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This study examined the effect of hearing status on role salience and anticipated work–family relations among 101 unmarried young adults aged 20–33 years: 35 with hearing loss (19 hard of hearing and 16 deaf) and 66 hearing. Participants completed the Life Role Salience scale, anticipated conflictual relations scale, anticipated facilitory relations scale, and a background questionnaire. The deaf participants demonstrated a significantly higher level of commitment to work but anticipated the significantly lowest level of conflict. Hearing status was a significant variable in predicting anticipated conflictual relations among all participants. Mode of communication was a significant predictor of conflictual relations among the hearing loss group. Implications for theory and practice were discussed.

Work and family functioning play a central role in the life of western society, and, therefore, these factors are important components in assessing the functioning of persons with disabilities. Research has shown the disadvantages experienced by individuals with disabilities in different aspects of career development (Szymanski & Hershenson, 2005). The critical period of emerging adulthood, the period between the early 20s and 30s, when young persons are exposed but not yet committed to different jobs and intimate personal relationships, has not received sufficient research attention regarding work and family roles and their interrelations (Cinamon, 2006; Friedman & Weissbrod, 2005). Although agreement exists regarding the importance of addressing work–family issues as part of students’ career programs (Barnett et al., 2003; Cinamon & Rich, 2004), very little research has been conducted in this area in general and among populations with disabilities in particular. Furthermore, the impact of disability on work–family issues during this sensitive and critical period has not been investigated at all. This study focused on examining attributions of importance to work and family roles and anticipated work–family relations (WFR) among three groups of young adults differing in their hearing status. Addressing such issues may enlarge the body of knowledge regarding young adults’ work and family plans as well as the influence of hearing loss on career development.

Disabilities and Career Development

Adults with disabilities, in general, exhibit dramatically high rates of unemployment and underemployment (Burkhauser & Houtenville, 2003), which can adversely affect economic and social status and self-image. Even at the period of emerging adulthood, young adults with disabilities face challenges in establishing a career. They are often slower in launching a career than their nondisabled counterparts (Benshoff, Kroeger, & Scalia, 1990). Some young adults with disabilities may begin to think of themselves as people of lower worth and less deserving of good jobs and may set their career aims too low (Dipeolu, Reardon, Sampson, & Burkhead, 2002; Lustig et al., 2003; Saunders et al., 2000). Inasmuch as individuals with disabilities are
less likely to hold part time jobs in their teenage years, they face greater hurdles in testing their skills and abilities (Lustig et al., 2003). Consequently, they tend to be slower in crystallizing their career interests in young adulthood (Shahnasarian, 2001), and they demonstrate lower aspiration levels that have a negative impact on their vocational choices (Babbitt & Burbach, 1990; Jones, 1997; Saunders et al., 2000).

Similar results were reported in the several studies available regarding career-related variables in persons with hearing loss. Schroedel's (1992) review of the literature on deaf individuals’ occupational expectations concluded that deaf persons had relatively low expectations; they more often indicated that blue-collar jobs were more suitable than did hearing persons. Weisel and Cinamon (2005) showed that deaf and hard-of-hearing (HH) adolescents expressed biased evaluations of deaf women’s competence and did not find highly prestigious occupations as suitable for deaf adults.

The accumulative knowledge in the field of career development of people with disabilities in general and hearing loss in particular lacks a broader perspective, having focused mainly on the work domain and disregarded the family domain. To offer such a wider perspective, this study investigated attributions of importance to both work and family roles and examined two types of domain-specific anticipated WFR.

Moreover, to study the impact of disability, this study examined career-related variables among emerging adults with normal hearing and with two different levels of hearing loss and modes of communication. Inasmuch as physical hearing loss occurs on a continuum from mild to profound, an audiological distinction can be made between those who are deaf (i.e., a severe or profound hearing loss) and those who are HH (i.e., a mild, moderate, or moderately severe hearing loss). However, the distinction between deaf and HH can also be made according to other factors, such as mode of communication. Those who rely primarily on vision to learn language are considered deaf, and these individuals may use signs in addition to spoken language, whereas those who rely primarily on hearing to learn language are considered HH (Antia & Levin, 2001). This last distinction was adopted in this study.

**Attributions of Importance to Work and Family Roles**

Role salience refers to the importance individuals ascribe to roles played out in various domains such as work and family (Super, 1990; Super et al., 1996). Developmental career theorists, researchers, and counselors use the role salience construct to comprehend how people structure life roles in the context of their lives (Hartung, 1998; Nevill & Calvert, 1996; Super et al., 1996). Role salience crucially affects the career plans of adolescents and young adults (Niles & Goodnough, 1996). It also figures prominently in models conceptualizing WFR because individuals invest more time and energy to the role they deem more important (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985).

Two important variables have attracted the focus of role salience research: gender (e.g., Friedman & Weisbrod, 2005; Hartung & Rogers, 2000) and cultural differences (e.g., Super & Sverko, 1995; Watson, Stead, & de-Jager, 1995). Yet, the effects of disabilities, especially hearing loss, on role salience have received insufficient empirical attention, especially regarding the period of emerging adulthood. Possibly, due to the family’s crucial role in supporting and caring for the family member with a disability (Algozzine, Browder, Karvon, Test, & Wood, 2001), young adults with disability may attribute greater importance to family roles compared to their nondisabled counterparts. On the other hand, perhaps young adults with disability may attribute higher importance to the work role compared to their nondisabled counterparts because success in this role indicates better functioning and good rehabilitation. In light of these speculations, the first goal of this study was to examine differences in attributions of importance to life roles among young adults with differing hearing status.

**Relations Between Work and Family**

Ecological system theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1989) as well as Super’s (1990) theory emphasized the mutual influences between various domains of human functioning. These theories underlie many research studies dealing with the relationships between work and family roles. Despite agreement that these relations
include conflictual and facilitory aspects, most research thus far has focused on conflict (Frone, 2003).

Work–family conflict (WFC) is defined as a form of interrole conflict in which pressures from work and family roles are incompatible (Greenhaus & Beutell, 1985). Research has shown two types of WFC, each with its own unique domain-specific antecedents and unique negative outcomes: work interfering with family (W → F) and family interfering with work (F → W). Research has consistently demonstrated that W → F conflict surpasses F → W conflict among working adults with families (for a review, see Frone, 2003).

Work–family facilitation (WFF) is a less established concept than WFC, going by various labels and definitions. Following Wayne, Musisca, and Fleeson (2004), we defined WFF as occurring when, by virtue of participation in one role, performance or functioning in the other role is enhanced. As in WFC, bidirectionality also exists for facilitory relations. Work can facilitate family life (W → F), and family can facilitate work (F → W) (Wayne et al., 2004). The few existing studies in this area indicated positive outcomes of facilitation such as better mental health (e.g., Grzywacz & Marks, 2000; Hammer et al., 2005). Furthermore, studies demonstrated significantly higher levels of F → W facilitation than W → F facilitation (Hammer et al., 2005; Wayne et al., 2004).

One important issue in the area of WFR is whether conflict and facilitation constitute independent constructs that can be experienced simultaneously or whether they comprise the high and low ends of the same construct. The little available empirical evidence suggests the former: WFC and WFF seem to be independent constructs with different antecedents and different outcomes, but further empirical support for this claim is needed (Hammer et al., 2005; Voydanoff, 2005; Wayne et al., 2004).

Anticipated conflict and facilitation between work and family may affect emerging adults’ career plans (Barnett et al., 2003; Cinamon, 2006). Research on young people’s expectations may enhance understanding of the development of career and family plans and aspirations and may promote timely career interventions to minimize the harmful effects of WFC on the realization of family and career goals. However, little research has systematically examined young adults’ expectations regarding the prevalence and type of conflict and facilitation they might encounter (Barnett et al., 2003; Cinamon, 2006; Conlon, 2002). This important issue was not investigated at all among young adults with hearing loss.

The few studies focusing on anticipated WFR among young adults mostly investigated expectations of conflictual relations (Barnett et al., 2003; Cinamon, 2006; Livingston, 1996) and reported that expected conflicts influenced career plans (Barnett et al., 2003; Cinamon, 2006, Livingston, 1996). Moreover, most studies measured global perceptions of future conflict without considering the bidirectional aspects. Barnett et al. (2003), for example, calculated global measures of conflict among college participants inasmuch as the correlation between the two types of conflict was high. In contrast, Cinamon (2006) found a low correlation between the two conflicts and unique antecedents, leading her to claim that young adults do differ in expectations for the two types of conflict. These mixed results emphasize the need for further examination of young adults’ perceptions and awareness concerning possible relations between work and family. Hence, this study aimed to investigate both types of anticipated WFR (conflictual and facilitory), each bidirectionally, among young adults with and without hearing loss. Furthermore, we examined whether WFC and WFF are distinct constructs and investigated the contribution of hearing loss to the variance in anticipated WFR. On one hand, it might be assumed that young adults with hearing loss would anticipate higher levels of W → F conflict compared to hearing adults due to their difficulties assimilating into the hearing community, especially in the world of work, as well as lower levels of F → W conflict due to the supportive experiences they had within their families as people with special needs. This line of logic leads us to assume that these differences would be stronger among young deaf people compared to those who are HH. It could also be assumed that young adults with hearing loss would anticipate higher levels of both types of facilitation due to the central role of work and family among this special group. On the other hand, it could also be assumed that young adults with hearing loss would anticipate lower levels of W → F conflict due to their
lower vocational aspirations (Babbitt & Burbach, 1990; Jones, 1997; Saunders et al., 2000), which lead them to less demanding jobs. The multifaceted nature of this issue will be examined in this study.

Method

Participants

Participants were 101 unmarried young adults (50 males, 51 females) aged 20–33 years (\(M = 25, SD = 2.88\) years) from central Israel: 35 with hearing loss and 66 hearing. Among participants with hearing loss, 19 (12 females and 7 males) used spoken language as their main mode of communication and would be referred to as the HH, and 16 (7 females and 9 males) simultaneously used spoken and signed language and would be referred to as the deaf group. It should be noted that the participants that comprised this deaf group study were not necessarily affiliated with the Deaf community in Israel. The Deaf community in Israel, like in other cultures, communicates solely through Israeli sign language.

The demographic study on deaf people in Israel (Sela & Weisel, 1992) indicated high rates of unemployment among this population (37%), holding less prestigious occupations, and only few were advanced in their work.

Within the HH group, 17 had hearing aids, 3 used cochlear implants, and 2 did not use any sensory aids. Four of them had moderate hearing loss and 15 had severe to profound hearing loss. The age of onset of hearing loss was during the first 3 years of their lives. Within the deaf group, 12 had hearing aids, 1 participant used cochlear implant, and 4 did not use any sensory aids. Four of this group had moderate hearing loss and 12 had severe to profound hearing loss. The age of onset of the hearing loss was in the range of 0–24 months.

About half (55.2%) of the participants reported having temporary jobs: 47.4% of the HH participants, 68.8% of the deaf, and 60.3% of the hearing participants. No significant differences emerge among the groups in this variable (\(\chi^2 = 1.74; p > .05\)). About 42% reported involvement in a relationship: 26.3% of the HH participants, 31.3% of the deaf, and 51.6% of the hearing participants. No significant differences emerged between the three groups in this variable (\(\chi^2 = 1.74; p > .05\)).

Of the participants, 57.10% were students: 12 HH (six participants were BA students, five were MA students, and one was a PhD student), 7 deaf (all of them were BA students), and 34 hearing (all were BA students). Significant difference emerged between the groups in educational status (\(\chi^2 = 24.64; p < .001\)).

Instruments

Attributions of importance to life roles. The Life Role Salience Scale (LRSS) (Amatea, Cross, Clark, & Bobby, 1986) was used to assess participants’ attributions of importance to work and family roles. The LRSS assesses attributions of importance to four roles: work role, spousal role, parental role, and housework role. It includes 40 items using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). A 10-item subscale that taps each of the four roles comprises five items reflecting commitment to the role (e.g., “I intend to invest much time and energy in raising my children”) and five items reflecting the value attributed to the role (e.g., “The aim of my life is to have an interesting career”). Cronbach alphas reported by Amatea et al. (1986) for the commitment and value subscales of the four roles were, respectively, .83 and .86 (work), .80 and .84 (parental), .81 and .94 (spousal), and .79 and .82 (housework). Following other researchers who did not measure the housework role among academic participants because they frequently hire outside help for housework (e.g., Chi-Ching, 1995; Cinamon & Rich, 2002a), this study, too, utilized only the 30 items comprising the work role, parental role, and spousal role subscales. We assumed that young adults too do not attribute high importance to the housework role in this unique period of identity exploration, when they invest their time and energy in experiencing work possibilities and personal relationships.

The salience of each role was determined by commitment and by values; therefore, we examined reliability for each separately. Cronbach alphas for the commitment and value subscales, respectively, were .82 and .70 for the work role, .61 and .68 for the
parental role, and .61 and .68 for the spousal role. These lower reliability values compared to those of the original scales of Amatea et al. (1986) might be due to cultural differences between the Israeli and the American cultures.

Anticipated WFC. Cinamon’s (2006) 14-item questionnaire was used to measure two types of anticipated WFC. Seven items on a five-point Likert-type scale assess anticipated work interfering with family, W ∆→ F (e.g., “My work will take up time that I will want to invest in my family”), and seven items assess F ∆→ W conflict (e.g., “My family’s demands and personal problems will interfere with my work”). The score for each subscale comprised the mean of its seven items. Cronbach alphas were .78 for the W ∆→ F conflict and .81 for the F ∆→ W conflict.

Anticipated WFF. The scale of Wayne et al. (2004) adapted by Cinamon and Rich (2005) was used to measure anticipated perceptions of facilitory relations between work and family. The measure includes 10 items on a five-point Likert-type scale: five items assessing F ∆→ W facilitory relations (e.g., “My family life will help me relax and prepare for my next working day,” alpha = .81) and five items assessing W ∆→ F facilitory relations (e.g., “The satisfaction I will get in my work will help me in my role at home,” alpha = .83).

Demographic questionnaire. Data were collected on gender, age, marital status, degree and year of study (for students), employment status and type (student job versus career-oriented position), engagement with intimate relations, residential status, and parents’ occupational status during late childhood and adolescence.

Procedure
All participants completed the self-report questionnaire individually and voluntarily. No time limits and no incentives were offered. The hearing participants were university students who were approached by a research assistant. Approximately 85% of those who were approached consented to participate. Participants who were HH or deaf received the questionnaires through two organizations for individuals with hearing loss. Return rate was approximately 80%.

Results
Table 1 presents means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations of the main study variables.

The first goal of the study was to investigate attributions of importance to life roles among the three participant groups (hearing, HH, and deaf). The multivariate analysis of variance indicated a significant group difference in role salience, F(12, 182) = 2.50; p < .00; η = .14. Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and F values for each of the six life role salience subscales for the three groups of participants.

As can be seen in Table 2, differences emerged among the three groups for all the subscales except parenting values, but differences were significant only in work commitment, F(2, 96) = 9.67; p < .01. Bonferroni post hoc tests revealed that deaf participants had a significantly higher level of work commitment.
Table 2  Means, standard deviations, and $F$ values of the life role salience subscales among HH ($n = 19$), deaf ($n = 16$), and hearing ($n = 66$) participants

| Subscale            | Group | $M$   | $SD$  | $F(2,96)$ | $\eta$ |
|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|--------|
| Work values         | HH    | 3.93  | .69   | .22       | .00    |
|                     | Deaf  | 3.96  | .50   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 3.85  | .69   |           |        |
| Work commitment     | HH    | 3.42  | .86   | 9.67**    | .17    |
|                     | Deaf  | 4.05  | .67   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 3.17  | .69   |           |        |
| Spouse values       | HH    | 3.81  | .96   | .29       | .00    |
|                     | Deaf  | 3.99  | .51   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 3.93  | .71   |           |        |
| Spouse commitment   | HH    | 3.89  | .75   | .65       | .01    |
|                     | Deaf  | 3.89  | .28   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 4.02  | .56   |           |        |
| Parental values     | HH    | 4.11  | .80   | .00       | .00    |
|                     | Deaf  | 4.12  | .74   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 4.12  | .78   |           |        |
| Parental commitment | HH    | 4.23  | .58   | 1.84      | .04    |
|                     | Deaf  | 3.95  | .85   |           |        |
|                     | Hearing | 4.25  | .48   |           |        |

$**p \leq .01$.

(M = 4.05, $SD = .67$) in comparison to the HH ($M = 3.42$, $SD = .86$) and hearing ($M = 3.17$, $SD = .69$) groups.

Examination of Tables 1 and 2 reveals that among all three groups of participants, the family roles (especially the parenting role) were more salient than the work role.

The second goal of the study was to explore anticipated WFR. First, discrimination between both directions of conflict and facilitation was examined. Second, dominance between conflict and facilitation was explored. These analyses were conducted across all participants and within each of the three different groups.

Distinctions between the two types of conflict and two types of facilitation were examined via Pearson correlation analyses following Barnett et al. (2003) and Cinamon (2006), suggesting that high correlations between the two types of relations is an indication to lower distinction between the constructs. Table 3 presents these values. As seen in the table, a high significant correlation emerged between the two conflict types across all the participants (HH: $r = .50$; deaf: $r = .72$; hearing: $r = .81$). Inasmuch as 56% of the variance of one conflict type was explained by the other (because $r = .75$ in the all sample), it can be concluded that the participants did not differentiate between the two types of conflict. The correlation between the two facilitation types ($r = .58$) was lower compared to the correlation between the two types of conflict ($r = .75$) indicating that only 33% of the variance of one type of facilitation was explained by the other.

Table 3  Means, standard deviations, Pearson correlations, and paired $t$-tests between the two conflict and two facilitation types across all participants and within each group

|                    | HH ($n = 19$) | Deaf ($n = 16$) | Hearing ($n = 66$) | Total ($N = 101$) |
|--------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                    | $M, SD$      | $M, SD$        | $M, SD$            | $M, SD$          |
| **Conflict**       |              |                |                    |                   |
| $W \rightarrow F$ | 2.96, .68    | 2.30, .60      | 2.62, .66          | 2.70, .67        |
| $F \rightarrow W$ | 2.63, .57    | 2.30, .62      | 2.64, .64          | 2.59, .64        |
|                    | $t(18) = 2.27^*$ | $t(15) = .00$ | $t(63) = 1.70$ | $t(100) = 2.43^*$ |
| **Facilitation**   |              |                |                    |                   |
| $W \rightarrow F$ | 3.67, .87    | 3.29, .50      | 3.54, .78          | 3.55, .78        |
| $F \rightarrow W$ | 4.40, .49    | 4.02, .54      | 4.17, .60          | 4.20, .58        |
|                    | $t(18) = 4.80^{**}$ | $t(15) = 4.50^{**}$ | $t(63) = 7.74^{**}$ | $t(100) = 0.14^{**}$ |
| **Conflict**       |              |                |                    |                   |
| $W \rightarrow F$ | $r = -.65^{**}$ | $r = .04$      | $r = .10$          | $r = -.01$       |
|                    | $t(18) = -2.19^*$ | $t(15) = -5.09^{**}$ | $t(63) = -6.76^{**}$ | $t(100) = -8.17^{**}$ |
| **Facilitation**   |              |                |                    |                   |
| $W \rightarrow F$ | $r = -.09$ | $r = -.06$ | $r = .13$ | $r = .10$ |
|                    | $t(18) = -9.75^{**}$ | $t(15) = -8.07^{**}$ | $t(63) = -14.90^{**}$ | $t(100) = -19.76^{**}$ |

$p \leq .05$.  $^{**}p \leq .01$. 
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other type. These results suggest that the participants did differentiate between the two facilitation types, relatively more than they differentiated the two types of conflict. Overall, no significant correlations emerged between the W → F conflict and facilitation or between the F → W conflict and facilitation (p > .05).

As for the correlations within the three groups, the HH group seemed to differentiate between the two conflict types (r = .50) as well as between the two facilitation types (r = .65). The deaf and the hearing groups, however, differentiated only between the two types of facilitations (deaf: r = .23; hearing: r = .57) but not between the two types of conflict (deaf: r = 72; hearing: r = .81).

Regarding the dominance issue, paired sample t-tests indicated that across all the participants, as well as within each group separately, levels of F → W facilitation were higher than levels of W → F facilitation. Levels of W → F conflict were significantly higher than levels of F → W conflict only among the HH participants (t(18) = 2.27; p < .05).

Four linear regression analyses were conducted to predict the four types of WFR by role salience and hearing status (were used as dummy coding in the regression). Only the model of F → W conflict was significant, F(7, 93) = 3.08, p < .001, explaining 19% of the variance by two predictors: parental commitment (β = -.28, p < .05) and hearing status (β = .18, p < .05). Levels of parental commitment were negatively correlated with anticipating levels of F → W conflict (r = -.21). The more young adults planned to be committed to the parental role, the less F → W conflict they anticipated. Furthermore, the HH group was more likely than the deaf group to anticipate F → W conflict (M = 2.63, SD = .57, versus M = 2.30, SD = .62, respectively).

The same four regressions were conducted only for individuals with hearing loss (n = 35), with the six subscales of role salience and the mode of communication (spoken language/simultaneous speech–sign) as the predictor variables. Two regressions were significant. The anticipated W → F conflict model, F(7, 27) = 3.20, p < .01, explained 45% of the variance, with a significant contribution by communication mode (β = -.48, p < .001). Deaf participants, compared to HH, anticipated lower levels of W → F conflict (M = 2.30, SD = .60, versus M = 2.96, SD = .68, respectively). The W → F facilitation model, F(7, 27) = 2.48, p < .05, explained 39% of variance, with significant contributions by commitment to spouse (β = .58, p < .001) and communication mode (β = -.35, p < .05). The more commitment to the spouse role, the more levels of W → F facilitation was expected. Deaf participants anticipated also less W → F facilitation (M = 3.29, SD = .50) compared to HH participants (M = 3.67, SD = .87). In sum, HH participants who used spoken language anticipated higher levels of conflict as well as higher levels of facilitation. Deaf participants anticipated the lowest levels of both types of conflict and facilitation relations.

In order to examine the contribution of background variables (gender, age, employment status, engagement with intimate relations, and participation in education) to the variance of the dependent variables (role salience and anticipations of WFR), linear regressions were conducted. Significant results were found only in the work commitment regression, F(6, 99) = 3.26; p < .001. Only participation in education was found significant (β = -.24; p < .05). Participants who were students demonstrated lower work commitment compared to those who were not students. These regressions (those who focus on the main variable of this study, hearing status, and those who focus on the background variables) indicate that hearing status is an important predictor of role salience and anticipating WFR.

**Discussion**

Anticipated relations between the domains of work and family play an important role in the period of emerging adulthood, a time of identity exploration (Arnett, 2000). The aim of this study, therefore, was to explore anticipated conflictual and facilitory relations between work and family roles as well as attributions of importance to these roles. Furthermore, another goal of this study was to examine the impact of hearing loss on these variables. The following discussion deals with these issues as reflected in the present results and draws implications for career intervention and counseling.
Role Salience

The current results indicated that family roles were highly salient to the future planning of all the young adults who participated in the study. Within the family domain, the parenting role was deemed most important. These results support previous LRSS findings by Friedman and Weissbrod (2005) and by Cinamon (2006), who likewise showed that the students in their studies attributed higher importance to future family roles than to work roles. The stronger weight given to family roles during the period of emerging adulthood is unsurprising in that such roles are highly familiar to participants from personal experience throughout childhood and adolescence. Interestingly, high importance attributed to family roles was also reported among adult employees (e.g., Cinamon & Rich, 2002b). It is important to note that the Israeli society is considered as traditional in terms of family obligations and commitments among both Jewish and Arabic societies, and it is possible that this notion is reflected in the results as well. Nevertheless, many adults invest more time and energy in their work roles compared to their family roles (Cinamon & Rich, 2002b). This discrepancy suggests that differences may exist between how adults view their work and family roles and their actual behaviors, in a reality where they may face demands in the work world that do not enable them to invest sufficient time with their family. Future research should investigate this incongruence further, and career counseling as well as career intervention should prepare young people for such gaps in order to prevent future frustrations.

As reported above, the salience of the family domain was highest for all the participants. In addition, although the subgroups did not differ significantly in five out of the six subscales, the deaf group did score significantly differently from the other two groups in work commitment. Deaf young adults reported a higher commitment to the work world compared to the hearing and HH groups. Inasmuch as the current deaf participants used spoken language and signs simultaneously as their mode of communication, perhaps this group was not as fully integrated into the hearing world as the HH group, who relied solely on spoken language for communication. This distinction may lead to a greater dominance of their hearing disability within their evolving identity. Consequently, we suggest that hearing disability affects role salience in the exploration process during emerging adulthood. As integration in the work world is a major indicator for good rehabilitation and coping with disability, the deaf participants indicated more commitment to this role compared to their counterparts.

WFR: WFC and WFF

The current results regarding anticipated WFR among all young adults participated in the study indicated no significant correlation between its conflictual and facilitory aspects, as well as different predictors for each, suggesting that future conflict and facilitation are perceived by the young adults as independent constructs. These results coincide with the established coexistence of conflict and facilitation in the lives of adult employees (Hammer et al., 2005).

Another indication of participants’ awareness of WFR like in adult employees was the finding that levels of facilitation surpass levels of conflict (Hammer et al., 2005; Voydanoff, 2005). This finding was evident in all three participant groups. Furthermore, the current results also revealed that the HH young adults anticipated higher levels of W → F conflict than vice versa, and all the participants anticipated higher levels of F → W facilitation than vice versa. In other words, they expected that work would render a more deleterious impact on family life than family would on work, whereas family would serve as a facilitator for positive work experiences more than work would facilitate positive family experiences.

Regarding the issue of awareness concerning the bidirectional influences of conflict and facilitation, the results are not clear cut. The construct of conflict relations was not differentiated either by the group as a whole or by the hearing and the deaf. Only the HH made the distinction between future conflicts of W → F and F → W. Regarding facilitation, examination of the results of the whole sample (hearing and deaf) indicates differentiation between the two types of facilitation (only 25% of the variance of one facilitation is explained by the other one). Examination of each subgroup revealed that the deaf group differentiated
the most between the two constructs. It should be mentioned that the results showing a lack of differentiation support the results of Barnett et al. (2003) and those showing differentiation support Cinamon’s (2006). These mixed outcomes may suggest a developmental process of exploration that may be influenced by other variables not taken into account here, such as different life experiences. Anticipated WFC is part of a complicated developmental process of future planning that incorporates awareness of multiple aspects within each domain (work, family) and their complex blending and combination. This process likely develops through exploration of life experiences. Support for this hypothesis may be lent by the distinction that the present HH group made between the two conflict types. We believe that they were more sensitive to this differentiation due to their more complicated exposure to life experiences, as they belong to both the hearing as well as the deaf communities. Future research should consider more variables that may affect perceptions of WFR.

Hearing Loss and Anticipating WFR

The last goal of this study focused on the impact of hearing loss on anticipated WFR. The results indicated that the HH participants were more similar to the normal hearing participants on the issue of anticipating WFR. The deaf participants anticipated the lowest levels of conflicts and facilitations. This may stem from misunderstanding the future complex relations between the two important domains of family and work due to the more restricted exposure of the deaf to the hearing world. In contrast, the HH participants are, generally, educated in regular educational system with hearing peers, and therefore, their exposure to the different aspects of the world of work is wider. Another explanation may be the fact that deaf young adults are aware of their community’s vocational problems in the work domain, and therefore, they assume that they will have less demanding jobs, leading them to anticipate fewer conflicts as well as less facilitation.

The discussion and the interpretation of the current results should consider its limitations: the present design is based only on self-reports of the participants, and thus future study may consider also peer or parents’ estimations of the individuals’ commitments to life roles. Also, it should be noted that the correlation nature of the study does not prove causality.

The results of this study suggest also practical implications, especially regarding career intervention. Instead of solely focusing on matching between the individual and specific occupation, there is a need to consider a developmental and wide perspective of career that address work and family issues simultaneously. Preparation of adolescents and young adults to blend work and family roles effectively (see extension in Cinamon & Rich, 2005) may be an example for such perspective. Furthermore, the results indicate the importance of a sensitive intervention to the special characteristics and needs of young adults with hearing loss. It is clear from the results that the work role is salient in their identity, especially for the deaf participants. Therefore, it is important to include in the interventions issues of personal work meaning (e.g., what does “work” mean to me, and what do I expect to achieve through work in life). Clarification of identity and the role of the disability in the identity are crucial. Understanding the role of the hearing loss in the process of choosing a vocation and planning a career should be an essential element in career counseling as well as in career intervention. Feldman (2004) discussed five elements that should compose career interventions for persons with disabilities: (a) developing greater impression management skills to better sell themselves, (b) getting part time or internship work experience while in school, (c) getting complete information on the rights of people with disabilities, (d) getting practice making career-related decisions, (e) and learning how to discuss disability-related problems with future supervision. The present outcomes shed light on other aspects that should be considered in these programs, such as the need to develop awareness concerning the complex relationship between work and family and the need to consider communication mode when creating optimal career intervention programs for young adults with hearing loss.

Finally, as a result of the different practices we had to use for recruiting the participants, some more thoughts regarding career interventions and career counseling emerged. Whereas young adults who are enrolled in universities or colleges may enjoy the
attention and exposure to career counselors and different sorts of career services, others who are not enrolled in such formal organizations might not be exposed to such services. In fact, the participants with hearing loss in this study demonstrated lower participation in the university compared with the normal hearing participants. It is recommended that social services focus on providing services to this group, as well as other organizations for deaf and HH people, should implement a proactive approach. The objective should be to get and encourage these young people, who do not learn, to participate in career intervention or to offer them career services.
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