



**IS THERE A LINK BETWEEN FAMILY
STRUCTURES AND WOMEN'S AND MEN'S
MANAGERIAL CAREER ADVANCEMENT?**

Phyllis Tharenou

*Working Paper 03/97
February 1997*

Abstract

The aim of this study was to assess the impact of family structures on women's and men's managerial career advancement. At Time 1, 2536 women and 2441 men responded to a survey. A year later, 1529 women and 1421 men responded to a repeated data collection. Family structures were found to predict women's and men's managerial advancement and women's not men's employment disruption, and to lead to them rather than the reverse. Childless single men and women advanced the least, and single parents also had reduced advancement. Traditional fathers advanced as much as other men, although more than posttraditional fathers in some subsamples. Mothers with employed spouses advanced as much as other women. The effects on employment disruption were not consistent with explaining the effects of family structures on advancement.

IS THERE A LINK BETWEEN FAMILY STRUCTURES AND WOMEN'S AND MEN'S MANAGERIAL CAREER ADVANCEMENT?

Family roles are said to reduce women's advancement into management (e.g., Schwartz, 1989). This may explain why female managers are often childless singles or childless marrieds, unlike most male managers who are married fathers (e.g., Brett, Stroh, & Reilly, 1992; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1995). However, despite these patterns of family roles, effects are usually not found for marital status and children, individually, on women's managerial career advancement, nor men's (e.g., Gattiker & Larwood, 1990; Shenhav, 1992; Tharenou & Conroy, 1994). Because the workforce is comprised of single, traditional and dual-earner families (see Schneer & Reitman, 1993), it may be more useful to examine family structures than single family variables. The aim of this study, therefore, was to assess if family structures are related to men's and women's managerial career advancement (managerial promotions, managerial level and pay). The impact on employment disruption (employment breaks and work discontinuity) was also examined. Employment disruption is argued to be a major explanation for why family roles reduce women's career advancement (Becker, 1985).

Schneer and Reitman's (1993) typology is used to derive family structure. The six structures are: Single, either childless (S) or parents (SC); married with the spouse not employed outside the home, either childless (M1) or parents (MC1); and married with the spouse employed outside the home, either childless (M2) or parents (MC2). Most of the empirical evidence for the impact of family structures on managers' advancement is for single/married status (Tharenou, 1997). There has been recent increased empirical interest in single parents, dual-earner mothers, and traditional (versus dual-earner) dads (Tharenou, 1997). Hence, these four family structures form the major focus of this study.

Childless Singles

Most theories propose that single childless men (S) advance less than married men. According to human capital theory, employers regard marriage as a proxy for stability and responsibility when allocating wages and status to men (Becker, 1975). From the wife as resource view, married men have more resources to invest in their careers than single men because wives provide husbands with additional resources (Kanter, 1977; Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). The empirical evidence is in support. Single men earned less than married men (e.g., Dolton & Makepeace, 1987; Hammer & University, 1993; Hersch, 1991; Jacobs, 1992; Korenman & Neumark, 1991; Loh, 1996; Melamed, 1995), controlling for children (Landau & Arthur, 1992; Witkowski & Leicht, 1995). However, advancement should be examined, not just pay, and family structures specified. Korenman and Neumark (1991) found that marriage increased men's job grade, much more than their pay. Schneer and Reitman (1993) found that single childless men earned less than traditional fathers, but as much as men with employed spouses.

Theoretical frameworks would generally suggest that single childless women (S) should advance more than married women. For example, human capital theory suggests that household duties lower married women's pay by reducing their time in the labor force, and inducing them to seek more convenient, less energy-intensive jobs (Becker, 1985). In support, time spent out of the labor force was lower for never married than married women (Dolton & Makepeace, 1987; Duncan, Prus, & Sandy, 1993). This is presumably because they have fewer child-rearing and household duties. However, the empirical studies do not show support for single women being paid more than married, or advancing more. Only a minority of studies found marriage to be a penalty for women's

pay (Jacobs, 1992; Melamed, 1995). Most found marriage and pay unrelated (Duncan et al., 1993; Hammer & University, 1993), controlling for children (Dolton & Makepeace, 1987; Hersch, 1991; Witkowski & Leicht, 1995). Moreover, when studies used family structures, single women earned less than married women, including those in two-career families (Brett et al., 1992; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993). This is thought to be because single women have less employment stability than married, like men. Hence, for fulltime employees, consistent with the evidence for family structure:

Hypothesis 1 proposes that single childless men and women will advance less than married.

Hypothesis 2 proposes that single childless women will have less employment disruption than married women.

Single Parents

Single parents (SC) should have reduced managerial advancement. Because of their sole responsibility for child-rearing, employers may expect that they will not be able to do the out-of-hours work, travel, attendance at training and development, and job relocation found in managerial work. However, single parents may not have reduced advancement than their comparable group, other singles. Views conflict from human capital and distributive justice theories. From human capital theory (Becker, 1975), single parents should advance less than childless singles. This is because the family-duties of sole parents should interrupt their work continuity and diminish their time investment in work. The scarce evidence is in support. For persons who worked at 'some time' in the year, compared to childless singles, single parents had less labor force tenure (Tilly & Albelda, 1994) and less family income (Albelda & Tilly, 1992). The latter may have been found because the single parents were less likely to be fulltime employees than the childless singles. Distributive justice theory argues that employers allocate rewards based on an individual's needs (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). Single parents should be allocated more advancement because they have greater need than childless singles to cater for their families. Moreover, single parents who are fulltime employees may be thought to be more stable than childless singles because they need to provide for families and because they have overcome the rigors of sole parenthood to remain fulltime employed. Hence, for fulltime male or female employees:

Hypotheses 3 proposes that single parents should advance more than childless singles.

Nevertheless, because of sole responsibility for child-rearing:

Hypothesis 4 proposes that single parents should have more employment disruption than childless singles.

Traditional Fathers

Theories suggest that traditional fathers (MCIs) should advance more than other men. From the wife as resource view, the not-employed wife can devote resources to her husband's career, whereas the potential exists for an employed wife to diminish these resources (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982), and children might further diminish them. Fathers with not-employed spouses should conform best to societal expectations because men are expected to be married and support their families (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). From a distributive justice view, as family breadwinners, traditional fathers should have greater advancement allocated because of financial need than most other men (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). The empirical evidence is in support. For chiefly private sector managers, traditional fathers

earned more than other men, especially fathers in dual-career families (Brett et al., 1992; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993; Stroh & Brett, 1996), and were promoted more (Brett et al., 1992).

Hypothesis 5 proposes that traditional fathers should advance more than other married men or fathers.

Posttraditional Women

Posttraditional women (mothers with employed spouses, MC2s) are thought to have difficulties staying in management roles because of the heavy constraints of rearing children (Schwartz, 1989).

According to human capital theory, family duties signal to employers that employed mothers have diminished labor force attachment and investment (Becker, 1985). In support, compared to never-married childless women, married mothers spent more time out of the labor force (Duncan et al., 1993). This is presumably because of child-rearing. Hence,

Hypothesis 6 proposes that mothers with employed spouses should have more employment disruption than childless women (single or married).

In regard to advancement, according to social stereotypes, a wife and mother should care for her husband and children, and thus should need advancement less than other women (Schneer & Reitman, 1993). Moreover, because married women carry out more household duties and child-care than married men (e.g., Biernat & Wortman, 1991; Konrad & Cannings, 1994), they should benefit less from their spouse as a resource for career advancement. As well, they may provide resources for their husband's career (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). Despite these proposals, the empirical evidence is not in support. Mothers with employed spouses had similar salaries, promotion and managerial levels than other mothers and married women and more than childless singles (Brett et al., 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993, 1995). This may be because posttraditional mothers now form a substantial proportion of the workforce (Schneer & Reitman, 1993, 1995). Hence, the once traditional gender stereotypes are less operative, and there are new contemporary gender norms for women's employment. Posttraditional mothers are thought to meet the demands of home and work, demonstrating substantial ability to their employers (Landau & Arthur, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993, 1995). Thus:

Hypothesis 7 proposes that mothers with employed spouses should advance more than childless singles and as much as other women.

The Present Study

This study compares the impact of six family structures (S, SC, M1, M2, MC1, MC2) simultaneously on the managerial career advancement and employment disruption of fulltime employees ranging in managerial level. By including all six simultaneously, unlike previous studies, the strongest theoretical test is obtained by comparison of their effects. This study examines the effects of family on both career advancement and employment disruption, because employment disruption from family roles is thought to reduce women's advancement into management. Previous studies have only examined pay and employment disruption (Dolton & Makepeace, 1987; Duncan et al., 1993; Tilly & Albelda, 1994).

Moreover, the rare studies that have examined family structures derived from three factors at a time have done so with highly particular samples. For one sample, effects were examined on family income for employees who worked 'at some time' during the year (Albelda & Tilly, 1992; Tilly & Albelda, 1994), contaminating the results. In other studies, private sector managers (Brett et al., 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993). Family structures should affect the advancement of managers more than subordinates. A problem with only sampling managers, however, is that it is not known if family structures affect advancement into management positions from subordinate ones (a theoretically-likely proposition), as well as advancement once in the managerial hierarchy to higher levels. Hence, a sample ranging in level from subordinates to senior managers is used in the present study. When testing hypotheses, managerial status is taken into account by comparing subordinates and managers.

Family factors may also be more likely to affect managerial advancement decisions in the private than public sector. The public sector has more regulated, specified selection and promotion procedures than the private sector (Shenhav, 1992). This may result in the lesser capacity of factors other than job-relevant selection criteria to affect managerial advancement in the public compared to the private sector. Therefore, the present study takes into account any public versus private sector effects by comparing employees in the private and public sectors when testing hypotheses.

Apart from one sample (Brett et al., 1992; Stroh & Brett, 1996), studies of the impact of family structures on managerial advancement have been cross-sectional. If family structures affect initial gaining of management positions and advancement once in the managerial hierarchy, effects should be prospective. Most studies have not assessed if family roles predict change in managerial advancement or employment disruption; the present study does so. The scarce longitudinal studies are of single family variables and have found conflicting results. Marriage increased men's salary (Kenny, 1983; Korenman & Neumark, 1991). Changing marital status did not predict men's or women's entry into management 5 years later; but having children did and only in the private not the public sector (Shenhav, 1992). Reverse relationships also need testing. Managerial advancement could change family structure through providing increased resources. Increased pay could result in marrying or having children (Korenman & Neumark, 1991; Schneer & Reitman, 1993); spouses of men who earn more may not need to work (Landau & Arthur, 1992). Unlike earlier studies, this study assesses if family structures lead to advancement and disruption rather than the reverse using a repeated measures test.

Hypothesis 8 proposes that family structure will lead to managerial career advancement and employment disruption rather than the reverse.

From the arguments previously given, specific propositions can also be made for some family structures.

Hypothesis 9 proposes that single childlessness and single parenthood will lead to less managerial career advancement than the reverse, and that traditional fatherhood will lead to more managerial career advancement than the reverse.

Hypothesis 10 proposes that single childlessness will lead to less employment disruption than the reverse, and that single parenthood and being posttraditional women will lead to more employment disruption than the reverse.

Insert Tables 1 and 2

METHOD

Respondents and Data Collection

The Australian Public Service (comprising 20 departments) agreed to participate in the study, which was part of a larger study of Australian's career paths. In order to gather a similar private sector sample, private sector companies were approached to participate that were also white collar and in administrative, clerical and professional occupations. All but two of the 22 approached agreed. Respondents were sought who were fulltime, and in early to mid-career below executive and senior management levels, where career advancement can be most affected. Because only about 25% of Australian managers are women (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996), a stratified sampling procedure was used where possible (e.g., through computerized personnel records) to mail to selected men and women using their grade levels and occupational streams.

Survey data were collected at two times a year apart. Prepaid envelopes were supplied for returning the survey. On the first mail-out, the respondents (who were anonymous to the researcher) could supply their names and addresses if they wished to take part in the longitudinal study. The Time 1 return rate was 52%, providing 2614 women and 3013 men, of whom 83% volunteered for the longitudinal study. The Time 2 response was 79%: 1593 women and 1841 men. Some respondents had spouses employed part-time, as shown in Table 1. They were omitted to provide the clearest comparison between the family structures with employed and not-employed spouses. The Time 1 sample was thus 2536 women and 2441 men, and the Time 2 sample, 1529 women and 1421 men.

The means showed respondents were 30 to 34 years old, employed 5 to 10 years in their organizations, and were in organizations of 2000 to 4000 employees and the public sector, and had a spouse. As shown in Table 2, they had completed high school or an undergraduate degree, were mostly in public administration, finance, and community services industries, and were clerks, professionals, managers/administrators, and paraprofessionals. Compared to the men (Table 2), chi-square tests (available from the author upon request) showed the women were younger, lower in managerial level and occupation level, and were more often single and had a spouse employed fulltime. They had fewer children and years organization tenure, and were more public servants and in smaller organizations.

Measures

Managerial career advancement was the average of three items: (a) managerial level, from 1, nonsupervisor/nonmanager (subordinate) to 6, executive; (b) salary, from 1, under \$15,000 Australian to 6, over \$95,000 (about 75% U.S.); and (c) total managerial promotions, from 1, none to 6, nine or more. Managerial career advancement was thus measured as promotions in managerial ranks and the level of managerial position and salary attained, as suggested (Miner, Chen, & Yu, 1991; Tharenou, 1997). Although managers' pay has been used as a separate measure, it has been found consistently related to managerial promotions and level, and indicates managerial career advancement (see Tharenou's, 1997, review). The three constructs had formed a separate factor in a

separate sample of managers and executives (Tharenou & Conroy, 1994). For the public sector and each private organization, to help respondents to answer their managerial level accurately, the appropriate grade levels for that organization were inserted next to each managerial level. For salary, bonuses and commissions were not included. Most Australians at these levels (none below executive level in the public sector) do not have bonuses or commissions. The 3-item measure was reliable. Alpha coefficients were .80 (Time 1) and .78 (Time 2) and the test-retest correlation was .90. Employment disruption was the average (z-scores) of: (a) years of employment breaks from 1, no time taken for breaks to 5, 10 or more years' breaks; and (b) continuity of work as a full-time employee since leaving fulltime education; 1, was yes and 2, no. The measure was reliable; an alpha of .82 (at Times 1 and 2) and test-retest correlation of .86.

All analyses (available from the author upon request) were also conducted with the three separate items for career advancement and the two separate items for employment disruption. The three advancement items (including salary) gave highly similar results, as did the two disruption items. So they were combined into the managerial advancement and employment disruption measures.

Each family category (S, SC, M1, M2, MC1, MC2) was derived from the three items of marital status (spouse/no spouse), parental status (children/no children), and spouse employment status, scored 1 if in that category or 0 if not. Marital status (see Table 2) was collapsed into spouse (married, cohabiting) and no spouse (single, divorced, separated, widowed). The control variables were age, education level, organization tenure, employer sector, organization size, and occupational level. Occupation level was the average of single-digit codes for their occupation and their position reported by each respondent ($\alpha = .93$). The codes were from the Australian Standard Classification of Occupations. They were: 1, managers and administrators; 2, professionals; 3, paraprofessionals; 4, tradespersons; 5, clerks; and 6, salespersons and personal service workers. In the analyses predicting advancement, employment breaks were also controlled.

Methods of Analysis

Hierarchical regression analyses were run separately on the male and female samples to test Hypotheses 1 to 7, and cross-lagged regression analyses to test Hypotheses 8, 9 and 10. The separate hierarchical regressions were used because initial regression tests showed significant interaction effects between the family structures and gender for advancement and disruption (indicated in Tables 4 and 5). There were also significant interactions between family structures and the sample divided into (a) public versus private sector employees, or (b) subordinates (nonsupervisors/ nonmanagers) versus managers (first-line supervisors, lower level managers, middle managers, senior managers). The latter split was on the managerial level item. The analyses to test hypotheses were thus repeated for the total sample split by public/private sector or by subordinate/manager rank. It should be noted that the split into subordinates and managers results in the effect on subordinates' managerial career advancement being chiefly on their pay, as there is no variation in managerial level and a majority had not had managerial promotions in their careers. Pairwise deletion was used for missing data.

Five of the family structures were small samples: M1 women and men, SC women and men, and MC1 women (Table 1). All analyses were repeated with these small samples omitted. The five family structures were retained in the analyses (reported in Tables 4 to 6) because the results were similar to when they were omitted, and they are groups rarely examined. The results of these small samples must be viewed as exploratory. When the sample was split by public versus private sector or by subordinates versus managers for the hierarchical or cross-lagged regressions, the five samples (SCs, M1s, female MC1s) were omitted because they were small sample sizes. This left S,

M2, and MC2 structures for women and S, M2, MC2, and MC1s for men. Hence, Hypotheses 3 and 4 (single parents) were not tested for the analyses of the subsamples. The results of analyses testing Hypotheses 1 to 10 for the female and male samples split into public/private sector and subordinates/managers are available from the author upon request.

Hierarchical regression analyses. Family structure was coded as five dummy variables (S, M1, M2, SC, MC1), with MC2 the omitted family structure as in other studies (Schneer & Reitman, 1993). For the contemporaneous analysis (Time 1), advancement or disruption was regressed in Step 1 on the control variables to partial out their effects and control for gender differences, and in Step 2 on family structures to assess their distinct explanation. In the longitudinal analysis, Time 2 advancement and disruption were the dependent variables. Their Time 1 counterparts were partialled first (Step 1), prior to entering the Time 1 controls (Step 2), and then the Time 1 family structures (Step 3). This predicted the change in advancement or disruption by earlier family structures. Because of the large sample size and number of tests (Tables 4 and 5), the significance level was reduced to $p < .01$ from $p < .05$.

Cross-lagged regression analysis. To test Hypotheses 8, 9 and 10 for reverse effects, cross-lagged regression analysis was used. The technique was developed to test for bivariate reciprocal effects with two wave repeated panel data to overcome the problems of cross-lagged correlational analysis, including synchronicity and stationarity, as shown by Rogosa (1980). The present data met the conditions for analysing using cross-lagged techniques specified by Rogosa. Time 2 family structure (x_2) and managerial career advancement (y_2) were each regressed on the equation of their Time 1 counterparts (x_1, y_1). If the beta coefficient for the relationship between Time 1 family structure and Time 2 advancement (x_1y_2) was significant and that between Time 1 advancement and Time 2 family structure (x_2y_1) was not, family structure was interpreted as more likely to lead to advancement rather than the reverse. If both cross-lagged coefficients were significant, reciprocal effects were interpreted. Because the cross-lagged tests are conservative, the usual significance level was retained ($p < .05$).

Insert Table 3

RESULTS

Correlations between the predictor variables, given in Table 3, showed there were no problems with multicollinearity for entry of variables to the regression analyses. The results of the regression analyses testing Hypotheses 1 to 7, given in Tables 4 and 5, showed significant but very little (most 1% or less), variance was added by the family structures, which had small standardized beta coefficients.

Insert Tables 4 and 5

Overall, Hypothesis 1 was supported. Childless singles advanced less than married employees. For men, support for Hypothesis 1 was shown by the significant negative regression coefficients for Ss

and nonsignificant coefficients for married employees (Table 4). For the dummy variable, the pattern translated into Ss advancing less than MC2s. For the regressions conducted on the subsamples split on employer sector and manager status (thus omitting SC and M1 men), the overall pattern was the same (for six of the eight subsamples) as the total sample. Partially supporting Hypothesis 1, the results indicated that single childless women advanced less than married women, apart for M1s. The negative beta coefficients for M1s were significant, suggesting negative advancement for M1 women, as it does for S women. For the dummy variable, the pattern translated into Ss having less advancement than MC2s. For the sample split by employer sector and manager status (thus omitting SC, M1, and MC1 women), childless singles advanced less than marrieds (M2s, MC2s) overall for five of the eight subsamples (three other beta coefficients were not significant for Ss).

Hypothesis 2 proposed that single childless women would have less employment disruption than married women. It gained support, as shown in Table 5, apart from M2s. For women, contemporaneously, the significant negative regression coefficients showed that Ss had less employment disruption than married employees apart from M2s, who had similarly less disruption as Ss. For the dummy variable, the pattern translated into Ss having less employment disruption than MC2s. The longitudinal pattern of results was similar but less pronounced. Presumably much of the effect was captured in the Time 1 measure of disruption that was partialled. Ss had less employment disruption longitudinally than marrieds apart from M2s, who had similarly less disruption. For the regressions run for the subsamples, there was partial support for Hypothesis 2. Ss had less employment disruption than married women for seven of the eight subsamples for MC2s, but only for two of the eight for M2s.

Overall, results supported Hypothesis 3. Single parents advanced more than childless singles. The negative beta coefficients for male and female Ss and nonsignificant betas for single parents (Table 4) translated into Ss advancing less than SCs. For the longitudinal data for men, SCs had reduced advancement, but not as strongly as Ss. Overall, there was little support for Hypothesis 4 that single parents would have more employment disruption than childless singles. The support was only for women and contemporaneously. For women, the significant betas for Ss and nonsignificant betas for SCs for the contemporaneous data (Table 5) translated into Ss having less employment disruption than SCs. For women, for the longitudinal data (Table 5), the significant beta coefficients for both Ss and SCs indicated that both were related to less employment disruption. For men, SCs and Ss were similarly unrelated to employment disruption, not supporting Hypothesis 4.

The results did not support Hypothesis 5. MC1 men's advancement was not more than other married men or fathers for the overall sample, but was so (inconsistently) for particular subsamples. For the contemporaneous and longitudinal data, MC1 men did not advance more than other married men or fathers (Table 4). Compared to the dummy variable, MC2, MC1s did not have greater advancement. However, there was support for Hypothesis 5 for some of the subsamples (results available from the author upon request). The significant positive beta coefficients for MC1 men translated into their having greater managerial advancement than MC2 men in the private sector at Time 1 and in the public sector at Time 2. The negative beta coefficients for M2 managers at Time 1 and subordinates at Time 2 translated into M2s having less advancement than MC1 counterparts.

Hypothesis 6, that MC2 women's employment disruption would be greater than single or married childless women's, was supported. Overall, the pattern of betas translated into MC2 women contemporaneously having greater employment disruption than the childless Ss, M2s and M1s (but not the mothers: SCs, MC1s), supporting Hypothesis 6. The longitudinal effects were less pronounced. Presumably most effects were captured in the partialled Time 1 disruption.

Longitudinally, MC2s had more disruption than Ss and M2s (childless women) but not M1s and unexpectedly more than SCs. MC2 women had greater employment disruption than Ss and M2s for 13 of the 16 subsamples.

Overall, Hypothesis 7, that MC2 women's advancement would be greater than childless singles and as much as other women, gained partial support. The pattern of negative coefficients for Ss translated into MC2 women having greater managerial advancement than Ss. MC2 women also had more advancement than M1 women but similarly to MC1s, M2s and SCs. For the subsamples, MC2 women had greater managerial advancement than Ss for five of the eight subsamples (other three beta coefficients were nonsignificant for Ss). MC2 women also had greater managerial advancement than M2 private sector women, as given by significant negative beta coefficient for M2s at Time 2.

Insert Table 6

Table 6 provides the results of the cross-lagged regression analyses. For the subsamples, the analyses were done only for Ss, M2s, MC2s and male MC1s, because of sample size. As shown in Table 6, beta coefficients were more likely to be significant between Time 1 family structures and Time 2 managerial career advancement or employment disruption than between Time 1 managerial career advancement or employment disruption and Time 2 family structures. Hypothesis 8 is thus supported. Family structure is more likely to lead to managerial career advancement and employment disruption rather than the reverse. The significant beta coefficients were, however, very low in magnitude.

There was support for Hypothesis 9 for reduced advancement leading from being Ss and SCs. As shown in Table 6, for women and men, being Ss led to less managerial career advancement rather than the reverse. When the analyses were repeated for Ss for the four subsamples for men and women, the effect was found only for two: subordinates (thus mostly on pay) and private sector employees. For women and men, being SCs led to less managerial career advancement rather than the reverse, especially for SC men. Hypothesis 10 was supported for S women status leading to less employment disruption, but not for SC women status leading to more employment disruption. For women but not men, being Ss (all subsamples) and SCs led to less employment disruption rather than the reverse.

The results for family structures not included in Hypotheses 9 and 10 are also reported in Table 6. Only major themes are noted. Being an M1 woman was more likely to lead to less managerial advancement and more employment disruption than the reverse. In a reciprocal relationship, although being an M1 man was likely to lead to managerial career advancement, it was more likely that advancement increased the likelihood that men remained M1s. Being an M2 woman (only private sector sample) or man was more likely to lead to greater managerial career advancement than the reverse. In a reciprocal link, being an M2 woman subordinate was likely to lead to managerial advancement and advancement likely to lead to remaining M2s.

Hypothesis 9 was supported for traditional fatherhood leading to managerial advancement only for public servants. Overall, being MC1 men, or women, did not lead to managerial advancement. For men, for the subsamples, being MC1 public servants led to more advancement than the reverse. Overall, being MC2 men or women was not linked to managerial career advancement. For the

subsamples, being MC2 women managers or private sector employees led to more advancement than the reverse. For men, being MC2 subordinates led to more advancement than the reverse.

There was support for Hypothesis 10 for posttraditional women status leading to employment disruption. Being MC2, or MC1, women led to more employment disruption rather than the reverse. For the women MC2 subsamples, being an MC2 manager or public servant led to more disruption. There were no links for MC1 (including subsamples) or MC2 men with employment disruption.

DISCUSSION

The results of this study show that family structures predict managerial career advancement for employees ranging in level from subordinates to senior managers. However, they explain little of advancement. This is consistent with the explanation of salary by family variables (e.g., Landau & Arthur, 1992) and the relative importance of family variables for managerial career advancement from amongst organizational and individual factors (e.g., Gattiker & Larwood, 1990; Melamed, 1995; Tharenou & Conroy, 1994). Family structures may have been unimportant for this sample because their managerial career advancement was so stable. This reduces the potential impact of family structure. Nevertheless, family structures do lead to women's and men's managerial advancement and to women's employment disruption rather than the reverse. It has been thought to be the case that family structure is more likely to be an antecedent than a consequence. However, longitudinal studies have not had repeated data nor specified family structures to provide a clear test.

Not surprisingly, family structures predict employment disruption for women but not men, as shown for the effects of marriage and children (Li & Curry, 1992). However, the effects of family structure on managerial career advancement appear inconsistent with those on employment disruption, as shown elsewhere (Brett et al., 1992). For example, being a childless single woman or single mother of this sample leads to less advancement but also less employment disruption. Hence, women's lesser managerial advancement appears not explained by a lack of labor force attachment, as proposed by human capital theory (Becker, 1985).

The results indicate more about which family structures reduce managerial advancement than increase it. The strongest finding for this sample is that being childless singles is the worst of the family structures for women's and men's managerial career advancement. Being single fathers or mothers also reduces advancement, as does being childless women with not-employed spouses. There were some controls for productivity effects in the analyses through education, organizational tenure and age. Hence, the reduced advancement of these groups may not be due to lower productivity on their part.

Childless Singles

The reduced advancement of male and female childless singles is consistent with results for salary (Landau & Arthur, 1992). As suggested by Korenman and Neumark (1991), the marriage premium does appear to be on advancement. The penalty imposed is not just on men, but on women. Women's rise into managerial ranks is not assisted by being single and childless. Indeed, 77.7% of Australian female managers are married (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996). Moreover, male and female employees with high advancement do not appear to select themselves into marriage. Those who remain single advance less than those who marry, especially when subordinates and in the private sector. The effect for subordinates (not managers) suggests that childless singles may not

be thought to need advancement because they do not have families, as expected in distributive justice theory (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). Or childless singles may not conform to stereotypes that may exist of supervisors and managers as married parents. The effect for the private sector may be because it has less regulated practices for employment and promotion in Australia than the public sector. This may allow extraneous variables such as family roles to influence advancement decisions.

The results suggest that employment disruption is an unlikely explanation for the reduced managerial advancement of the childless single men and women of this sample. This is especially so for the women, for whom single childlessness led to less employment disruption. This does not support a human capital view (Becker, 1985). Childless singles would have reduced employment disruption because they do not have the interruptions of child-rearing nor their spouses' jobs (e.g., relocation).

Single Parents

The results for the single parents of this study must be considered exploratory as they were a very small group. Fulltime employed single mothers are rare (Lino, 1994); hence, they are likely to be especially capable individuals. The single parents of this sample may have advanced more than the childless singles because employers take account of the needs to provide for children in advancement decisions, as expected in distributive justice theory (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). Despite this, being a single parent still reduces advancement, especially for men. This may be because being a single parent contravenes social stereotypes that may exist that managers are married parents. Men are usually single parents less than women (Lobel & St. Clair, 1992); therefore, the negative effects are greatest on men. The results do not support employment disruption as an explanation for the reduced advancement of the single mothers of this sample. Being a single mother leads to less employment disruption than the reverse. Single mothers who are fulltime employees may have high support for child-care (e.g., grandparents, siblings) and may have been able to use the beneficial workplace practices for family needs introduced recently in Australia (e.g., from the *Industrial Relations Reform Bill*, 1993). Hence, the results for single parents who are fulltime employees cannot be generalized to other single parents.

Married Women

The mothers or childless women with employed spouses of this sample fare best in managerial advancement compared to other women. This is perhaps more in the private sector, consistent with the private sector assisting women's entry into management more than the public sector (Shenhav, 1992).

The posttraditional mothers of this sample advance more than single childless women, who are usually thought to advance into management, and at least as much as most other married women. This is consistent with the evidence for pay (Brett et al., 1992; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993, 1995). The advancement of posttraditional mothers is despite their greater employment disruption than childless women. Hence, the result does not support a human capital theory explanation of reduced labor force attachment (Becker, 1985). Moreover, being posttraditional mothers increases managerial career advancement for managers or private sector employees. The results are consistent with views that employers regard married mothers as having shown they have the ability to balance responsibilities and meet the demands of home and work, and so advance them as much as, or more than other married women (Landau & Arthur, 1992;

Schneer & Reitman, 1993). The effect may be greatest in the private sector because the more flexible employment practices can take into account individual circumstances. It may also be that the private sector needs to advance the best people in order to be financially successful more than the public sector (although this contradicts the findings for marital status), and thus posttraditional women are not disadvantaged. The effect is surprising for managers. Perhaps the women managers of this sample have circumstances, such as spouse support, that allow the longer work hours, more attendance at training and development, and more job relocation needed for managerial than subordinate work.

The childless women with employed spouses of this sample, overall, have some favorable circumstances for advancement. Their status leads to increased managerial career advancement especially in the private sector. This advancement contrasts with the ensuing reduced advancement of the other childless women (singles, those with not-employed spouses) and single mothers. The result is consistent with the evidence that dual-career childless women managers are paid more than childless singles (Brett et al., 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993). There is a substantial incidence of women managers being childless marrieds (Brett et al., 1992; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1995). Childless women with employed spouses may gain benefit for advancement from their lack of child-rearing duties (unlike single mothers) combined with the encouragement and assistance of their spouses. This is unlike the childless singles and single mothers; or childless women with not-employed spouses, who may be disaffected. Childless women with employed spouses also have lesser employment disruption, presumably because of lack of child-rearing duties, and this may help their advancement.

Childless women with not-employed spouses appear to fare badly for managerial advancement and employment disruption. This is worse than for their counterparts who are mothers, whose advancement is not affected even though they have ensuing employment disruption. Employers may regard childless women with not-employed spouses as needing to advance less, because they do not have children to support, and employers may have negative attitudes regarding husbands who are not fulltime employees. Advancement would not be reduced for mothers with not-employed spouses as for childless counterparts, because mothers bear the sole financial needs of the family.

Married Men

Traditional fatherhood did not increase managerial career advancement overall. There were some positive effects for traditional dads when public servants compared to other men, and when compared to posttraditional dads (private and public sectors). The inconsistency for the public/private sector results may mean that the sector is not the important factor. The favorable impact for public servants does not support the view that the impact of family structures for men is more likely where advancement is less regulated.

The lack of clear superiority for traditional dads over posttraditional dads conflicts with U.S. evidence for chiefly private sector managers (Brett et al., 1992; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993; Stroh & Brett, 1996). The effects, however, were weak (Landau & Arthur, 1992). The differences in results between earlier studies and the present one may be due to differences in samples and countries. The U.S. samples appear high in advancement-orientation towards management. They were managers who were MBAs and transferees, and were likely to have been in dual-career families. This is unlike the Australian sample. It comprised 40% subordinates and 20% first-line supervisors, and about half were clerks and paraprofessionals. The employed couples were more likely dual-earner than dual-career. The U.S. also has less regulated employment

practices than the centralised highly regulated employment practices of Australia (Kidd & Shannon, 1996), especially in the public sector from which two-thirds of the sample were drawn.

The only reciprocal relationships with managerial advancement were found for childless men with not-employed spouses. This is a small sample, for whom results must be considered exploratory. The results suggest that spouses of childless men may not need to work when their husband's managerial career advancement increases. Their financial need is also less because they do not have children. This is consistent with a distributive justice view (Pfeffer & Ross, 1982). Being childless men with not-employed spouses also increased managerial advancement and decreased employment disruption, suggesting spouses act as resources.

Limitations and Future Research

Several shortcomings of the present study render the conclusions less convincing than desirable. The small numbers of single parents, childless employees with not-employed spouses, and mothers with not-employed spouses render their results underestimated and, at best, exploratory. The short, one-year time lag did not capture sufficient change in advancement or family structures to predict advancement. Moreover, causality cannot be inferred from cross-lagged regression analysis. It suggests but does not confirm directionality. The measures were self-report. Very little of managerial career advancement was explained by family structures and a substantial amount by the control variables, especially occupational level and age. Other family variables which may help explain the impact of family structure on advancement were not taken into account. These include the age and number of children, time spent on family duties, spouse support, and values such as job involvement. The impact of family structures may be greater for couples that are dual-career than dual-earner. The occupation types of respondents and their spouses were not examined. Future research requires larger samples of the smaller family structures, longer time lags, specification of family structures by including occupation types, and inclusion of explanatory variables (e.g., job involvement) in an attempt to increase the variance explained. The impact of family structures may also be indirect. They may reduce or increase factors related to managerial career advancement such as work experience, training and development, and work hours (Tharenou, 1997). In the present study, employment disruption was not examined as an intervening variable. Indirect effects require research.

The theories of human capital, spouse as resource, and conformance to social expectations recently have received at best marginal, and in some cases no, support for explaining the impact of family structures on managerial career advancement (Brett et al., 1992; Landau & Arthur, 1992; Lobel & St. Clair, 1992; Schneer & Reitman, 1993; Stroh & Brett, 1996), as in the present study. These theories were developed based on the contrast between traditional family men and other men, and on gender differences. They may no longer be suitable to explain the impact of family roles in the contemporary workforce. Future research requires development and testing of theories that reflect contemporary gender roles and associated behaviors, stereotypes and expectations. Distributive justice theory appeared most explanatory of the existing theories, but was not directly tested in this study. Future research requires employers' decisions about advancement allocation to be examined directly.

In regard to the practical implications of the present results, organizations need to carefully analyse their selection and promotion procedures for management to determine if they are equitable and merit-based. It is not apparent from this study why being childless singles and single parents results in reduced advancement compared to other family structures, apart from not being due to employment disruption and perhaps productivity or occupation type. There may be negative

attitudes towards singles for advancement. Similarly, where there is an advantage for traditional dads, organizations need to examine selection and promotion practices to ensure that there is equitable, merit-based treatment for all men. The advancement of mothers or childless women with employed spouses suggests that spouse support is important. There may have also been a positive impact of practices the government has introduced and ensured organizations have recently introduced to assist work-family balance, including for single mothers.

REFERENCES

- Albelda, R., & Tilly, C. (1992). All in the family. Policy Studies Journal, 20, 388-404.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (1996). Labor force Australia. (Cat. No. 6203.0). Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Becker, G.S. (1975). Human capital. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, G.S. (1985). Human capital, effort, and the sexual division of labor. Journal of Labor Economics, 3, 533-558.
- Biernat, M., & Wortman, C.B. (1991). Sharing of home responsibilities between professionally employed women and their husbands. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60, 844-860.
- Brett, J.M., Stroh, L.K., & Reilly, A.H. (1992). What is it like being a dual career manager in the 1990s? In S. Zedeck (Ed.), Work, families and organizations (pp. 138-167). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Dolton, P.J., & Makepeace, G.H. (1987). Marital status, child-rearing and earnings differentials in the graduate labor market. The Economic Journal, 97, 897-922.
- Duncan, K.C., Prus, M.J., & Sandy, J.G. (1993). Marital status, children and women's labor market choices. The Journal of Socio-Economics, 22, 277-288.
- Gattiker, U.E., & Larwood, L. (1990). Predictors of career achievement in the corporate hierarchy. Human Relations, 8, 703-726.
- Hammer, E.R., & University, H. (1993). On the relationship between rank/occupational sorting and pay variation by sex. The Mid-Atlantic Journal of Business, 29, 283-301.
- Hersch, J. (1991). Male-female differences in hourly wages. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 44, 746-759.
- Jacobs, J.A. (1992). Women's entry into management. Administrative Science Quarterly, 37, 282-301.
- Kanter, R.M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kenny, L.W. (1983). The accumulation of human capital during marriage by males. Economic Inquiry, 21, 223-231.

- Kidd, M.P., & Shannon, M. (1996). The gender wage gap: A comparison of Australia and Canada. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, *49*, 729-746.
- Konrad, A.M., & Cannings, K. (1994). Of mummy tracks and glass ceilings. Relations Industrielles, *49*, 303-333.
- Korenman, S., & Neumark, D. (1991). Does marriage really make men more productive? Journal of Human Resources, *26*, 283-307.
- Landau, J., & Arthur, M.B. (1992). The relationship of marital status, spouse's career status, and gender to salary level. Sex Roles, *27*, 665-681.
- Lino, M. (1994). Income and spending patterns of single-mother families. Monthly Labor Review, May, 29-37.
- Li, P.S., & Currie, D. (1992). Gender differences in work interruptions as unequal effects on marriage and child-bearing. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, *23*, 217-229.
- Lobel, S.A., & St. Clair, L. (1992). Effects of family responsibilities, gender and career identity salience on performance outcomes. Academy of Management Journal, *35*, 1057-1069.
- Loh, E.S. (1996). Productivity differences and the marriage premium for white males. The Journal of Human Resources, *31*, 566-589.
- Melamed, T. (1995). Career success. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *47*, 35-60.
- Miner, J.B., Chen, C.C., & Yu, K.C. (1991). Theory testing under adverse conditions. Journal of Applied Psychology, *76*, 343-349.
- Pfeffer, J.P., & Ross, J. (1982). The effects of marriage and a working wife on occupational and wage attainment. Administrative Science Quarterly, *27*, 66-80.
- Rogosa, D. (1980). A critique of cross-lagged correlations. Psychological Bulletin, *88*, 245-258.
- Schneer, J.A., & Reitman, F. (1993). Effects of alternate family structures on managerial career paths. Academy of Management Journal, *36*, 830-843.
- Schneer, J.A., & Reitman, F. (1995). The impact of gender as managerial careers unfold. Journal of Vocational Behavior, *47*, 290-315.
- Schwartz, F.N. (1989). Management women and the new facts of life. Harvard Business Review, *89*, 65-75.
- Shenhav, Y. (1992). Entrance of blacks and women into managerial positions in scientific and engineering occupations: A longitudinal analysis. Academy of Management Journal, *35*, 889-901.
- Stroh, L.K., & Brett, J.M. (1996). The dual-earner dad penalty in salary progression. Human Resource Management Quarterly, *35*, 181-201.
- Tilly, C., & Albelda, R. (1994). Family structure and family earnings. Industrial Relations, *33*, 151-167.

- Tharenou, P. (1997). Managerial career advancement. In I.T. Robertson and C.L. Cooper (Eds.), International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp. 39-94). New York: Wiley.
- Tharenou, P., & Conroy, D.K. (1994). Men and women managers' advancement. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 43, 5-31.
- Witkowski, K.M., & Leicht, K.T. (1995). The effects of gender segregation, labor force participation, and family roles on the earnings of young adult workers. Work and Occupations, 22, 48-72.

TABLE 1

Sample Numbers and Frequencies at Times 1 and 2

Family Structure	Time 1 Sample		Time 2 Sample			
	Women	Men	Women	Men		
Single, no children (S)	921 (16.4)	859 (15.3)	514 (15.0)	459 (13.4)		
Single, children (SC)	160 (2.8)	83 (1.5)	91 (2.6)	56 (1.6)		
Married, no children, not-employed spouse (M1)	50 (0.9)	119 (2.1)	43 (1.3)	71 (2.1)		
Married, no children, full-employed spouse (M2)	867 (15.4)	456 (8.1)	508 (14.8)	278 (8.1)		
Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)	50 (0.9)	564 (10.0)	33 (1.0)	310 (9.0)		
Married, children, full-employed spouse (MC2)	488 (8.7)	360 (6.4)	340 (9.9)	247 (7.2)		
Subtotal	2536	2441	4977	1529	1421	2950
Married, no children, part-employed spouse	41 (0.7)	106 (1.9)	29 (0.8)	79 (2.3)		
Married, children, part-employed spouse	37 (0.7)	466 (8.3)	35 (1.0)	341 (9.9)		
Total	2614 (46.5)	3013 (53.5)	5627	1593 (46.4)	1841 (53.6)	3434

TABLE 2
Description of Samples of Men and Women at Times 1 and 2
by Percentage Frequencies on Demographic Items

Item	Time 1		Time 2		Item	Time 1		Time 2	
	Men	Women	Men	Women		Men	Women	Men	Women
Employer					Organization tenure				
Public sector	30.3 **	30.9	35.4 **	35.5	< 5 years	20.1 **	22.5	17.9 **	19.9
Private sector	23.4	15.4	18.4	10.7	5 up to 10 years	12.1	14.3	12.7	15.0
Age					10 up to 15 years	7.4	6.0	7.8	7.3
<19 years	0.1 **	0.2	0.0 **	0.0	15 up to 20 years	5.1	2.3	5.3	2.4
20 - 24	6.7	8.3	4.5	3.5	20 up to 25 years	4.3	0.9	4.9	1.1
25 - 29	9.0	11.8	9.6	7.8	25 up to 30 years	2.5	0.3	3.1	0.3
30 - 34	9.3	8.3	9.5	8.9	30 up to 35 years	1.3	0.1	1.5	0.1
35 - 39	9.7	6.5	8.0	10.0	>35 years	0.8	0.0	0.7	0.0
40 - 44	8.9	4.9	6.0	10.0	Spouse employment*				
45 - 49	5.5	3.6	4.9	7.7	Fulltime	46.1 **	27.6	46.2 **	28.8
50 - 54	2.9	1.9	2.6	3.3	Not employed	3.6	22.8	4.3	20.6
55 - 59	1.2	0.6	0.9	1.9	Organization size				
60 - 64 years	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.3	1-1000	16.7 **	16.8	17.8 **	18.0
Spouse/no spouse					1001-2000	2.9	3.3	3.3	3.6
Married	32.9 **	21.0	22.7 **	35.0	2001-4000	4.5	3.7	5.1	4.0
Cohabiting	4.0	6.3	6.0	3.7	4001-8000	4.5	4.1	4.2	4.0
Divorced	1.1	2.8	2.8	1.2	>8000	25.3	18.1	23.2	16.7
Separated but not divorced	1.2	1.6	1.4	1.5	Managerial level				
Single	14.3	14.5	13.0	12.3	Nonsupervisors/managers	18.1 **	21.3	15.9 **	17.1
Widowed	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	First-line supervisors	11.9	10.2	10.1	8.8
Dependent children					Lower level managers	9.3	4.6	9.7	5.3
None	27.4 **	33.3	25.8 **	31.8	Middle managers	9.0	6.9	11.0	10.0
One or more	26.3	13.1	27.8	14.5	Senior managers	3.1	2.3	4.6	3.5
Occupation level					Executives or more	2.2	1.0	2.4	1.5
Managers	12.4 **	7.1	11.8 **	7.1	Education level				
Professionals	15.8	14.5	18.8	6.8	Some secondary school	0.9 **	1.1	1.0 **	1.2
Paraprofessionals	6.8	6.3	9.1	11.0	10 years completed	7.4	7.6	6.8	7.0
Clerks	16.8	17.3	11.8	10.4	12 years completed	19.1	13.2	6.5	10.6
Sales/personal service	1.1	1.1	0.7	0.8	Technical college course	4.6	4.3	5.0	4.2
Other	0.7	0.1	1.4	1.1	Associate diploma	2.8	2.0	3.0	1.7
Industry					Diploma	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.7
Finance, property & business services	21.8 **	15.2	21.2 **	14.3	Undergraduate degree	11.7	10.5	12.7	12.0
Public administration & defence	25.3	25.9	21.0	20.8	Honours/graduate diploma	3.6	4.4	4.7	5.8
Community services	2.9	4.5	4.2	7.2	Masters	1.9	1.1	2.1	1.6
Other	3.6	1.5	7.3	3.9	PhD	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.6

Note. Significant differences by χ^2 goodness-of-fit tests between men and women are indicated by significance levels.

*The final samples for Times 1 and 2 do not include those with part-time spouses.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

TABLE 3

Correlation Matrix for All Variables for Total Sample for Times 1 and 2

Variables	X	SD	Correlations ^a														
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
<u>Time 1</u>																	
1. Organization size	3.22	1.78		07	-11	-17	14	24	-10	-05	07	02	01	-03	-02	07	-05
2. Public/private sector	1.38	0.49	21		-14	-14	10	09	-20	10	11	-01	-07	02	03	12	-08
3. Age	4.38	1.85	-14	-18		-03	-12	19	38	26	08	-29	09	19	-07	10	20
4. Education	4.63	2.28	-20	-21	03		-30	-21	20	-02	-04	05	-02	-03	00	-04	-01
5. Occupation level	3.06	1.60	22	26	-29	-36		07	-46	07	-02	10	-00	-01	01	-09	-05
6. Organization tenure	2.29	0.95	20	01	25	-27	01		04	-03	07	-08	01	04	-03	09	04
7. Managerial career advancement	2.33	1.50	-11	02	49	20	-57	17		-10	12	-25	01	09	-02	12	11
8. Employment disruption	3.58	1.33	-10	-23	26	02	-01	-09	-07		-25	-09	10	08	-03	-08	15
9. Gender	1.49	0.50	07	09	10	-02	-07	07	16	-23		-01	-05	06	-15	31	-06
10. Single, no children (S)	0.35	0.48	03	02	-33	04	16	-14	-28	-10	-01		-16	-14	-42	-25	-35
11. Single, children (SC)	0.04	0.21	-04	-09	14	-01	-01	00	04	14	-07	-17		-05	-14	-08	-11
12. Married, no child, not-employed spouse (M1)	0.03	0.18	01	01	15	-03	-02	04	05	01	08	-14	-04		-12	-07	-10
13. Married, no child, full-employed spouse (M2)	0.27	0.44	02	02	-10	-01	04	01	-04	-03	-18	45	-14	-11		-22	-30
14. Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)	0.12	0.33	06	13	15	-04	-14	14	23	-09	32	-28	-09	-07	-23		-18
15. Married, children, full-employed spouse (MC2)	0.17	0.38	-09	-11	25	02	-12	03	15	17	-06	-34	-10	-08	-27	-17	
<u>Time 2</u>																	
16. Organization size	3.07	1.78	77	10	-10	-17	18	18	-09	-05	07	04	01	00	-04	06	-06
17. Public/private sector	1.28	0.45	12	93	-15	-13	18	-02	07	-19	09	02	-07	01	01	10	-09
18. Age	4.85	1.86	-13	-15	97	-02	20	26	44	26	07	-33	12	16	-07	12	26
19. Education	4.96	2.36	-17	-15	-03	96	-34	-25	19	-04	-03	04	-02	-01	00	-05	01
20. Occupation level	2.73	1.45	13	11	-12	-31	55	05	-42	07	-01	12	00	-03	01	-08	-07
21. Organization tenure	2.39	0.89	20	-02	19	-20	05	63	08	-03	06	-09	01	02	-02	09	04
22. Managerial career advancement	2.60	1.59	-09	07	38	21	-52	11	90	-10	10	-28	00	06	01	19	15
23. Employment disruption	3.99	1.37	-06	19	28	-03	03	-05	-08	86	-24	-11	11	-01	-01	-07	17
24. Gender	1.48	0.50	07	09	06	-03	-01	07	09	-25	1.00	00	-06	07	-15	29	-05
25. Single, no children (S)	0.33	0.47	02	-01	-29	05	12	-10	-25	-08	00	85	-11	-09	-36	-25	-34
26. Single, children (SC)	0.05	0.21	-02	-08	09	-02	-02	01	04	10	-05	-15	79	-04	-14	-05	-06
27. Married, no child, not-employed spouse (M1)	0.04	0.19	-03	02	18	-03	-00	04	10	00	05	-10	-04	55	-02	01	-08
28. Married, no child, full-employed spouse (M2)	0.27	0.44	00	03	-06	-00	00	-03	-02	-03	-15	-30	14	-07	75	-20	-21
29. Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)	0.12	0.32	06	11	10	-03	-09	13	17	-08	30	-25	-08	02	-17	83	-12
30. Married, children, full-employed spouse (MC2)	0.20	0.40	-06	-07	20	00	-06	04	12	14	-06	-36	-06	-08	-19	-11	82

Note. Decimal points have been omitted from correlations. Correlations of .02 are significant at $p < .05$ and of .05 at $p < .01$.

^aIn the top right triangle of the table, the correlations above the diagonal are for the matrix between the Time 2 variables, 16 to 30.

TABLE 4

Regression Analyses for Times 1 and 2 Managerial Career Advancement

Variables	Time 1			Time 2		
	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men
	B	B	B	B	B	B
<u>Time 1</u>						
Career advancement measure				.90 **	.86 **	.89 **
Organization size	-.00	-.00	-.02	-.01	-.02	-.00
Employment breaks	-.04 **	-.15 **	-.08 **	-.02	-.07 **	-.01
Organization tenure	.08 **	.09 **	.08 **	-.02	-.04 **	-.02
Employer sector	.19 **	.10 **	.23 **	.06 **	.06 **	.08 **
Education	.10 **	.13 **	.07 **	.05 **	-.02	.04 *
Age	.37 **	.35 **	.36 **	-.05 **	-.01	-.06 **
Occupation level	-.45 **	-.51 **	-.38 **	-.04 **	-.09 **	-.00
Gender	.02			-.05 **		
Married, no child, not-employed spouse (M1)	-.01 ^a	-.04 **	-.01	-.01 ^a	-.06 **	.02
Single, children (SC)	.00	.00	-.01	-.03 **	-.03	-.04 *
Married, no child, full-employed spouse (M2)	-.04 *	-.03	-.04	-.00 ^a	-.03	-.00
Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)	.03 ^{ab}	-.04	.02	-.03 *	-.00	-.02
Single, no children (S)	-.12 **	-.11 **	-.15 **	-.08 ^{ab}	-.09 **	-.09 **
Constant	.09 **	.11 **	.13 **	.08 **	.09 **	.11 **
R ²	.52 **	.50 **	.54 **	.82 **	.82 **	.82 **
df	13,4669	12,2363	12,2293	14,2619	13,1367	13,1239
ΔR ² family	.011 **	.006 **	.016 **	.003 **	.006 **	.005 **

^a Interaction was significant with gender.

* p < .01. **p < .001.

TABLE 5

Regression Analyses for Times 1 and 2 Employment Disruption

Variables	Time 1			Time 2		
	Total	Women	Men	Total	Women	Men
	B	B	B	B	B	B
<u>Time 1</u>						
Employment disruption measure				.83 **	.81 **	.80 **
Organization size	.01	.03	.01	.02	.03	.02
Organization tenure	-.17 **	-.18 **	-.15 **	.00	.01	.00
Employer sector	-.18 **	-.12 **	-.24 **	.01	-.01	-.00
Education	-.00	-.09 **	.01	-.02	-.05 **	.02
Age	.29 **	.48 **	.06	.08 **	.10 **	.04
Occupational level	.11 **	.10 **	.07 *	.05 **	.08 **	.02
Gender	-.22 **			-.06 **		
Married, no child, not-employed spouse (M1)	-.06 ** ^a	-.05 *	.01	-.02 ** ^a	.01	-.03
Single, children (SC)	.03	-.00	.03	-.03 ^a	-.05 **	.02
Married, no child, full-employed spouse (M2)	-.12 ** ^a	-.20 **	.04	-.03 ^a	-.05 *	.01
Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)	-.06 **	-.01	.04	-.00	.03	.01
Single, no children (S)	-.11 ** ^a	-.22 **	.04	.05 ^a	-.10 **	.05
Constant	.10 **	.13 **	.12 **	.07 **	.09 **	.10 **
R ²	.21 **	.34 **	.08 **	.74 **	.78 **	.65 **
df	12,4670	11,2364	11,2294	13,2620	12,1368	12,1240
ΔR ² family	.012 **	.035 **	.002	.001	.007 **	.003

^a Interaction was significant with gender.

* $p < .01$. ** $p < .001$.

TABLE 6

**Standardized Cross-Lagged Regression Parameters Between Family Structures and Managerial Career Advancement
or Employment Disruption**

Family Structure	Management Advancement		Employment Disruption	
	B MA ₂ FS ₁	B FS ₂ MA ₁	B ED ₂ FS ₁	B FS ₂ ED ₁
Single, no children (S)				
Total	-.02 **	-.01	-.03 ***	.00
Women	-.03 **	-.01	-.06 ***	-.01
Men	-.02 *	-.01	.03	.02
Single children (SC)				
Total	-.03 ***	.00	-.01	-.01
Women	-.02 *	-.01	-.03 *	-.03
Men	-.05 ***	.01	.02	-.01
Married, no children, not-employed spouse (M1)				
Total	-.01	.06 ***	.00	.01
Women	-.05 ***	.03	.03 **	.04
Men	.03 *	.09 ***	-.04 **	.03
Married, no children, full-employed spouse (M2)				
Total	.05 ***	.01	-.00	-.00
Women	.04 ***	.01	.00	.01
Men	.04 **	.01	-.01	-.04 *
Married, children, not-employed spouse (MC1)				
Total	-.02 *	-.02 *	.01	-.01
Women	.01	-.02	.04 **	.04
Men	.00	-.01	.00	-.00
Married, children, full-employed spouse (MC2)				
Total	.02 *	.00	.02 *	.01
Women	.02	.00	.04 ***	-.01
Men	.01	-.00	-.02	.02

Note. MA=managerial career advancement; ED=employment disruption; FS=family structures.
*p<.05. **p<.01. ***p<.001.