

# Impact of Disability on the Family Structure

by PAULA A. FRANKLIN\*

*The 1972 survey of the disabled and nondisabled provides comparative data on the two groups that can be used to assess the effects of disability on the family structure. Although the disabled were about as likely to have married as persons in the general population, the stability of their marriages was more limited. The extended families of disabled persons generally provided no greater support through financial or household assistance or visits than did the relatives of healthy persons. Within the nuclear family, contraction of activities—rather than compensatory shifts in sex roles—and decreased participation in most aspects of living were the major consequences of disability.*

A LONG-TERM DISABILITY that limits the ability to work has an impact on more than the individual's health and economic status. The social environment, the living situation within which the disabled person exists, is also affected by an extended illness or a chronic health impairment. This setting is usually the family, for 7 out of every 10 disabled persons are currently married.<sup>1</sup>

The Social Security Administration survey of the disabled and nondisabled in 1972 provides data on the self-reported behavior of the two groups that are useful in examining the impact of disability upon individuals and their families.<sup>2</sup> For the first time it is possible to contrast the behavior and the family patterns of these two segments of the population.

This article focuses on the married household. In the 1972 survey, 18 percent of the disabled and 9 percent of the nondisabled were widowed, separated, or divorced and the respective proportions of those who were never married were 11

percent and 12 percent. The family arrangements and adjustments of the latter groups are not within the scope of this report.

## FAMILY FORMATION AND TERMINATION

Although the disabled are about as likely to have married as are persons in the general population, their marriages—particularly those of disabled men—more often have been postponed to a later age.<sup>3</sup> (The survey data do not indicate the marriage rate—that is, the number of marriages for each group. The proportions of disabled and nondisabled persons still married at the time of the 1972 survey, however, were 71 percent and 79 percent, respectively.)

More marriages end through divorce or separation for the disabled than for the nondisabled. The severely disabled are more likely to be widows or widowers. Among the disabled, therefore, family formation has occurred later and ended earlier—an indication that such marriages are less stable than those between persons with better health status.

Virtually all married persons (99.7 percent) in the 1972 survey sample, however, indicated that the spouse was present in the household. How do various members in the families of the disabled adjust to health impairments? Is the liability of poor health, and its resulting limitation on the resources of these family groups, distributed in a discernible pattern? Do other family members compensate by taking over the afflicted person's customary role functions? Does the family lower its living standard below the level accepted by those who enjoy normal health? Answers to these questions emerge from an examination of the survey data for all married respondents. The disabled—those with severe and occupational impairments and with secondary work limitations—and the nondisabled—both those who have recovered and those who were never disabled.

\* Division of Disability Studies, Office of Research and Statistics

<sup>1</sup> See Kathryn H. Allan and Mildred E. Cinsky, "General Characteristics of the Disabled Population," *Social Security Bulletin*, August 1972; Kathryn H. Allan, "First Findings of the 1972 Survey of the Disabled: General Characteristics," *Social Security Bulletin*, October 1976.

<sup>2</sup> For descriptions of the survey sample estimates and sampling variability, a discussion of the limits of the data, and definitions of disability at different levels of severity, see the technical note in Kathryn H. Allan, *ibid*.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid*.

## GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF MARRIED PERSONS

Men and women were represented about equally among the married survey respondents (table 1). Most disabled persons and their spouses, however, were older than their nondisabled counterparts. About two-thirds of those in families with disabled members were over age 44, and a third were older than 54. Conversely, among nondisabled respondents and their spouses, more than three-fifths had not reached age 45, and only a seventh had attained age 55.

TABLE 1—Selected general characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged 20–64, by disability status, summer 1972

Characteristic	Currently disabled	Non-disabled
Total number (in thousands)	11 066	71 362
<i>Age of respondent</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
20–24	4 4	9 7
25–34	11 1	28 9
35–44	16 4	23 9
45–49	15 9	11 5
50–54	16 0	11 3
55–59	16 2	8 7
60–64	20 0	5 9
Median age	51	39
<i>Age of spouse</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Under 25	4 9	10 0
25–34	10 7	27 5
35–44	16 3	24 1
45–49	13 9	12 0
50–54	17 0	10 4
55–59	15 7	8 2
60–64	11 4	4 7
65 and over	9 5	2 5
Median age	51	40
<i>Sex</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Men	48 0	49 3
Women	52 0	50 7
<i>Age of youngest child in household</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
None	64 1	34 1
Under age 6	14 7	31 7
6–11	15 8	19 6
12–15	9 5	10 4
16–17	5 9	4 2
<i>Race</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
White	89 3	91 5
Black	10 2	7 3
Other	4	1 0
<i>Education</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Elementary (including none)	31 8	13 1
High school (in years)		
1–3	20 9	15 8
4	32 5	43 0
College	14 3	27 4

TABLE 1—Selected general characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U.S. population aged 20–64, by disability status, summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Currently disabled	Non-disabled
<i>Geographic location</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Northeast	19 0	23 5
North Central	26 6	28 4
South	37 4	30 1
West	16 8	17 8
<i>Area and size of community</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Rural	22 1	17 1
Urban, under 100,000	43 9	43 2
City, 100,000 or more	23 8	25 0
Suburb.	6 7	10 6
<i>Area and type of residence</i>		
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Urban		
Center city	25 5	27 5
Fringe	18 6	23 6
Other	12 4	13 0
Rural		
Nonfarm	23 2	20 1
Farm	5 6	3 6
Not reported	14 8	12 2
<i>Veterans' status, men</i>		
Total number (in thousands)	5 310	35,203
Total percent	100 0	100 0
Nonveteran	53 0	46 2
Veteran	46 7	53 4
Vietnam Era	3 8	11 4
Korean Conflict	7 6	11 4
World War II	32 6	22 6
Peacetime	2 0	7 2

The age of the youngest child in the household reflects the difference between the two groups in predominant life stages. One-sixth of both the disabled and the nondisabled families had adolescents aged 12–17. More than half the families with a disabled member, compared with a third of the other families, had no children under age 18, however. These proportions were reversed for those families with children under age 12.

The age difference between members of the two groups was also consistent with differences in the period of military service among respondents who were veterans. A greater proportion of nondisabled than disabled men had been in the Armed Forces. The nondisabled were also more likely to have served in the Korean and Vietnam conflicts. World War II nevertheless predominated as the war during which the majority of those in both groups served.

The proportion of disabled persons who were black was greater than the proportion among the nondisabled. The disabled also had less formal

education. Almost a third, compared with less than an eighth of the nondisabled, had only an elementary school education, proportionately fewer completed high school or had gone to college.

More families with a disabled person lived in the South. They were more likely to live in rural areas and less likely to reside in the suburbs or the urban fringe. Therefore, the disabled were older, less well-educated, and resided in the less affluent geographical areas of the United States.

## FAMILY COMPOSITION AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Among both the disabled and nondisabled, the survey respondent was either the head of the

household or his wife, not another household member (table 2). Among the severely disabled, the survey respondents were wives more often than they were household heads.

The predominant living pattern was the nuclear family, composed of the married couple and their children. The larger proportion of children aged 18 and over among the families of the disabled appears to be a function of the age of the survey respondent and of the life-cycle stage. Few of the respondents resided with their parents or other relatives. The size of the living unit for the disabled, likely to consist of two or three persons, was smaller than for the nondisabled. Two-fifths of the severely disabled lived only with their spouse, compared with three-tenths of the recovered and those in the other currently disabled

TABLE 2—Family characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972

Characteristic	Total U.S. population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
Total number (in thousands)	82,429	11,066	5,116	2,641	3,309	71,362	7,463	63,899
<i>Relationship of respondent to household head</i>								
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Head	48.0	46.9	41.2	54.9	49.4	48.1	50.2	47.9
Wife of head	51.1	52.4	58.1	44.7	44.7	50.9	48.4	51.2
Other relative	8	5	5	4	6	8	8	8
<i>Household composition</i>								
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spouse and children under age 18	73.6	66.3	65.9	63.7	69.0	74.7	71.2	75.2
Other relatives	25.7	32.8	32.7	36.0	30.4	24.6	27.3	24.3
Adult children only	16.6	23.2	21.7	26.0	23.3	17.9	20.7	17.5
Adult children and—								
Parents	8	7	6	2	1.1	8	7	8
Brothers and sisters, no parents	1	0	0	1	0	1	—	1
Other	1.3	3.1	4.0	3.1	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.0
No adult child but—								
Parents	3.0	3.2	3.9	1.2	3.8	2.9	2.9	2.9
Brothers or sisters, no parents	5	4	4	6	4	6	5	6
Other	1.4	2.1	2.0	4.8	2	1.3	9	1.3
Nonrelatives only	6	9	1.3	3	7	6	1.3	5
<i>Number in family</i>								
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
1	2	1	1	0	0	2	4	2
2	26.1	36.3	42.9	30.7	30.6	24.5	30.3	23.8
3	20.7	23.8	21.9	28.5	23.0	20.2	20.5	20.2
4	23.1	16.9	14.7	18.1	19.3	24.1	22.6	24.3
5	14.9	10.6	8.2	12.0	13.2	15.6	13.4	15.9
6 or more	15.0	12.4	12.3	10.6	14.0	15.4	12.7	15.7
<i>Number of children of respondent under age 18</i>								
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None	36.8	54.1	61.7	60.3	45.4	34.1	42.9	33.1
1	20.5	17.2	14.8	19.9	18.9	21.0	19.9	21.1
2	20.1	14.0	11.1	15.2	17.4	21.1	18.3	21.4
3	12.1	6.8	4.8	7.3	9.4	13.0	10.3	13.3
4 or more	10.4	7.9	7.7	7.2	9.0	10.8	8.7	11.1

See footnote at end of table

TABLE 2—Family characteristics of married disabled Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
<i>Extended family of respondent</i>								
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
No relatives in or outside household.....	6	7	7	5	7	6	9	6
Relatives in or outside household <sup>1</sup> .....	99 4	99 3	99 3	99 5	99 3	99 4	99 1	99 4
Parents.....	71 2	51 8	42 5	53 3	65 0	74 2	67 2	75 1
Father.....	46 2	27 3	20 1	25 7	39 6	49 2	42 8	49 9
Mother.....	64 6	45 5	36 2	46 5	58 9	67 6	59 6	68 6
Parents-in-law.....	68 1	47 0	38 2	50 3	58 0	71 4	63 7	72 3
Brothers or sisters.....	89 4	89 2	87 2	91 2	90 6	89 4	87 5	89 6
Own children.....	46 3	66 3	71 9	66 0	57 9	43 2	55 0	41 8
Under age 18 outside household.....	4 8	5 5	5 1	6 9	4 9	4 7	5 9	4 6
18 or over.....	43 4	63 7	69 4	63 1	55 4	40 2	51 4	38 9
Other.....	61 5	56 2	52 7	57 9	60 3	62 3	59 5	62 6
<i>Relatives living within hour of travel</i>								
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	15 8	15 7	14 3	13 7	19 3	15 8	14 8	15 9
Relatives within hour.....	84 2	84 2	85 5	86 3	80 6	84 2	85 2	84 1
<i>Relatives seen at least once a month</i>								
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	18 1	20 4	21 8	17 7	20 5	17 7	17 7	17 7
Relatives seen.....	81 9	79 4	77 9	82 2	79 4	82 2	82 0	82 3

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not add to total because household members may be counted in more than one category

groups and with one-fourth of the general married population

Virtually all (99 percent) of the entire population had relatives in or out of the household. For the vast majority—about 8 out of every 10—a relative was living within an hour of travel time and was seen at least once a month. Differences in life-cycle stage again were reflected in the composition of the extended families of the disabled and nondisabled. The disabled were more likely than the nondisabled to have children, usually adults, living outside the household (70 percent, in contrast to 45 percent) and less likely to have living parents (50 percent, compared with 75 percent) as well as parents-in-law or other relatives. In both groups, about 90 percent had brothers and sisters

### EXTENDED-FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS

Did the families of persons with chronic and multiple health problems have a different relationship to their extended families from that for the general population? Did they receive more household help, greater financial contributions,

or social support from those relatives living outside the immediate unit? Table 3 indicates that there were few differences in the behavior of the extended families of the disabled and nondisabled. Most received no household help from relatives living outside the household.

Though about 9 out of 10 neither gave nor received any financial support outside the nuclear family, about 1 in 12 said that they assisted a relative residing outside the household. For the small proportion of the entire population that did receive income (approximately 2 percent) the median amount was about \$900. Severely disabled men received much less, approximately \$200, severely disabled women received considerably more, about \$1,500.

About 1 in 12 of the currently disabled, compared with 1 in 20 of the nondisabled, did not see nearby relatives regularly. The responses of the severely disabled differed slightly. A fifth reported seeing their relatives less than they had before the onset of disability, and an eighth said they saw theirs more. Such persons were also somewhat more likely to receive help from relatives, usually in the form of household help. This assistance, however, was received by only a small

proportion' of the severely disabled—about a seventh

Additional resources to compensate for the loss of health usually were not provided by the extended family. The pattern of relationships and reciprocity remained similar to that for the general population. Thus, the burden of adjustment and coping with poor health remained within the nuclear family unit.

## FAMILY DIVISION OF LABOR

Over the past 30 years, shifts have occurred in the traditional marital role of the husband as the sole economic provider for the family

unit and the role of the wife as the unassisted housekeeper. The 1972 survey provides baseline data on how members of the general married population are currently apportioning the marital roles of economic contribution and participation in household tasks within the family unit. Once these norms are established, the behavior of the disabled can be contrasted with that for the general population to determine the extent of any compensatory balancing to offset the losses in health.

## ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION

The great majority of all married men were in the labor force and currently employed (table

TABLE 3 — Extended-family characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re covered	Never disabled
Total number (in thousands) 1	81,732	10,942	5,050	2,624	3,273	70,785	7,371	63,413
<i>Help in household from relatives</i>								
Total percent...	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None	87 9	85 6	82 8	89 0	87 3	88 2	86 5	88 4
Help from relatives	11 9	14 1	16 9	10 8	12 3	11 5	13 0	11 4
Not reported	3	3	3	2	4	3	5	2
<i>Financial support to/from relatives outside household</i>								
Total percent...	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None	90 4	89 3	90 1	88 8	88 4	90 6	89 1	90 8
Support	1 1	1 7	2 9	4	1 0	1 0	1 9	8
From relatives only	7 9	8 1	5 8	9 8	10 2	7 8	7 9	7 8
To relatives only		1	7		1			
To/from relatives	6	9	1 1	1 1	3	6	1 0	5
Not reported								
<i>Contact with relatives</i>								
Total number...	82,429	11,066	5,116	2,641	3,309	71,362	7,463	63,899
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
No relatives outside household	8	1 1	1 3	7	1 1	8	1 2	8
Relatives outside household	99 2	98 9	98 7	99 3	98 9	99 2	98 8	99 2
No relatives near, no contact	12 0	11 5	12 0	10 1	12 0	12 1	11 5	12 2
Relatives near, no contact	5 4	8 2	9 2	7 4	7 4	4 9	5 3	4 9
Relatives seen, no help	68 9	64 1	59 2	70 6	66 5	69 7	67 4	69 9
Help from relatives	12 3	14 6	17 8	10 8	12 5	12 0	14 0	11 8
In home	11 3	12 8	14 9	10 4	11 4	11 0	12 1	10 9
Support	6	7	1 2	1	3	6	1 2	5
Both in home and support	5	1 1	1 7	3	7	4	8	3
Not reported	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5
<i>Comparison of 1972 relatives' visits with pre-onset visits</i>								
Total number		10,947	5,050	2,624	3,273			
Total percent		100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0			
Less		14 6	20 8	12 2	6 9			
More		8 2	12 5	4 6	4 6			
Same as before		68 2	62 1	72 9	73 9			
Not reported		9	4 6	10 2	14 6			

See footnote at end of table

TABLE 3—Extended-family characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled Percentage distribution on noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re-covered	Never disabled
Men								
<i>Income from contributions</i>								
Total number.....	40,513	5,310	2,136	1 480	1 694	35,203	2 810	31,393
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	98 3	98 6	98 2	99 2	98 6	98 3	99 7	98 1
Income from contributions.....	1 7	1 4	1 8	8	1 4	1 7	3	1 9
Median (for those with contributions).....	\$892	\$602	\$204	\$584	\$815	\$923	\$802	\$951
Women								
Total number.....	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	97 7	97 0	97 4	98 1	95 5	97 8	98 6	97 7
Income from contributions.....	2 3	3 0	2 6	1 9	4 5	2 2	1 4	2 3
Median (for those with contributions).....	\$882	\$818	\$1,484	\$834	\$668	\$910	\$638	\$950

<sup>1</sup> Excludes those without extended family

4) The exceptions were the severely disabled, a finding that is consistent with the survey definition of severe disability—that is, inability to work or to work regularly. About 7 out of 10 such persons were not currently employed but had been previously. In contrast, about 50 percent of all married women except the severely disabled were in the labor force; five-sixths of the latter were not employed or looking for work. Most women had worked at some time, however. Unemployment—the inability to find a job—had only a slight bearing on the labor-force status of either men or women, sick or well.

In terms of male/female economic roles, the predominant pattern continues to be that most men make the principal economic contribution to the family as measured by labor-force participation. The major change during the past generation has been in the proportion of married women who are employed outside the home. The labor-force participation rates of married women rose sharply between 1950, when 23 percent of those with their husbands present were in the work force, and 1974, when 43 percent were so situated.<sup>4</sup>

The major changes in labor-force status between 1970 and 1972 occurred for the severely

disabled when they dropped out of the labor force.<sup>5</sup> Among the severely disabled, fewer men than women were out of the labor force in either year and more were employed both times, but more men than women dropped out of the labor force during the 2-year period. The ratio of male/female labor-force participation was about 2 to 1 for most groups, but for the severely disabled employed in both years, it was about 3 to 1. This finding suggests that severely disabled men may feel more pressure to continue employment.

Among the nondisabled population, 8 out of every 10 men were employed in both 1970 and 1972. For every 10 women, 3 were employed in both years, 1 became employed, 1 was no longer in the labor force or was unemployed, and 3 were not in the labor force in either year.

About half the wives of the currently disabled men were employed, a proportion similar to that for the nondisabled population (table 5). Yet twice as many families of the currently disabled men as families of the recovered—1 in 6, compared with 1 in 12—included a member who started work or increased the hours of work after

<sup>5</sup> Because the 1972 survey was based on a subsample of the 1970 Decennial Census, data for the 2 years were available for an analysis of changes in such characteristics as occupation, income, and labor-force status among the disabled and nondisabled.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, *Manpower Report of the President—1975*, 1975.

the onset of disability. Approximately five-sixths of those in the latter group indicated that they would have gone to work anyway; the same proportion of those in the former group said that they increased outside employment because of the disability. It was four times more likely that the wife worked than that any other family member did. The median annual income for the working wives of the currently disabled was about \$3,900, almost \$400 less than the amount for other working wives. Since the wives of disabled men indicated that their increased labor-force participation came as a response to illness rather than other factors, such women appear to have shifted

their role to offset the economic loss caused by illness.

Although more than 9 out of 10 husbands in the general population were employed, the number was closer to 8 out of 10 for the spouses of currently disabled women. Fewer of these men held full-time, full-year jobs.

The reduction in economic contribution was especially apparent for the husbands of severely disabled women. The median earnings of these men were approximately \$7,200 a year, about \$1,500 lower than the earnings of spouses in the other two groups of currently disabled women. In contrast, median earnings for married men in

TABLE 4—Labor-force characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled			Nondisabled			
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Current labor-force status</i>								
Total number (in thousands)	40,513	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not in labor force	5.9	32.9	73.7	5.8	5.1	1.8	.8	1.9
Never worked	2	8	2.0		1	1	1	1
Previously employed	5.7	32.1	71.7	5.8	5.0	1.7	.8	1.7
In labor force <sup>1</sup>	94.0	66.6	25.2	94.1	94.7	98.1	99.1	98.0
Currently employed	92.5	63.2	22.7	91.7	89.4	96.9	98.0	96.8
At work	83.6	54.2	13.5	81.9	81.4	88.1	87.4	88.2
Full time	75.1	43.5	5.0	65.7	72.7	79.8	78.4	80.0
Part time	7.2	10.1	8.3	15.9	7.3	6.7	7.0	6.7
With job, not at work	8.9	9.0	9.2	9.8	7.9	8.9	10.7	8.6
Unemployed	1.5	3.4	2.5	2.5	5.4	1.2	1.1	1.2
<b>Women</b>								
Total number (in thousands)	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not in labor force	51.8	68.7	87.0	51.2	47.4	49.1	41.0	50.0
Never worked	8.5	12.0	16.5	3.5	9.7	8.0	4.1	8.4
Previously employed	43.3	56.7	70.5	47.7	37.6	41.2	26.9	41.6
In labor force <sup>1</sup>	48.0	30.5	12.2	48.7	51.3	50.8	58.4	49.9
Currently employed	45.1	28.2	10.3	44.4	49.6	47.8	55.7	47.0
At work	38.3	24.5	7.1	40.2	45.4	40.5	47.3	39.7
Full time	24.5	11.1	1.0	11.3	20.5	26.6	27.5	26.5
Part time	13.3	13.2	5.9	28.1	15.8	13.3	19.8	12.6
With job, not at work	6.9	3.6	3.2	4.2	4.2	7.4	8.4	7.3
Unemployed	2.8	2.4	1.9	4.3	1.7	2.9	2.7	2.9
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Change in labor force status, 1970-72</i>								
Total number	40,513	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not in labor force either year	2.4	13.2	31.2	3	1.6	7	2	8
No longer in labor force	2.6	14.1	30.9	3.8	1.8	8	5	9
Became unemployed	9	2.6	1.6	1.6	4.9	7	7	6
Became employed	4.2	4.0	2.6	6.6	3.5	4.2	5.3	4.1
Remained employed both years	77.0	49.6	17.7	75.1	67.5	81.1	82.3	80.9
Remained unemployed both years	4	6	7	7	4	3	4	3
Not reported	12.6	15.9	15.3	11.9	20.3	12.1	10.5	12.3

See footnote at end of table

TABLE 4—Labor-force characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re covered	Never disabled
<b>Women</b>								
<i>Current labor-force status—Continued</i>								
Total number.....	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Not in labor force either year.....	36 4	47 3	57 4	36 3	36 4	34 6	27 9	35 4
No longer in labor force.....	8 8	10 6	14 5	6 9	6 2	8 5	7 6	8 6
Became unemployed.....	1 0	7	1 1	3	4	1 0	1 6	1 0
Became employed.....	10 6	8 8	3 6	14 9	13 9	10 9	14 7	10 5
Remained employed both years.....	28 1	16 3	6 1	24 7	29 0	30 0	34 5	29 5
Remained unemployed both years.....	1 2	1 1	4 4	2 4	1 4	1 3	6	1 4
Not reported.....	13 9	15 2	16 9	14 6	12 7	13 6	13 1	13 7
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Current occupation</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	37,480	3,356	486	1,357	1,514	34,124	3,734	30,389
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Professional and managerial.....	32 5	23 3	28 4	24 3	20 7	33 4	29 8	33 9
Clerical and sales.....	11 8	13 8	8 9	14 9	14 5	11 6	12 8	11 5
Craftsmen and operatives.....	39 5	37 6	31 6	35 8	41 3	39 7	45 9	39 0
Farmers and farm laborers.....	4 1	9 3	17 3	8 8	7 2	3 6	3 6	3 5
Household service and laborers.....	11 3	15 3	13 3	15 9	15 5	10 9	8 2	11 3
Not reported.....	7	6	4	3	9	7	1	8
<b>Women</b>								
Total number (in thousands).....	18,920	1,622	306	515	801	17,298	2,034	15,264
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Professional and managerial.....	20 0	19 2	12 3	14 8	24 6	20 1	15 2	20 7
Clerical and sales.....	44 0	30 4	32 7	27 8	31 2	45 3	40 7	45 9
Craftsmen and operatives.....	16 3	15 5	5 4	9 2	23 6	16 4	20 8	15 8
Farmers and farm laborers.....	1 8	4 7	7 0	8 3	1 5	1 5	1 3	1 6
Household service and laborers.....	17 6	23 3	42 6	37 7	19 1	16 5	20 8	15 9
Not reported.....	3	9	6	2 4	1	2	1 2	1

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not add to total because household members may be counted in more than one category

the general population were about \$9,850. This disparity reveals the reverse side of compensatory shift. Because, under the survey definition, work includes housework as well as paid employment, some disabled women are housewives limited in their capacity to do regular household tasks. Men whose wives were too ill to fulfill the traditional housekeeping functions may have limited their outside employment. The reduced labor-force participation of the husbands of severely disabled women might also be a function of their being older than their own wives (and the wives of disabled men) and thus more likely to be retired.

Among the disabled and nondisabled men, the current occupational distributions in table 4 show that the disabled were less likely to be professionals or managers and more likely to be farmers,

farm laborers, household service workers, or laborers. Disabled women were less likely to be employed in clerical or sales jobs and more likely to be household service workers or laborers. The occupations in which the disabled clustered require less education and permit intermittent employment and more flexible scheduling, but they also yield lower earnings. More than three-fifths of the less severely disabled men and four-fifths of the nondisabled men earned more than \$5,000 in 1971. Less than a fifth of the severely disabled earned this much; the majority were unemployed.

The general earnings level of women was about six-tenths that of men. More than half the women in the general population employed in 1971 earned more than \$3,000. The major exceptions, severely and occupationally disabled women, earned much



less Half of those who were working earned less than \$2,000 .

The severely disabled suffered the greatest economic hardship because, under the survey's em-

ployment-based definition, they were either unable to work or to work regularly The spouses of such persons were at an economic disadvantage both in the amount of time available for labor-force par-

TABLE 5 — Family employment characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re-covered	Never disabled
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Employment experience of spouse in 1971</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	40,513	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Not employed in 1971.....	44 7	46 6	46 5	46 1	47 2	44 4	40 0	44 9
Employed in 1971 <sup>1</sup> .....	51 1	49 2	49 1	48 0	50 4	51 4	55 0	51 0
Full time all year (50-52 weeks).....	21 9	21 5	24 9	19 9	18 5	22 0	26 5	21 5
Full time (26-49 weeks).....	9 5	9 9	7 6	11 0	11 8	9 4	7 1	9 7
Part time (26-52 weeks).....	10 4	8 5	8 1	8 1	9 3	10 7	14 3	10 3
Intermittent.....	9 2	9 4	8 5	9 0	10 8	9 2	7 1	9 5
Full time.....	4 8	5 8	4 5	4 5	8 8	4 7	3 7	4 8
Part time.....	4 4	3 5	4 0	4 5	2 0	4 6	3 4	4 7
Not reported.....	4 2	4 2	4 4	5 9	2 4	4 2	5 0	4 1
<b>Women</b>								
<i>Employment experience of spouse in 1971</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	35,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Not employed in 1971.....	6 5	14 7	19 7	11 2	8 2	5 2	7 6	4 9
Employed in 1971 <sup>1</sup> .....	91 8	82 9	77 6	86 9	89 8	93 2	90 6	93 5
Full time all year (50-52 weeks).....	76 2	60 0	50 2	65 8	74 0	78 8	74 7	79 2
Full time (26-49 weeks).....	10 5	13 3	14 9	12 8	10 9	10 1	11 6	9 9
Part time (26-52 weeks).....	2 2	3 5	3 4	4 2	3 3	2 0	1 9	2 0
Intermittent.....	2 8	6 0	9 2	4 1	1 6	2 3	2 4	2 3
Full time.....	2 2	4 7	6 9	3 3	1 5	1 8	1 9	1 8
Part time.....	6	1 4	2 3	8	2	5	5	5
Not reported.....	1 8	2 4	2 7	2 0	2 0	1 7	1 9	1 7
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Employment status of family member after disability</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	9,120	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	3,810	3,810	0
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	-----
No member increased hours of work.....	84 5	80 6	75 2	81 9	86 1	89 9	89 9	-----
Increased hours of work <sup>1</sup> .....	14 5	18 7	24 4	18 1	12 0	8 6	8 6	-----
Spouse.....	12 7	16 2	21 0	16 4	9 9	7 7	7 7	-----
Children.....	2 6	4 0	6 2	3 0	2 2	7 7	7 7	-----
Parents.....	2	1	-----	1	1	3	3	-----
Other.....	2	1	1	1	2	3	3	-----
Not reported.....	1	1	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Not reported.....	1 1	7	4	-----	1 9	1 5	1 5	-----
<b>Women</b>								
<i>Employment status of family member after disability</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	9,410	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	3,654	3,654	0
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	-----
No member increased hours of work.....	91 4	90 6	88 5	92 5	93 1	92 7	92 7	-----
Increased hours of work <sup>1</sup> .....	6 0	7 5	10 2	7 4	2 8	3 5	3 5	-----
Spouse.....	8 9	6 0	7 1	6 1	4	2 2	2 2	-----
Children.....	2 0	2 5	2 8	2 1	2 4	1 2	1 2	-----
Parents.....	1	1	2	1	-----	-----	-----	-----
Other.....	1	1	1	-----	-----	1	1	-----
Not reported.....	1	1	2	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Not reported.....	2 6	1 9	1 4	1	4 1	3 8	3 8	-----

See footnotes at end of table.

participation and in the wages received for their efforts. An obvious cost of chronic illness has been the reduced capacity of the family to generate economic resources to meet its own needs.

### PARTICIPATION IN HOUSEHOLD ACTIVITIES

In the nondisabled population, almost everyone helped in some way with household tasks (table 6). Sex differences in the proportion of those helping with shopping, light and heavy household

chores, and money handling were apparent (table 7). Shopping and light household chores were performed by 19 out of 20 women. About half the men shopped for family needs and two-thirds assisted with light household chores. Men were as likely as women to do the heavy household chores, with 7 out of every 10 persons reporting participation. Seven out of every 10 women and 6 out of every 10 men handled family financial affairs. About 25 percent of the men participated in two, three, or four types of activities, but about 50 percent of the women participated in all four and

TABLE 5—Family employment characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled. Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled			Nondisabled			
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re covered	Never disabled
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Reason family member started or increased work</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	9,120	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	3,810	3,810	0
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-----
No member increased hours of work.....	84.5	80.6	75.2	81.9	86.1	89.9	89.9	-----
Increased hours of work <sup>1</sup> .....	14.5	18.7	24.4	18.1	12.0	8.6	8.6	-----
Spouse <sup>2</sup> .....	12.7	16.2	21.0	16.4	9.9	7.7	7.7	-----
Worked regardless of respondent's disability.....	1.1	1.5	1.5	2.4	7	6.9	6.9	-----
Worked because of respondent's disability.....	10.8	13.7	18.4	13.3	8.1	---	---	-----
Other family member <sup>2</sup> .....	3.0	4.2	6.2	3.2	2.4	1.3	1.3	-----
Worked regardless of respondent's disability.....	9	1.3	8	1.1	2.0	5	5	-----
Worked because of respondent's disability.....	1.9	2.9	5.4	2.1	5	5	5	-----
Not reported.....	1.1	7	4	---	9.9	1.5	1.5	-----
<b>Women</b>								
<i>Reason family member started or increased work</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	9,410	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	3,654	3,654	0
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	-----
No member increased hours of work.....	91.4	90.6	88.5	92.5	93.1	3.5	3.5	-----
Increased hours of work <sup>1</sup> .....	6.0	7.5	10.2	7.4	2.8	2.2	2.2	-----
Spouse <sup>2</sup> .....	3.9	5.0	7.1	6.1	4	5	5	-----
Worked regardless of respondent's disability.....	3	2	3	4	1	5	5	-----
Worked because of respondent's disability.....	2.6	3.6	5.9	2.1	3	1.2	1.2	-----
Other family member <sup>2</sup> .....	2.1	2.7	3.0	2.2	2.4	1.3	1.3	-----
Worked regardless of respondent's disability.....	1.1	1.1	7	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.1	-----
Worked because of respondent's disability.....	6	9	9	1.1	6	1	1	-----
Not reported.....	2.6	1.9	1.4	1	4.1	3.8	3.8	-----
<b>Men</b>								
<i>Total earnings of spouse</i>								
Total number (in thousands).....	40,513	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
None.....	49.3	51.5	50.7	49.6	54.3	48.9	44.3	49.5
Earnings.....	50.7	48.5	49.3	50.4	45.7	51.1	55.7	50.5
\$1-999.....	6.9	5.9	7.7	6.5	3.0	7.0	7.0	7.0
1,000-1,999.....	5.7	7.8	6.1	6.6	11.0	5.3	6.6	5.2
2,000-2,999.....	5.5	5.2	6.0	6.6	3.2	5.5	6.9	5.4
3,000-4,999.....	11.9	11.9	12.5	14.5	8.9	11.9	11.0	11.9
5,000-9,999.....	9.4	9.6	10.9	8.3	9.0	9.4	8.9	9.5
10,000-99,999.....	6.8	5.0	4.2	4.4	6.6	7.1	9.9	6.8
100,000 or more.....	4.6	3.0	2.0	3.5	3.9	4.8	5.3	4.7
Median earnings.....	\$4,231	\$3,890	\$3,792	\$3,760	\$4,252	\$4,263	\$4,316	\$4,279

See footnotes at end of table

TABLE 5—Family employment characteristics of married disabled and nondisabled Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status summer 1972—Continued

Characteristic	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re covered	Never disabled
Women								
<i>Total earnings of spouse</i>								
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent. . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None . . . . .	11 8	18 6	22 6	17 8	11 8	10 7	12 2	10 5
Earnings . . . . .	88 2	81 4	77 4	82 2	88 2	89 3	87 8	89 5
\$1-999 . . . . .	1 6	3 6	5 7	2 7	4	1 4	1 7	1 4
1 000-1,999 . . . . .	2 0	3 7	5 1	2 9	1 8	1 7	1 3	1 9
2 000-2,999 . . . . .	1 8	3 0	5 0	1 2	5	1 6	2 4	1 5
3,000-4,999 . . . . .	6 3	8 2	8 1	8 6	8 2	6 0	6 4	5 9
5 000-6,999 . . . . .	12 0	13 8	13 6	14 7	13 6	11 8	9 5	12 0
7,000-9,999 . . . . .	23 0	21 3	17 3	19 1	30 2	23 2	24 1	23 1
10,000 or more . . . . .	41 3	26 8	22 6	33 0	33 6	43 7	42 3	43 8
Median earnings . . . . .	\$9,648	\$8,175	\$7,806	\$8,717	\$8,843	\$9,865	\$9,807	\$9,869

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not add to total because household members may be counted in more than one category

\* Excludes those not reporting

35 percent were involved with three Men therefore helped substantially with household work, although the major responsibility for such tasks was borne by women

Disability limited participation in household activities Currently disabled men were much more likely than nondisabled men to help with only one task or none at all Most affected were severely disabled men, 1 in 4 of whom did nothing

to assist The corresponding proportion for severely disabled women was much lower—1 in 20 Although currently disabled women reduced their participation below the level of that for healthy wives, they contributed more to the completion of household tasks than did currently disabled men

Thus, the withdrawal rate under the pressure of chronic poor health varied for men and women along the lines of the traditional sex-role assign-

TABLE 6—Current participation of married disabled and nondisabled in household activities Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Number of activities	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Re covered	Never disabled
Men								
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	40,513	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent. . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None . . . . .	5 1	12 4	24 5	6 0	2 8	4 0	6 8	3 6
1 . . . . .	12 9	18 5	22 3	18 4	13 8	12 0	9 1	12 4
2 . . . . .	25 0	23 6	22 2	24 7	24 6	25 2	22 9	25 5
3 . . . . .	27 2	23 8	19 6	25 8	27 2	27 8	24 6	28 2
4 . . . . .	25 8	14 0	8 6	14 0	20 8	27 5	27 2	27 6
Not reported . . . . .	4 0	7 7	2 9	11 1	10 7	3 4	9 5	2 7
Women								
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	41,916	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None . . . . .	4	3 0	5 3	1	7	—	—	—
1 . . . . .	1 6	7 6	12 9	3 6	6	6	1	7
2 . . . . .	9 9	19 7	20 0	19 2	19 5	8 3	9 3	8 2
3 . . . . .	36 1	39 9	42 2	40 1	35 5	35 5	35 2	35 5
4 . . . . .	48 4	21 6	14 4	29 7	29 2	52 6	48 1	53 1
Not reported . . . . .	3 6	8 3	5 2	7 3	14 5	2 9	7 3	2 4

**TABLE 7—Current participation of married nondisabled in household activities** Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U S population aged 20–64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Type of participation	Nondisabled		
	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
	Men		
Total number (in thousands) .....	35,203	3 810	31,393
Total percent .....	100 0	100 0	100 0
None .....	4 0	6 8	3 6
Participation <sup>1</sup> .....	93 0	84 2	94 1
Shopping for family needs ..	53 4	52 9	53 5
Heavy chores .....	73 7	66 9	74 6
Light chores .....	68 0	63 7	68 6
Money handling .....	61 5	55 3	62 3
Not reported .....	3 0	9 0	2 3
	Women		
Total number (in thousands) .....	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent .....	100 0	100 0	100 0
None .....	97 5	92 8	98 0
Participation <sup>1</sup> .....	95 7	91 2	96 2
Shopping for family needs ..	72 2	67 0	72 8
Heavy chores .....	96 8	91 3	97 4
Light chores .....	70 7	67 4	71 1
Money handling .....	2 5	7 2	2 0

<sup>1</sup> Percentages do not add to total because household members may be counted in more than one category

ment The data confirm the hypothesis advanced by Greenblum in an earlier study<sup>6</sup> that sex-role norms restrain exemption from prescribed activity through claims to disability but sanction withdrawal from nonprescribed activities Under these predictions, men are not as exempt from outside employment but can more readily withdraw from family and social participation Conversely, women are not as exempt from home and social activities, although they can more readily withdraw from outside employment The 1972 survey data support these predictions on sex-role response to disability in the areas of economic contribution and household participation

Fifty percent of the currently disabled women, compared with about 30 percent of the men, said that they were doing as much or more shopping than before the onset of the current disability (table 8) The proportions were very similar for light housekeeping More than half the women and less than half the men were doing as much

<sup>6</sup> Joseph Greenblum, "Propositions on Social Disability," *International Journal of Health Services* (forthcoming issue, 1977)

**TABLE 8—Change in participation of married disabled in household activities** Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U S population aged 20–64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Type of activity	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
	Men			
<i>Extent of change</i>				
Total number (in thousands) ..	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent ..	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Reduced none some participation ..	32 9	17 3	32 3	53 2
Reduced some, stopped none ..	12 2	10 8	15 4	11 1
Stopped some, continued others, reduced none ..	20 4	19 9	24 8	17 0
Stopped some, continued others, reduced some ..	14 7	24 9	10 5	5 4
Stopped all participation ..	9 3	20 5	2 9	8
Never participated ..	10 6	6 7	14 1	12 8
	Women			
Total number (in thousands) ..	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent ..	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Reduced none, some participation ..	27 0	18 4	30 2	40 7
Reduced some, stopped none ..	16 3	15 4	19 7	15 2
Stopped some, continued others, reduced none ..	17 7	15 2	23 6	18 1
Stopped some, continued others, reduced some ..	28 2	41 2	19 1	10 9
Stopped all participation ..	2 6	4 6	1	7
Never participated ..	8 2	5 2	7 2	14 3
	Men			
<i>Shopping for family needs</i>				
Total number (in thousands) ..	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent ..	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation ..				
More ..	3 3	3 6	3 9	2 3
Same as before ..	28 5	20 2	32 5	35 6
Less ..	8 0	12 6	6 3	3 6
Stopped ..	12 5	22 4	9 6	2 6
Never did ..	34 0	34 1	32 9	34 8
Participation, not reported if some or less ..	6 2	4 6	3 8	10 5
No participation, not reported if stopped or never ..	7 5	2 6	10 9	10 7
	Women			
Total number (in thousands) ..	5,756	2,980	1,161	1 615
Total percent ..	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation ..				
More ..	3 1	2 0	3 1	5 0
Same as before ..	47 3	35 6	58 5	60 9
Less ..	22 2	29 9	19 0	10 3
Stopped ..	13 6	21 6	7 1	3 6
Never did ..	2 8	3 4	2 6	2 0
Participation, not reported if some or less ..	2 7	2 2	2 3	3 8
No participation, not reported if stopped or never ..	8 2	5 3	7 3	14 3

TABLE 8—Change in participation of married disabled in household activities Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U S population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972—Continued

Type of activity	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
Men				
<i>Heavy chores</i>				
Total number (in thousands)	5 310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	2 3	1 0	2 6	3 8
Same as before	20 1	7 8	23 4	32 7
Less	10 4	10 2	11 8	9 4
Stopped	34 6	55 0	27 2	15 2
Never did	21 3	22 3	20 8	20 3
Participation, not reported if some or less	3 8	1 1	3 2	7 8
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	7 5	2 6	11 0	10 7
Women				
Total number (in thousands)	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	2 4	1 4	2 9	3 8
Same as before	14 9	11 4	19 6	17 9
Less	11 5	9 3	15 3	12 8
Stopped	41 8	52 0	38 2	25 6
Never did	19 6	19 7	15 1	22 7
Participation, not reported if some or less	1 3	4	1 7	2 7
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	8 5	5 8	7 2	14 6
Men				
<i>Light chores</i>				
Total number (in thousands)	5 310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	4 9	6 5	5 9	2 2
Same as before	30 7	17 2	37 3	41 9
Less	12 9	18 7	13 8	4 6
Stopped	12 7	21 8	7 9	5 4
Never did	23 8	25 6	21 8	23 2
Participation, not reported if some or less	7 5	7 6	2 3	12 1
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	7 5	2 7	11 0	10 6

or more money handling Among the currently disabled, more women than men had stopped doing heavy household chores, however Currently disabled men and women were both more likely to have reduced or stopped engaging in heavy household chores than money handling Shopping and light housekeeping—the tasks that fall between heavy household chores and money hand-

TABLE 8—Change in participation of married disabled in household activities Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized U S population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972—Continued

Type of activity	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
Women				
<i>Light chores—Continued</i>				
Total number (in thousands)	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	5 6	3 7	6 7	8 2
Same as before	49 9	37 7	64 3	62 2
Less	28 9	43 2	20 0	8 9
Stopped	4 7	8 1	4	1 5
Never did	3	2	1 1	-----
Participation, not reported if some or less	2 1	1 4	4	4 8
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	8 4	5 7	7 2	14 3
Men				
<i>Money handling</i>				
Total number (in thousands)	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	1 7	2 1	1 9	1 2
Same as before	42 0	36 1	46 3	45 7
Less	5 0	7 4	4 9	2 0
Stopped	11 2	18 3	8 4	4 9
Never did	26 3	29 6	25 7	22 7
Participation, not reported if some or less	6 1	3 6	1 9	12 8
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	7 7	2 9	11 0	10 8
Women				
Total number (in thousands)	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More	3 2	2 1	5 4	3 7
Same as before	51 6	49 7	57 1	51 1
Less	4 0	6 1	1 0	2 2
Stopped	7 9	11 5	5 0	3 2
Never did	21 9	22 9	20 4	20 0
Participation, not reported if some or less	3 2	1 9	3 8	5 1
No participation, not reported if stopped or never	8 6	5 8	7 2	14 7

ling in terms of energy and mobility requirements—also fell between them in terms of withdrawal by the currently disabled

Compensatory role shifting within the household rarely occurred under the stress of diminished health resources Persons who were currently disabled seldom added to their household responsibilities Only a small proportion, usually

TABLE 9—Current participation of married disabled and nondisabled in social activities Percentage distribution of US non-institutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Type of activity	Total U S population	Currently disabled				Nondisabled		
		Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
Men								
Total number (in thousands) .....	40,513	5 310	2,136	1,480	1,694	35 203	3,810	31,393
Total percent. ....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	4 6	14 2	25 9	7 4	5 4	3 2	2 8	3 3
Activities in—								
Home only.....	4 3	9 2	14 1	5 3	6 4	3 6	3 1	3 6
Outside only.....	10 1	16 1	18 9	17 7	11 2	9 3	9 3	9 2
Home and outside.....	77 1	52 9	38 4	58 5	86 4	80 7	75 7	81 3
Not reported.....	3 8	7 6	2 8	11 1	10 6	3 3	9 1	2 6
Women								
Total number (in thousands).....	41,916	5,756	2,980	1 161	1,615	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent. ....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	4 3	10 7	16 0	5 0	5 0	3 2	2 0	3 4
Activities in—								
Home only.....	3 4	7 2	9 5	5 3	4 2	2 8	4 4	2 7
Outside only.....	9 1	18 1	23 3	20 4	6 9	7 7	7 6	7 7
Home and outside.....	79 8	55 8	45 9	62 1	69 5	83 6	78 8	84 2
Not reported.....	3 4	8 2	5 3	7 2	14 3	2 6	7 2	2 1

less than 5 percent, reported doing more shopping, money handling, or light or heavy household chores. The proportions were similar for both men and women.

### PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Social activities are an important part of living for the vast majority of persons in the nondisabled population (table 9). At the time of the survey, about 80 percent of such persons were socially active both outside and in the home and almost 10 percent more were participating in outside activities only. About 3 percent confined their social activity to the home, and the same small proportion reported no social life at all.

Disability limited the extent of social participation. A direct relationship was evident. The greater the severity, the more restricted the participation. About two-thirds of the less severely disabled men participated in activities both outside and in the home, but only a little more than one-third of the severely disabled were this active socially. One in 15 of the less severely disabled men had no social activities, compared with 1 in 4 of the severely disabled. The pattern was similar for currently disabled women.

Sex-role differences were apparent among the

severely disabled. Men were more likely to do nothing socially, which corroborates the hypothesis that women receive less sanction to withdraw from their prescribed role of social leadership on the basis of disability. Differences between men and women in social activity were not as dramatic as those in household participation. This finding suggests that social activities are more marginal, and therefore more expendable, than basic survival activities.<sup>7</sup>

Chronic illness does not appear to provide more time for leisure and recreation. These activities do not expand as employment decreases. Although approximately 40 percent of the currently disabled reported doing as much or more at home as before the onset of disability, about 30 percent said they did less or had stopped entirely (table 10). About half the respondents were doing as much or more outside the home, about a third were doing less or had stopped engaging in such activities. Approximately 4 out of 10 persons reported that there had been no reduction in social activities. The remainder reduced their participation or stopped engaging in one or more type of activity.

<sup>7</sup> Further differences between severely disabled men and women in the likelihood of men's participating in home activities only and of women's participating in both home and outside activities are significant at the level of one standard error (68 percent).

TABLE 10—Change in participation of married disabled in social activities. Percentage distribution of U.S. noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972

Type of activity	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
<b>Men</b>				
<i>Extent of change</i>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Reduced none, some participation . . . . .	45 2	26 2	53 0	62 2
Reduced some, stopped none . . . . .	19 1	25 4	17 8	12 4
Stopped either at home or outside, continued other . . . . .	14 0	19 8	10 8	9 4
Stopped both at home and outside . . . . .	8 5	16 7	4 3	1 8
Never participated or not reported . . . . .	13 2	11 8	14 1	14 2
<b>Women</b>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Reduced none, some participation . . . . .	41 5	31 2	47 1	56 6
Reduced some, stopped none . . . . .	25 5	28 3	28 2	18 6
Stopped either at home or outside, continued other . . . . .	14 1	19 4	12 4	5 6
Stopped both at home and outside . . . . .	7 7	12 0	4 3	2 5
Never participated or not reported . . . . .	11 1	9 2	8 0	16 9
<b>Men</b>				
<i>In home</i>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More . . . . .	3 0	2 5	3 4	3 4
Same as before . . . . .	38 4	26 0	46 2	47 1
Less . . . . .	15 4	22 8	12 8	8 4
Stopped . . . . .	13 5	20 9	9 6	7 6
Never did . . . . .	16 8	23 8	15 6	8 9
Participation, not reported if same or less . . . . .	5 3	1 2	1 4	13 9
No participation, not reported if stopped or never . . . . .	7 6	2 8	11 0	10 7
<b>Women</b>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More . . . . .	3 7	3 1	3 1	5 2
Same as before . . . . .	34 2	25 3	37 2	48 6
Less . . . . .	23 0	26 1	23 7	16 9
Stopped . . . . .	15 8	22 0	13 6	6 1
Never did . . . . .	12 6	16 6	11 8	5 9
Participation, not reported if same or less . . . . .	2 0	1 0	3 4	3 0
No participation, not reported if stopped or never . . . . .	8 5	5 9	7 2	14 3

Hobbies are similarly affected by disability (tables 11 and 12). The time devoted to such activities appeared to diminish rather than to expand with the severity of disability. Although

TABLE 10—Change in participation of married disabled in social activities. Percentage distribution of U.S. noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64, by disability status and sex, summer 1972—Continued

Type of activity	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severe	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
<b>Men</b>				
<i>Outside home</i>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More . . . . .	3 0	3 0	2 5	3 4
Same as before . . . . .	45 5	26 9	56 4	59 5
Less . . . . .	17 7	26 3	16 5	8 1
Stopped . . . . .	13 3	25 2	6 6	4 2
Never did . . . . .	10 1	14 7	6 2	7 6
Participation, not reported if same or less . . . . .	2 8	1 2	9	6 5
No participation, not reported if stopped or never . . . . .	7 6	2 7	11 0	10 6
<b>Women</b>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More . . . . .	3 8	3 8	4 6	3 3
Same as before . . . . .	45 4	34 1	56 9	57 8
Less . . . . .	22 2	29 0	20 4	11 0
Stopped . . . . .	11 6	17 7	5 8	4 4
Never did . . . . .	6 3	7 8	4 5	4 9
Participation, not reported if same or less . . . . .	2 5	2 4	5	4 3
No participation, not reported if stopped or never . . . . .	8 2	5 2	7 2	14 3
<b>Men</b>				
<i>Time spent with spouse</i>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Spends—				
Less . . . . .	4 4	5 7	4 8	2 4
More . . . . .	43 0	65 7	30 7	25 0
Same as before . . . . .	42 7	24 8	52 9	56 4
Not reported . . . . .	9 9	3 8	11 6	16 1
<b>Women</b>				
Total number (in thousands) . . . . .	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent . . . . .	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Spends—				
Less . . . . .	8 9	9 8	7 7	8 0
More . . . . .	27 5	35 5	23 2	15 8
Same as before . . . . .	54 4	48 7	60 9	60 1
Not reported . . . . .	9 3	6 0	8 2	16 1

TABLE 11—Participation of married disabled in hobbies  
Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized US population aged 20-64, by disability status, summer 1972

Type of participation	Currently disabled			
	Total	Severely	Occupational	Secondary work limitation
	Men			
Total number (in thousands).....	5,310	2,136	1,480	1,694
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More.....	4 6	4 8	4 2	4 6
Same as before.....	28 4	13 3	36 2	40 5
Less.....	14 9	19 2	15 0	9 3
Stopped.....	13 4	23 7	8 5	4 6
Never did.....	25 6	31 5	21 4	21 7
Participation, not reported if same or less.....	5 5	4 7	3 4	8 4
No participation, not reported if stopped or never.....	7 8	3 0	11 3	10 8
	Women			
Total number (in thousands).....	5,756	2,980	1,161	1,615
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Participation				
More.....	8 2	7 9	11 2	6 6
Same as before.....	24 8	19 3	28 2	32 6
Less.....	14 0	15 2	11 1	14 0
Stopped.....	10 4	16 3	5 9	2 7
Never did.....	27 3	30 1	28 2	21 4
Participation, not reported if same or less.....	6 7	5 2	8 2	8 4
No participation, not reported if stopped or never.....	8 6	6 0	7 3	14 3

more disabled women than men increased their participation in hobbies, the rise was approximately 8 percent for the former and less than 5 percent for the latter. About a fourth of all disabled persons did less or stopped such activity. These data support the hypothesis that for a significant fraction of the disabled, disability reduces the potential time for work, social, and personal activity.<sup>8</sup>

With diminished activity in personal development and social interaction, the currently disabled, especially men, increased the time spent with the marriage partner, as table 10 indicates. More than 40 percent of the currently disabled men, compared with 27 percent of the women, reported spending more time with their spouses. Once again, the extent of this reliance related

<sup>8</sup> Walter Oi, "Evaluation of Income Maintenance Programs for the Disabled," Economics Department, University of Rochester, (mimeographed paper available from the author)

TABLE 12—Participation of married nondisabled in hobbies  
Percentage distribution of noninstitutionalized US population aged 20-64, disability status, summer 1972

Type of participation	Nondisabled		
	Total	Recovered	Never disabled
	Men		
Total number (in thousands).....	35,203	3,810	31,393
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	21 6	20 6	21 7
Some.....	75 3	70 4	75 9
Not reported.....	3 1	9 1	2 4
	Women		
Total number (in thousands).....	36,160	3,654	32,506
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0
None.....	28 8	25 1	29 2
Some.....	68 7	67 7	68 9
Not reported.....	2 5	7 2	2 0

directly to the level of severity. 66 percent of the severely disabled men and 35 percent of the severely disabled women increased the time spent with their spouses. Disability apparently forces married couples into a stronger reliance on their own interpersonal resources and thereby places greater demands on the marriage relationship to supply social needs.

## CONCLUSION

Contraction, rather than compensation, emerges as the major impact of disability on the family structure. Although the disabled were as likely to have married as were persons in the general population, the duration and stability of their marriages were more limited. The educational, geographic, and economic resources available to these families, especially those of the severely disabled, were less abundant than for the general population. The extended family generally provided no greater support to the disabled than to the healthy population, so the nuclear family was forced to cope with its problems as well as it could. Men and women withdrew at a slower rate from their sex-assigned roles. Decreased participation in most aspects of living highlighted the patterns of the disabled in their family setting. Chronic poor health impoverished not only those it afflicted, but also those living with them.