moving for their husbands’ jobs than they think their husbands would for them. See Table 3.

The expected level of support measure was gendered and was not normally distributed. Three categories of level of support were created within wives and husbands as separate groups: high, medium, and low. Wives were categorized as having high support if their expected level of support was between 6 and 7 (approximately one standard deviation above wives’ mean expected level of support). Wives were categorized as having medium support if their expected level of support was between 5 and 5.8 (approximately one standard deviation below the mean), while wives were categorized as having low support if their expected level of support was less than 5 (more than one standard deviation below the mean). Husbands were categorized as having high support if their expected level of support was between 5.8 and 7 (approximately one standard deviation above husbands’ mean expected level of support). Husbands were categorized as having medium support if their expected level of support was between 4.4 and 5.6 (approximately one standard deviation below the mean), while husbands were categorized as having low support if their expected level of support was less than 4.4 (more than one standard deviation below the mean). Table 4 reflects the percentage of respondents who fall into each of the categories, separated by sex of respondent. As in Table 3, wives report higher levels of support for their husbands’ employment than they think their husbands would for their employment. Husbands report having higher levels of support for their wives’ employment than they think their wives would for their employment. See Table

Categories of expected employment prioritization were constructed based on the respondent's expected level of support and their report of their spouse's expected level of support. *Egalitarian* couples (55% of the sample) were couples where equal support was expected for relocating for either spouse's job opportunity (wife high support /husband high support; wife medium support /husband medium support). *Non-traditional* couples (20% of the sample) were those couples where the husband was expected to support the wife more than wife was expected to support husband in relocating for a job opportunity (wife medium support /husband high support; wife low support /husband high support; wife low support /husband medium support). *Traditional* couples (25% of the sample) were those couples where the wife was expected to support husband in relocating for his job opportunity more than the husband was expected to support wife if she were offered a job opportunity (wife high support /husband medium support; wife high support /husband low support; wife medium support / husband low support).

Multivariate Analysis

Although the categories of married couples were created from rank orderings of expected levels of support by spouses, the categories themselves are distinct groups. As such, multinomial logistic regression was employed to investigate the factors associated with being categorized as traditional or non-traditional as opposed to egalitarian (the reference category). That is, how does a change in one predictor (e.g., wife's age) change the odds of being in the category of traditional or non-traditional expected employment prioritizers relative to the reference category of egalitarian expected employment prioritizers?

The first set of columns in Table 5 reports the results of the multinomial logistic regression analysis predicting membership in the family categories where each spouse's characteristics are included as predictors. Each year of marriage was predicted to lead to a 7% increase in the likelihood of a couple being categorized as non-traditional versus egalitarian. Couples where husbands had high levels of education were more likely to be categorized as non-traditional versus egalitarian, although couples with a professional husband were 84% less likely to be categorized as non-traditional versus egalitarian. The couple was 6% more likely to be categorized as a non-traditional couple (as opposed to an egalitarian couple) if the respondent was male. See Table 5.

Couples were three times as likely to be categorized as traditional (versus egalitarian) if they had previously prioritized the husband's career. Finally, couples were almost six times as likely to be categorized as a traditional couple (relative to a egalitarian couple) if the respondent was female.

The second set of columns in Table 5 interrogates assertions of bargaining theory, that individuals with greater relative resources would be more likely to influence decision-making in a couple. Husbands' human capital characteristics are included in this model as controls. None of the measures capturing relative resources are statistically significant predictors of membership in the employment prioritization categories.

Conclusions

Given the job losses throughout in the Great Recession, researchers have begun to wonder how married couples are making decisions about prioritizing employment opportunities as the recovery begins. This paper uses unique data from married individuals to create three categories of couples based on the respondents' reports of the couples' likelihood of migration for job opportunities. The majority of married individuals were placed into the egalitarian or non-traditional categories. However, one-fourth still report that they would expect to prioritize the husband's employment over the wife's employment. This categorization seems to be a shift in expected prioritization. These results are largely consistent with Pixley's (2008) findings regarding decision-making patterns as well as Moen and Huang's (2010) findings that dual-earner couples may create a gendered career customization strategy that ultimately privileges husbands' jobs. The results in this paper could be due to the Great Recession as respondents report that they and their spouse are likely to be pragmatic in their responses to employment opportunities.

Egalitarian couples, those who respondents report are equally willing to move for either spouse's employment opportunity, seem to be those couples who are more recently married. Human capital theory found no support in these models when measured by wives' characteristics. There is some support for human capital theory when measured by husbands' characteristics, as couples where husbands have more education are more likely to be non-traditional rather than egalitarian. This result could be considered as support for human capital theory as respondents in couples where husbands have more education may feel as though they could move to support the wife's job and the husband would not have trouble finding employment. This result is net of husband's occupational prestige. Couples are more likely to be non-traditional, that is to say, expected to be more likely to relocate for the wife's job opportunity (at least relative to being egalitarian), when husbands are not professionals. Here, respondents in couples where husbands are not professionals likely feel the residual (if not direct) effects of the Great Recession in potential job opportunities (Goodman and Mance, 2011) and thus would be more likely to expect relocate for the wife's hypothetical job opportunity regardless of her own occupational status. Given previous research on dual-earner couples' responses to job security mismatch (Moen and Huang, 2010), this is entirely plausible.

Unexpectedly, relative resources between spouses (e.g., age, education, and occupational prestige) revealed no differences across the three groups of couples. These results suggest that married individuals may be thinking about the objective opportunities of each partner in the labor market (here, more likely the husband) rather than which partner has the within-couple comparative advantage. This finding seems to contradict bargaining theory and could be a reflection of the Great Recession's influence on couple decision-making processes and economic priorities. In-depth interviews would allow for further investigation into the factors married couples weigh when thinking about employment prioritization.

Future research should build on this study by increasing the sample size, having a more racially diverse sample, and incorporating spouse responses directly. One appropriate critique of this study is the limited nature of the data. The results are limited in generalizability due to the

relative lack of racial diversity in respondents included in the analytic sample. Additionally, there is the possibility that the non-responding spouse in a couple might not agree with how their preferences and expectations were characterized by their spouse. While spousal attributions for behavior measured through response to a hypothetical situation have been argued to be reliable and valid (Fincham and Bradbury, 1987), a better design would collect data from both spouses. As this research focused on heterosexual couples, reproducing the study with married gay and lesbian couples could help disentangle some of the gendered power dynamics hinted at by these findings. Finally, investigation of the usefulness of work-life policies in organizations that actively support the career priorities of employees and their spouses could yield information about best practices that support family well-being.

The distinctions across the three categories of couples may be of use to family life educators and others working with families who may experience relocation due to employment opportunities. This research highlights the gendered nature of expected employment prioritization as well as the extent to which husbands' resources are influential in the relocation decision-making process, challenging cultural presumptions that all couples respond to employment opportunities and change by rationally considering each partner's opportunities. The variations in couple-level prioritizations as well as the gendered influence of resources can be used to guide conversations with couples about their own expectations, priorities, and how gender plays a role in their decision-making. Employers can also use these findings as they recruit potential employees. Developing a set of policies that more fully support the whole family system of current and potential employees, including the decisions to prioritize careers, will benefit both employees (through job opportunities and stability) and employers (through reduced turnover).

This paper presents compelling insight into married couples' work-family responses to the Great Recession. Respondents suggest that employment opportunities are so valued that taking advantage of those opportunities based on each partner's individual resources is a necessary response. Specialization, especially gendered specialization, does continue to be a pathway some couples pursue, but there does not seem to be a resurgence of specialization around prioritizing men's employment. Cooke (2011) argues that political economies have not been able to successfully reduce both class and gender inequality, that the mechanisms that lead to greater equality along one axis tend to encourage inequality on the other. Is it possible that the increased class inequality that has resulted from the Great Recession can lead to greater gender equality, especially in families? Regarding employment prioritization, this paper suggests that the answer is yes, it is possible.

Shannon N. Davis is an Associate Professor of Sociology in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at George Mason University, 4400 University Dr. MSN 3G5, Fairfax, VA 22030.

References

- Abraham, M., Auspurg, K., & Hinz, T. (2010). Migration decisions within dual-earner partnerships: A test of bargaining theory. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 72, 876–892.
- Abraham, M., & Nisic, N. (2012). A simple mobility game for couples' migration decisions and some quasi-experimental evidence. *Rationality and Society*, 24, 168-197. DOI: 10.1177/1043463112440684
- Baldrige, D. C., Eddleston, K. A., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Saying “no” to being uprooted: The impact of family and gender on willingness to relocate. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 79, 131-149. DOI: 10.1348/096317905X53174
- Becker, G. S. (1991). *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M. A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J. P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces*, 79(1), 191–228.
- Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1992). I will follow him: Family ties, gender-role beliefs, and reluctance to relocate for a better job. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 97(5), 1241-1267.
- Blamey, R., & Bennett, J. (2001). Yea-saying and validation of a choice model of green product choice. In J. Bennett and R. Blamey (Eds.), *The choice modeling approach to environmental valuation* (pp. 179-201). Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Blau, F. D., Ferber, M. A., & Winkler, A. E. (2001). *The economics of women, men, and work*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living*. New York: Free Press.
- Boushey, H. (2011). Not working: Unemployment among married couples - Unemployment continues to plague families in today's tough job market. Washington, DC: Center for American Progress.
- Boyle, P., Cooke, T. J., Halfacree, K., & Smith, D. (2001). A cross-national comparison of the impact of family migration on women's employment status. *Demography*, 38(2), 201–213.
- Brett, J. M., & Reilly, A. H. (1988). On the road again: Predicting the job transfer decision. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 73(4), 614-620.

- Challiol, H., & Mignonac, K. (2005). Relocation decision-making and couple relationships: A quantitative and qualitative study of dual-earner couples. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(3), 247-274. DOI: 10.1002/job.311
- Clark, W. A. V., & Huang, Y. (2006). Balancing move and work: Women's labour market exits and entries after family migration. *Population, Space and Place*, 12(1), 31-44. DOI: 10.1002/psp.388
- Clark, W. A. V., & Withers, S. D. (2002). Disentangling the interaction of migration, mobility, and labor-force participation. *Environment and Planning A*, 34, 923-945. DOI:10.1068/a34216
- Cooke, L. P. (2006). "Doing" gender in context: Household bargaining and risk of divorce in Germany and the United States. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 112(2), 442-472.
- Cooke, L.P. (2011). *Gender-class equality in political economies*. New York: Routledge.
- Cooke, T. J. (2003). Family migration and the relative earnings of husbands and wives. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 93(2), 338-349. DOI: 10.1111/1467-8306.9302005
- Davis, S. N., Jacobsen, S. K., & Anderson, J. (2012). From the great recession to greater gender equality? Family mobility and the intersection of race, class, and gender. *Marriage & Family Review*, 48, 601-620. DOI: 10.1080/01494929.2012.691083
- DeMaris, A. (2004). *Regression with social data: Modeling continuous and limited response variables*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley and Sons.
- England, P., & Farkas, G. (1986). *Households, employment, and gender: A social, economic, and demographic view*. New York: Aldine Transaction.
- Fincham, F. D., & Bradbury, T. N. (1987). The impact of attributions in marriage: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 510-517.
- Goodman, C. J., & Mance, S. M. (2011). *Employment loss and the 2007-09 recession: An overview*. Monthly Labor Review. Washington, DC: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Greenstein, T. N. (1996). Gender ideology and perceptions of the fairness of the division of household labor: Effects on marital quality. *Social Forces*, 74(3), 1029-1042.
- Hardill, I., Green, A. E., Dudleston, A. C., & Owen, D. W. (1997). Who decides what? Decision making in dual-career households. *Work, Employment, and Society*, 11(2), 313-326. DOI: 10.1177/0950017097112006

- Jürges, H. (2006). Gender ideology, division of housework, and the geographic mobility of families. *Review of Economics of the Household*, 4(4), 299-323. DOI: 10.1007/s11150-006-0015-2
- Kochhar, R. (2011). *In two years of economic recovery, women lost jobs, men found them*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center Social and Demographic Trends. Retrieved from http://pewsocialtrends.org/files/2011/07/Employment-by-Gender_FINAL_7-6-11.pdf
- Kreider, R. M., & Ellis, E. (2011). *Number, timing, and duration of marriages and divorces: 2009. Current Population Reports, P70-125*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Kreider, R. M., & Fields, J. M. (2001). *Number, timing, and duration of marriages and divorces: Fall 1996. Current Population Reports, P70-80*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Legerski, E. M., & Cornwall, M. (2010). Working-class job loss, gender, and the negotiation of household labor. *Gender & Society*, 24(4), 447-474. DOI: 10.1177/0891243210374600
- Louviere, J. J., Hensher, D. A., & Swait, J. D. (2000). *Stated choice methods: Analysis and applications* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Manser, M., & Brown, M. (1980). Marriage and household decision-making: A bargaining analysis. *International Economic Review*, 21(1), 31-44.
- Mattingly, M. J., & Smith, K. E. (2010). Changes in wives' employment when husbands stop working: A recession-prosperity comparison. *Family Relations*, 59, 343-357. DOI: 10.1111/j.1741-3729.2010.00607.x
- Mincer, J. (1978). Family migration decisions. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 86(5), 749-773.
- Moen, P., & Huang, Q. (2010). Customizing careers by opting out or shifting jobs: Dual-earners seeking life-course "fit". Pp. 73-94 in *Workplace flexibility: Realigning 20th-century jobs for a 21st-century workforce* (K. Christensen and B. Schneider, eds.). Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Pixley, J. E. (2008). Life course patterns of career-prioritizing decisions and occupational attainment in dual-earner couples. *Work and Occupations*, 35(2), 127-163. DOI: 10.1177/0730888408315543
- Pixley, J. E., & Moen, P. (2003). Prioritizing careers. Pp. 183-200 in *It's about time: Couples and careers* (P. Moen, ed.). Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.
- Rabe, B. (2011). Dual-earner migration: Earnings gains, employment and self-selection. *Journal of Population Economics*, 24(2), 477-497. DOI: 10.1007/s00148-009-0292-1

Shauman, K. A., & Noonan, M. C. (2006). Family migration and labor force outcomes: Sex differences in occupational context. *Social Forces*, 85, 1735-1764.

Shihadeh, E. S. (1991). The prevalence of husband-centered migration: Employment consequences for married mothers. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53(2), 432-444.

Tichenor, V. J. (2005). *Earning more and getting less: Why successful wives can't buy equality*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Table 1

Sample Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean or % of sample	SD
<u>Employment Prioritization Category</u>		
Egalitarian	.55	
Non-traditional	.20	
Traditional	.25	
<u>Human Capital Characteristics</u>		
Wife Education	4.70	1.71
Wife Age	44.49	10.58
Wife Professional? (1 = yes)	.64	
Husband Education	4.38	1.8
Husband Age	46.69	11.05
Husband Professional? (1 = yes)	.53	
<u>Relative Resources</u>		
<u>Education</u>		
Husband more Education	.20	
Same Education	.43	
Wife more Education	.37	
<u>Age</u>		
Husband older	.64	
Same age	.11	
Wife older	.25	
<u>Occupational Status</u>		
Husband Professional, wife not	.16	
Same occupational prestige	.57	
Wife Professional, husband not	.27	
Respondent is female (1 = yes)	.61	
Marital Duration in years	17.40	11.21
<u>Previous Career Prioritization</u>		
Prioritized Husband's Career	.42	
Prioritized Wife's Career	.14	
Neither Prioritized	.44	

Note. $N = 116$ married individuals.

Table 2

Zero-Order Correlations Among Predictors

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
1. Female (1=yes)																			
2. Marital Duration in years	-0.014																		
3. Prioritized Wife's Career (1 = yes)	-0.099	-0.085																	
4. Prioritized Husband's Career (1 = yes)	-0.065	0.043	-0.336																
5. Prioritized Neither Career (1 = yes)	0.133	0.016	-0.361	-0.757															
6. Wife's Education	-0.034	0.216	0.085	-0.291	0.230														
7. Wife Professional? (1 = yes)	-0.021	0.270	0.034	-0.184	0.159	0.322													
8. Wife's age	-0.002	0.513	-0.031	0.059	-0.037	0.069	0.298												
9. Husband's Education	-0.141	0.310	0.013	-0.128	0.118	0.584	0.315	0.189											
10. Husband Professional? (1 = yes)	-0.039	0.169	0.116	-0.038	-0.043	0.202	0.118	0.101	0.490										
11. Husband's Age	0.018	0.484	-0.080	0.062	-0.007	0.073	0.312	0.919	0.185	0.072									
12. Husband Professional, wife not	0.010	-0.024	0.093	0.101	-0.165	-0.031	-0.599	-0.186	0.062	0.406	-0.156								
13. Wife Professional, husband not	0.030	0.081	-0.016	-0.072	0.082	0.095	0.447	0.052	-0.159	-0.658	0.126	-0.267							
14. Same occupational prestige	-0.035	-0.054	-0.056	-0.011	0.049	-0.062	0.048	0.093	0.096	0.285	0.005	-0.508	-0.694						
15. Husband older	0.003	0.017	-0.063	-0.059	0.102	0.087	0.118	0.001	0.079	-0.007	0.253	-0.006	0.131	-0.112					
16. Wife older	0.000	-0.151	0.000	0.121	-0.120	-0.096	-0.073	0.087	-0.099	-0.030	-0.145	-0.040	-0.079	0.101	-0.766				
17. Same age	-0.004	0.181	0.096	-0.077	0.009	-0.001	-0.080	-0.121	0.016	0.052	-0.186	0.064	-0.091	0.033	-0.472	-0.205			
18. Husband more education	-0.101	0.056	-0.136	0.109	-0.013	-0.291	0.051	0.147	0.339	0.152	0.167	-0.045	-0.154	0.171	0.150	-0.087	-0.108		
19. Wife more education	0.098	-0.223	0.203	-0.152	0.010	0.158	-0.017	-0.183	-0.509	-0.389	-0.168	-0.058	0.371	-0.288	-0.040	0.082	-0.052	-0.389	
20. Same education	-0.015	0.174	-0.089	0.061	0.001	0.079	-0.025	0.061	0.227	0.259	0.030	0.093	-0.240	0.145	-0.082	-0.010	0.139	-0.425	-0.669

Note. $p < .10$; $p < .05$

Table 3

Expected Support Levels for Family Mobility

	<u>Overall</u>		<u>Wife as respondent</u>		<u>Husband as respondent</u>	
	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>
Spouse expected support levels						
Wife expected support level	6.286	.921	6.654	.634	5.832	1.124
Husband expected support level	5.749	1.221	5.423	1.318	6.279	.812

Table 4

Gendered Levels of Expected Support: Percentages of Sample in Each Category

	<u>Wives as Respondents</u>		<u>Husbands as Respondents</u>	
	<u>WES^a</u>	<u>HES^b</u>	<u>WES^a</u>	<u>HES^b</u>
High support	.83	.54	.48	.77
Medium support	.13	.26	.34	.20
Low support	.04	.19	.18	.03

Note: Among women: High support = 6 - 7, Medium support = 5 - 5.8, Low support = < 5.

Among men: High support = 5.8 - 7, Medium support = 4.4 - 5.6, Low support = < 4.4.

^aWife Expected Support. ^bHusband Expected Support.

