Marital Status in TV Drama: A Case of Reduced Options

Nancy Signorielli, Ph.D.
Annenberg School of Communications
University of Pennsylvania

The author is Communications Research Coordinator at the Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa. 19104.
Submitted to the Journal of Broadcasting.

Marital Status in TV Drama: A Case of Reduced Options

Over the past 30 years, television has come to play an increasingly important role in our society. It is, in essence, the wholesale distributor of images and serves as the mainstream of our popular culture. It is "on" in the average home for over six hours each day. Unlike newspapers, magazines, and films, television presents a world that most people experience in a largely non-selective manner. It is, in brief, our nation's most common, constant, and vivid learning environment. While television is only one of many factors which may influence people, findings from some recent analyses[1] (discussed later) reveal that it may well be the single most common and pervasive source of certain sex-related conceptions and actions for large segments of the population.

From the earliest days of research on television content, marriage and the family have consistently appeared as important themes.[2] Two independent studies of television programming of the early 1950's found similar basic dimensions of content and that home and family were important and dominant program themes.[3] Studies about daytime serials have found that these programs deal almost exclusively with home and family. For example, Katzman's analysis of conversations in television serials revealed that love and the home were the predominant themes in 32.8 percent of all recorded conversations.[4] Content studies focusing upon the presentation of women on television have consistently revealed that women are usually presented in a home, family, or marital context.

A study of women in television programs designed for children and/or focusing upon family life found that most females are portrayed as either wives or mothers and that married female characters are not otherwise

employed.[5] Moreover, most women in children's shows are home-oriented and concerned with physical appearances: they are responsible for all cooking and cleaning, while authority is relegated to male characters. Hashell examined five episodes of each of 13 series in which women were the principal characters (e.g., "Alice," "One Day at a Time," "Charlie's Angels") and found that even though the women in this specially focused sample held jobs and supported households without male assistance, most of the topics they discussed were "traditionally female," dealing with romance, personal appearances, dating, and divorce.[6]

Information about the portrayal of marriage in prime-time dramatic television programming comes from a study by Manes and Melynk.[7] This analysis revealed that full-time housewives had more successful marriages than working wives, and that working women, as compared to working men, were more likely not to be married. Moreover, the few successfully married and working women often were not independent or "true" workers; they appeared to be ready to quit their jobs or were willing to work for their husbands.

A major study of prime-time network family series aired between 1947 and 1977 found that 90 percent of these programs were situation comedies and that more than half of all the heads of television households had middle-class occupations.[8] For example, 43 percent of heads of households in television family drama were professionals. In contrast, professionals make up only 14 percent of the U.S. labor force. These authors also note that the working class was especially underrepresented in these family-related series (6 percent of all family series) and were often presented in a negative fashion. No working class characters appeared in family series aired between 1966 and 1977. These authors noted two recurrent themes.[9] First (predominant in family series aired between 1949 and 1966), the working class

husband-father was often portrayed as a bumbling fool. Second (dominant since 1971) the children in these series were upwardly mobile. Thus, in these shows the working class family was presented with dignity when upwardly mobile -- dignity was attached to becoming middle class.

Methodology

This research was conducted as part of Cultural Indicators, an ongoing research project that has been examining trends in television content and conceptions of social reality since 1969.[10] The Cultural Indicators design consists of two interrelated procedures: (1) message system analysis -- the annual content analysis of prime-time and weekend-daytime network television drama and (2) cultivation analysis -- determining the conceptions of social reality that television viewing tends to cultivate in different groups of viewers.[11]

This study uses data from annual message system analyses and focuses upon the portrayal of married, formerly married, and single major characters in prime-time network television dramatic programs. These data isolate the gross, unambiguous, and commonly understood patterns of portrayal; they do not reflect what any particular individual viewer might see on any given evening but rather what large communities absorb over long periods of time.

The sample includes all dramatic prime-time (8 to 11 p.m. EST) programming aired on ABC, CBS, and NBC during one week in the fall of each year from 1975 to 1979.[12] In addition, the sample includes data from prime-time dramatic programs broadcast during one week each in the springs of 1975 and 1976. The data thus come from 7 one-week long samples of prime-time network dramatic programming. Dramatic programs include television plays, movies shown on television, cartoons with a fictional story line, as well as situation comedies and crime-adventure shows. This five year

sample includes 447 programs and 1298 adult major characters (those over 16 years old).

Each program in this sample was subjected to an extensive recording instrument that examined many different aspects of programming and characterizations. This analysis focuses upon some of the data collected for adult (over 16 years old) major characters (those who play roles essential to the plot). The specific content items used in this analysis include category schemes for marital status,[13] sex, social age, race, employment status, romantic involvement, importance of family life, committing violence and victimization, and personality traits that were assessed by five-point bipolar adjective scales such as repulsive-attractive, violent-peaceful, and stupid-smart.[14]

To assess the reliability of each content item in the instrument each program in the sample was independently coded by two pairs of trained monitors. (The final data set consists of a random selection of one of these two codings for each program.) An agreement coefficient was then calculated for each item.[15] Yearly coefficients range from .95 for sex to .50 for some personality traits. The yearly coefficients for marital status averaged around .75.

Findings

The prime-time television world is a fairly stereotyped and traditional world. Women have been consistently outnumbered by three to one: for each woman cast in a major role, three men are similarly cast.[16] Consequently, female characters are less important, play fewer different types of roles, and many are concentrated in roles that can be best described as "typically female."

When women do appear, however, they usually are younger than the men, are more attractive and nurturing, are quite often portrayed in the context of home and family, and likely to be married. Women who are employed (not usually those who are also married) are cast in traditionally female occupations -- nurses, secretaries, waitresses, and sometimes teachers. Men, on the other hand, are generally portrayed as older, more powerful and potent, and proportionately fewer are married. More men are employed and they usually work in high prestige and traditionally masculine occupations (doctors, lawyers, policemen, and other professionally-oriented jobs).[17] Finally, a considerable portion of the female character population is found in programs where major themes center around home and family.[18]

Notions of marriage, home, family and romance are important aspects of the way characters are portrayed and tend to be much more developed in female characters than male characters. Thus, the proportion of female characters who cannot be categorized as either married or not married is considerably smaller than the corresponding proportion of male characters. On prime-time network dramatic programs aired between 1975 and 1979 (see Table 1), only 12 percent of the females could not be coded on marital status; 45.1 percent are classified as single, 26.1 percent are married, and 13.2 percent are divorced, separated, or widowed.

* * * *

Table 1 about here

* * * *

Although there are some year-to-year differences there are no consistent trends in the data. Among men, the only year-to-year significant differences were found among those in the cannot code and single classifications -- for men whose marital status cannot be determined, there is an

overall negative trend that has both significant linear ($F=8.024$), $p<.001$) and non-linear ($F=4.574$, $p<.001$) components; for single men there is an overall positive trend that has both significant linear ($F=7.604$, $p<.001$) and non-linear ($F=3.179$, $p<.001$) components. Among women there is a significant year-to-year positive linear trend only for single women ($F=4.421$, $p<.05$). These trends would thus seem to indicate that while, overall, the number of men in the cannot code group decreased and the number of men in the single classifiction increased between 1973 and 1979, there were considerable fluctuations in the data. Among women, the analysis revealed that the number of single women increased linearly between 1973 and 1979. These trends, however, did not account for much variance; the maximum eta square was .0381.

Table 2 reveals that sex, race, and marital status are even more interwoven. While information about marital status is not available for more than a third of the white males, this information is missing for only 18.3 percent of of the non-white males. Consequently, more non-white than white males are either married or explicitly not married. Non-white males are also a little more likely than white males to be in the formerly married classification.

* * * *
Table 2 about here
* * * *

Among female characters, the relationship between race and marital status takes on a different form. White women are much more likely to be single than non-white women ($Z=2.66$, $p<.01$). Almost half of the white women are presented as single, while only 23.5 percent of the non-white women fall into this category. Married women include only 24.6 percent of the white women but 41.2 percent of the non-white women ($Z=2.13$, $p<.01$). Finally, slightly more non-white than white women are widowed, divorced, or separated.

Age is another very important aspect of characterization and is classified in two ways -- an estimation of a character's chronological age and

their social age. Social age is a descriptive variable that classifies characters in the following age-related roles: children-adolescents, young adults (those with few responsibilities or just beginning a career), settled adults (characters in the prime years of life, settled in careers, with families, etc.), and older adults (those portrayed as "old").

The relationship between age and marital status reflects some very predictable differences. For example, young adults are the least likely group to be married -- about 8 out of 10 of both young men and young women are single. Differences in marital status among settled adults are, however, sex-related. Most middle-aged men are found in three marital status categories: there is no information for 38.2 percent and about the same proportion (a little more than a quarter) are single as are married. Proportionally more women, who are settled adults, on the other hand, are married than single and information on marital status is missing for only 14.8 percent of these characters. The formerly married are also most likely to be middle-aged; they make up 16.7 percent of the middle-aged women and 9.0 percent of middle-aged men. Both older men and older women are rarely seen in these programs (necessitating caution when interpreting these results) and are the characters who are most likely to be presented as formerly married -- 43.5 percent of these men and 40.0 percent of the women are separated, divorced, or widowed. In regard to chronological age, in most roles female characters are younger than their male counterparts. Married characters, however, tend to be older than single characters and formerly married characters (because many are widowed) are usually the oldest group.

* * * *

Table 3 about here

* * * *

Romantic involvement in prime time tells a similar story. In short, more female than male characters are involved in some romantic situation or behavior and about half of the young adults and settled adults are also so categorized. But, among the elderly, romance is practically non-existent; in these seven annual weekly samples, only four older characters -- three men and one woman -- are presented as having a romantic relationship.

We also find that, in general, romance, home, family, and marriage are linked. Married characters are often involved in romantic relationships --[19] 70.7 percent of married men and 80.8 percent of married women. In contrast, among characters who are single, only 39.0 percent of the men and 47.4 percent of the women are involved romantically; and among the formerly married, only about a quarter of both men and women are romantically involved.

Marital status is also related to home and family. For example, family life is more likely to be important to married characters and married characters are also likely to either have or care for children. The group of characters most likely to be portrayed as having children are formerly married men.[20]

The relationship between marital status and employment in prime time (see Table 4) is especially important. First, many major characters -- over one quarter of the women and 10 percent of the men -- do not have jobs. These characters are not presented as unemployed; rather, an occupational role is not part of their characterization. About three-quarters of male adult characters and a little more than half of the female adult characters are portrayed in a specific occupation; the rest are housewives, criminals, retired, or not otherwise employed.

* * * *

Table 4 about here

* * * *

Among women occupational status is usually associated with marital status. Among all adult characters, married women are the least likely group to be portrayed as employed -- only 28.3 percent of married women have a specific occupational role. This is very different from our society where about half of all women who are married, and living with their husbands, have jobs. Women in prime time who are not married, however, are often employed -- 59.6 percent of the single women and 61.5 percent of the formerly married women are employed. For male characters, marital status is not related to employment status; most males are employed and the group with the smallest proportion of non-employed characters (but still seven out of ten) are those who are single.

The analysis of the personality traits of characters in these marital status categories reveals some additional interesting differences in portrayal. For the most part women, whether single, married, or formerly married, are more attractive, fair, sociable, and warm while the male characters in these classifications are more potent, rational, smart, and strong. In regard to the latter group of traits, however, the analysis revealed that on these scales women in the cannot code marital status category had scores that were almost identical to the men who also could not be coded on marital status. The formerly married female television character is also likely to be rated as stronger and smarter but less feminine, sociable, and warm than her married or single counterparts.[21]

Discussion

The results of all these analyses are remarkably similar and offer little more than a rather stereotypical and traditional portrayal of women and marriage. The picture that emerges is that home and family, marriage and romance are important themes and are usually presented as the domain of

the female. Marital status clearly differentiates female characters. Married women are often presented in the most stereotyped and traditional ways -- they have children, perform homemaking tasks, are involved romantically, are not involved in violence, and usually do not have an occupation. Moreover, the analysis of personality traits reveals that married women are feminine, peaceful, fairly happy, attractive, smart, and warm. Single women are also portrayed somewhat traditionally. As would be expected they are younger, do not have or care for children, family life is not presented as part of their characterization, they are likely to be employed, and they are a little more likely to be involved in violende. Moreover, the personality trait analysis revealed that single women are more attractive, sociable, warm, smart, and feminine than other women.

Formerly married women are presented less traditionally but seem to fare the least well of the women. They are older, they have jobs, they have and/or care for children, perform homemaking activities for others, are not often involved in a romantic relationship, and while many feel that family life is important they are less likely than married women to feel this way. Moreover, the personality traits of the formerly married woman reveal that she is less attractive, somewhat unhappy, a little selfish, and less feminine than the other women who populate prime-time drama.

Married and formerly married men, on the other hand, do not differ as much. Formerly married male characters are, however, a little older and a little unhappy and are very likely to have children and place value on family life. Men who are single, on the other hand, are very unlikely to be portrayed positively in regard to home and family. Naturally, they do not have children, they do not play roles indicating that family life is important, and many are not involved romantically (although more of the single than the

formerly married are so involved). Finally, these men are rated as younger and more attractive, sociable, strong, smart, and masculine than men in the other groups.

Although these images seem to idealize the unmarried state -- characters who are single are portrayed the most positively and with the least conflict -- they have jobs, are more powerful, and appear in a wider variety of settings, television also seems to foster the notion (especially for women) that marriage is benign, secure, and safe. But married women have considerably reduced options and rarely have a life away from the family -- they rarely are presented as able to mix marriage and other activities such as succeeding in a job. The formerly married woman seems to have it all -- she has a job and a family -- but she pays the price by being less feminine, attractive, sociable, selfish, and unhappy. These conflicts are almost never part of male characterizations -- males are both married and employed and seem to succeed in both. One negative aspect of male portrayals, however, is that married men are somewhat more likely to be portrayed as less important and powerful than their unmarried counterparts.

In a word, these images reflect an ambivalence about the "appropriate" roles and options for women in our society. And findings from our longitudinal study of a three year panel of over 200 adolescents in rural-suburban New Jersey[22] provide evidence that television may cultivate conflicts that reflect this ambivalence. For example, Morgan and Harr-Mazer[23] and Morgan[24] have found that television cultivates such outlooks as "families are good," "single is bad," and "families are large," as well as higher career aspirations and expectations.

In brief, these analyses reveal that girls who watch more television are more likely to have higher career aspirations and expections and also to be eager to get maried, have children at a relatively early age, and to express the desire to have more children. More importantly, longitudinal examination of these data reveals that early television viewing has a significant independent influence upon later family expectations, above and beyond the effects of earlier family expectations. This strengthens the possibility of making a causal inference; amount of viewing in early adolescence significantly relates to that part of family expectations in later adolescence which is not explained by early plans, and thus influences "new information" or change in family plans.

Television seems to cultivate attitudes about when to form a family and how many children to have that may be in conflict with the career aspirations it also cultivates. But we need to know more about the portrayal of family relationships and how they relate to occupational prestige and success. In addition, we need to understand the role television may play in cultivating images and expectations regarding continuities and disruptions in family life for other age groups. Beyond its influence on adolescents, the representation of family behaviors on television may contribute to adults' conceptions, both as they form families and as their children grow up.

Footnotes

[1] Michael Morgan, "Television and Adolescent Role Socialization." paper presented at the XXX Annual Conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico, 1980.

[2] See Greenberg, Bradley S., "Television and Role Socialization." National Institute of Mental Health, Television and Social Behavior Ten Years of Scientific Progress and Implications for the 80's, in press; George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli, "Media and the Family: Images and Impact," paper for the National Research Forum on Family Issues, White House Conference on Families, Washington, D.C., April 10-11, 1980; and Linda Busby, "Sex-role Research in the Mass Media." Journal of Communication, 1975, 25:2, 107-131.

[3] Dallas W. Smythe, "Reality as Presented on Television." Public Opinion Quarterly, 1954, 18, 156 and Sidney Head, "Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs." Quarterly of Film, Radio and TV, 1954, 9, 175-194.

[4] Natan Katzman, "Television Soap Operas: What's Been Going On Anyway?" Public Opinion Quarterly, 1972, 32, 200-213.

[5] Michele L. Long and Rita J. Simon, "The Roles and Statuses of Women on Children and Family TV Programs." Journalism Quarterly, 1974, 51, 107-110.

[6] Deborah Hashell, "The Depiction of Women in Leading Roles in Prime-Time Television." Journal of Broadcasting, 1979, 23, 191-196.

[7] A.L. Manes and P. Melynk, "Televised Models of Female Achievement." Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 1974, 4, 365-374.

[8] Richard Butsch and Linda M. Glennon, "The Portrayal of Social Class in Television Family Series, 1974-1977," 1978, unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

[9] Linda M. Glennon and Richard J. Butsch, "The Devaluation of Working Class Lifestyle in Television Family Series, 1947-1977," 1978, unpublished research report, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

[10] George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli, "The Mainstreaming of America: Violence Profile No. 11." Journal of Communication, 1980, 30:3, 10-29; George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Marilyn Jackson-Beeck, Suzanne Jeffries-Fox, and Nancy Signorielli, "Cultural Indicators: Violence Profile No. 9." Journal of Communication, 1978, 28:3, 176-207.

[11] This research and reports have focused upon many different topics including violence and power (George Gerbner, et al., "The Mainstreaming of America," op. cit.), images of aging (George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Nancy Signorielli, and Michael Morgan, "Aging with Television: Images on Television Drama and Conceptions of Social Reality." Journal of Communication, 1980, 30:1, 37-47.), sex-role and occupational portrayals (George Gerbner and Nancy Signorielli, "Women and Minorities in Television Drama: 1969-1978."

The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 1979; Nancy Signorielli, "The Valuation of Occupations on Television." paper presented at Public Views of Doctors and Lawyers, a National Invitational Conference, The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, October 18-19, 1979.).

[12] Although Cultural Indicators videotape and computerized data archives contain information dating from 1969, this analysis focuses upon data collected from 1975 when the marital status content item was expanded. Detailed comparisons with data from earlier samples thus could not be made.

[13] Each character's marital status is coded into one of five categories: cannot code (the story does not provide sufficient information about marital status), single (includes characters who co-habitate with the opposite sex but do not plan to marry), married characters (includes those who are presently married, get married, or plan to be married), the formerly married (includes widowed, divorced, separated), and mixed (characters who fall in more than one of these categories).

[14] A complete description of this methodology, including reliability measures, may be found in George Gerbner, Larry Gross, Michael Morgan, and Nancy Signorielli, "Violence Profile No. 11: Trends in Network Television Drama and Viewer Conceptions of Social Reality, 1967-1979." The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 1980. and George Gerbner, et al., "The Mainstreaming of America," op. cit.

[15] The assessment of reliability consists of the calculation of an agreement coefficient for each content item. Five computational formulae are used; their variations depend upon the scale type of the particular variable being analyzed. For the derivation of the formulae and a discussion of their properties, see Klaus Krippendorff, "Bivariate Agreement Coefficients for the Reliability of Data," in E.F. Borgatta, ed., Sociological Methodology: 1970, San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1970 and Klaus Krippendorff, Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology, Beverly Hills: Sage, 1980. These coefficients range from +1.00 to -1.00, where +1.00 indicates perfect agreement and .00 is agreement due solely to chance. A coefficient of .50 indicates that performance is 50 percent above the level expected by chance. Acceptable levels of reliability are defined as follows: items with agreement coefficients of .8 or above are considered as unconditionally reliable, items with coefficients between .6 and .8 are accepted conditionally, while items whose coefficients fall between .5 and .6 are used with extreme caution. All items used in this analysis meet these standards.

[16] This finding dates, in Cultural Indicators research, to 1969 and has also been noted by many other researchers, see Busby, op. cit.

17 These data were previously reported in Nancy Signorielli, "Television's Contribution to Sex Role Socialization." Paper presented at the Seventh Annual Telecommunications Policy Research Conference, Skytop, Pa., April, 1979; as well as Nancy Signorielli, "The Valuation of Occupations on Television." Paper presented at Public Views of Doctors and Lawyers: A National Invitational Conference, The Annenberg School of Communications, The University of Pennsylvania, October, 1979.

18 Overall, the notions of home and family, as well as close personal relationships between the sexes, are two of the most frequently appearing themes in prime-time network dramatic progrnming. Only crime and violence appear as consistently. A special analysis of Cultural Indicators message system analysis program data archives reveales that these two themes have been among the top three in prime time every year since 1969 (except for 1976 when home and family was fifth). Moreover, over the past eleven years, these themes have appeared in 80 percent of all prime-time programs (George Gerbner, et.al., "Media and the Family," op.cit.).

19 A character can only be coded as involved in a romantic relationship if there is specific information that the relationship actually has a romantic component (for example, there is some display of affection between the two characters). Thus, characters who are married will not automatically be coded as involved in a romantic relationship.

20 These data were previously reported in Nancy Signorielli, "Marital Status on Television." Paper presented at the XXXth Annual Conference of the International Communications Association, Acapulco, Mexico, May, 1980.

21 Ibid.

22 The basic theoretical framework for cultivation analysis is described in George Gerbner, et al., "Cultural Indicators," op. cit. and George Gerbner, et al., "The Mainstreaming of America," op. cit. The New Jersey Longitudinal study in described in Larry Gross and Michael Morgan, "Television and Enculturation," in Joseph Dominick and Jim Fletcher (eds.), Broadcast Research Methods: A Reader Boston: Allyn and Bacon, in press.

23 Michael Morgan and Heather Harr-Mazer, "Television and Adolescents' Family Life Expectations," Manuscript, The Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 1980.

20 Michael Morgan, "Television and Adolescent Role Socialization," op. cit.

Table 1

Marital Status of Adult Major Characters in Prime-Time Network Drama, 1975-1979

	All Characters	Males	Females
	N=1286	N=907	N=379
	%	%	%
Single	39.4	37.0	45.1
Married	21.8	20.0	26.1
Formerly Married	9.7	8.3	13.2
Mixed	2.0	1.4	3.4
Cannot Code	27.1	33.3	12.1

$x^2 = 23.08$

$p < .001$

Table 2

Marital Status of White and Non-White Adult Major Characters in Prime-Time Network Drama, 1975-1979

	White	Non-White
All Characters	N=1168	N=116
	%	%
Single	39.7	36.2
Married	20.9	31.0
Formerly Married	9.3	13.8
Mixed	2.1	1.7
Cannot Code	28.0	17.2
	x^2=12.08	$p < .01$
Males	N=823	N=82
	%	%
Single	36.6	41.5
Married	19.3	26.8
Formerly Married	7.9	12.2
Mixed	1.5	1.2
Cannot Code	34.8	18.3
	x^2=10.41	$p < .05$
Females	N=345	N=34
	%	%
Single	47.2	23.5
Married	24.6	41.2
Formerly Married	12.8	17.6
Mixed	3.5	2.9
Cannot Code	11.9	14.7
	(x^2 not applicable)	

Table 3

Marital Status of Adult Major Characters in Three Social Age Categories (Prime Time, 1975-1979)

	All	Male	Female
Young Adult	N=255	N=157	N=98
	%	%	%
Single	81.2	80.3	82.7
Married	5.1	3.8	7.1
Formerly Married	1.2	0.6	2.0
Mixed	1.6	1.9	1.0
Cannot Code	11.0	13.4	7.1
	(x^2 not applicable)		
Settled Adult	N=976	N=712	N=264
	%	%	%
Single	28.1	27.4	29.9
Married	26.8	24.2	34.1
Formerly Married	11.1	9.0	16.7
Mixed	2.2	1.3	4.5
Cannot Code	31.9	38.2	14.8
	x^2=60.60	$p < .001$	
Older Adult	N=33	N=23	N=10
	%	%	%
Single	18.2	8.7	40.0
Married	15.2	13.0	20.0
Formerly Married	42.4	43.5	40.0
Mixed	3.0	4.3	0.0
Cannot Code	21.2	30.4	0.0
	(x^2 not applicable)		

Table 4

Employment and Marital Status of Adult Major Characters
(Prime Time, 1975-1979)

	Cannot Code	Single	Married	Formerly Married	Total
All Characters	N=348	N=507	N=280	N=125	N=1286
	%	%	%	%	%
Unknown	4.0	15.8	25.4	16.8	14.9
Unemployed	2.3	2.2	2.1	4.8	2.5
Not Working	10.6	14.8	3.9	5.6	10.3
Housewife	0.0	0.8	9.6	4.0	2.8
Employed	83.0	66.5	58.9	68.8	69.6
Males	N=302	N=336	N=181	N=75	N=907
	%	%	%	%	%
Unknown	3.3	12.8	17.1	6.7	9.9
Unemployed	2.0	1.2	2.2	5.3	2.0
Not Working	11.6	15.8	5.0	6.7	11.5
Housewife	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1
Employed	83.1	69.9	75.7	81.3	76.5
Females	N=46	N=171	N=99	N=50	N=379
	%	%	%	%	%
Unknown	8.7	21.6	40.4	32.0	26.6
Unemployed	4.3	4.1	2.0	4.0	3.7
Not Working	4.3	12.9	2.0	4.0	7.4
Housewife	0.0	1.8	27.3	10.0	9.2
Employed	82.6	59.6	28.3	50.0	53.0