

To The Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley entitled "The Influence of Personal, Positional, and Resource Power on Equity in Dual-Earner Marriages." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Human Ecology.

Priscilla White Blanton

Priscilla White Blanton,
Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Jessie S. Fabun

Joe M. Mallett

Julia A. Malia

James D. Smith

Accepted for the Council:

Leominkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

The Influence of Personal, Positional,
And Resource Power
On Equity in Dual-Earner Marriages

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley

August, 1993

Copyright © Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley, 1993

All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to the chair of my committee, Dr. Priscilla White Blanton. A mentor in the true sense of the word, she has been a source of ideas, encouragement, prompting, laughter, knowledge, and good common sense.

I would like to thank the members of my committee: Dr. Greer Litton Fox, Dr. Jim Moran, Dr. Arie Nettles, Dr. Julia Malia, and Dr. Josette Rabun for their invaluable comments and suggestions. I would also like to thank Don Broach, computer consultant, for his kind and calming assistance throughout the data analysis programming. I thank Melissa Tilson for her diligence throughout the word processing of this document and its many revisions. Thank you, Mel.

I thank my dear friend, Jen Gilliard, who has been colleague and confidant for the last four years. Dr. Jeanne Gilley, Dean, College of Human Ecology, Louisiana Tech University, has given me invaluable encouragement, guidance, and opportunities, and has helped me to define and realize my professional goals. I thank her for her steadfast confidence in my abilities.

My parents, De and Lois Jeffcoat, have supported me through all my endeavors. I thank them for their constant encouragement and for their love. I wish to thank my son, Jeffrey, for the motivation and the opportunity to seek my doctorate.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my wonderful husband, Ed, who has remained cheerful, enthusiastic, and supportive of me--listening to all of my ideas, reading every word I have written, and weathering many crises with me. Thank you, Ed.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate power, beyond just decision making processes to include relational aspects of power and the influence of socioeconomic resources on perceptions of equity in marriage for husbands and wives. In addition, a new scale to measure personal and positional power in marriage was developed, and its reliability and validity were tested.

Ninety-two husbands and wives comprised the sample for the study. Husbands' and wives' means did not differ for the positional power subscale of the PPPI, nor the equity scale. Husbands' and wives' means on the personal power subscale of the PPPI were significantly different, however. T-tests were conducted also on the means of individual items of the new scale and differences were revealed on three items of the personal power subscale.

Regression analyses using the variables of hours worked in paid employment, personal income, and educational attainment to predict personal power for both husbands and wives were conducted. The models were not significant for predicting variance in personal power. The same model was tested for predicting positional power in both husbands and wives. Again, the model using socioeconomic variables as predictors for positional power was not significant.

A regression analyses using the variables of hours worked in paid employment, personal income, educational attainment, personal power, and positional power to predict equity for both husbands and wives was tested. None of the socioeconomic variables was

a significant predictor for equity; however, positional power was a predictor variable for equity in husbands and wives combined when univariate analyses were examined, and personal power approached significance.

Regression analyses were then conducted for husbands and wives as separate groups. Although the full model predicted 26 percent of the variance in equity for husbands, the full model was not significant for wives. Regression analysis testing a reduced model through forced entry of variables into the equation was conducted for husbands. The reduced model of personal power and positional power predicted 27 percent of the variance in equity for husbands.

The strongest predictor of equity for husbands was positional power, and it was an inverse relationship. Therefore, the more use of positional power, the less perceived equity. The relationship between personal power and equity was positive. Thus, the more use of personal power, the more the marriage was seen as being equitable.

The findings of this study support the notion that when couples can achieve economic interdependence, their marriage is seen as equitable. Economic interdependence moves both husbands and wives toward a "win-win" situation if they are able to see that they are not losing their traditional bases of power, but rather are adding new bases of power. Men can have personal power without losing their masculinity; women can have positional power without losing their femininity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
ONE. INTRODUCTION	1
TWO. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Power	6
Personal/Positional Power	14
Equity	18
Socioeconomic Resources	21
Summary	23
THREE. METHODS	25
Sample	25
Instrumentation	34
Operational Definitions	39
Data Collection Procedures	40
Data Reduction and Transformation	42
Data Analyses	42
FOUR. RESULTS	44
Comparison of Husbands and Wives	44
Regression Analyses	53
FIVE. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS	59
Conclusions from the Study	59
Discussion of the Study's Conclusions	59

CHAPTER	PAGE
Implications for Theory	65
Implications for Practice	67
Implications for Research	69
Limitations of the Study	71
Summary	71
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIXES	78
APPENDIX A	79
APPENDIX B	80
APPENDIX C	81
APPENDIX D	82
APPENDIX E	83
APPENDIX F	86
APPENDIX G	87
APPENDIX H	88
APPENDIX I	90
VITA	91

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Age, Hours in Weekly Employment, and Length of Marriage for Husbands and Wives	27
2. Frequency Distribution of Personal Income	28
3. Family Income	30
4. Frequency Distribution of Educational Attainment	31
5. Frequency Distribution of Employment Status	32
6. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Employment	33
7. Frequency Distribution of the Religiosity Variables	35
8. Frequency Distribution of the Life Situation Variables	36
9. Factor Loadings for the Personal/Positional Power Inventory	38
10. Sample Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges on Personal and Positional Power and Equity Scales	46
11. A Summary of <i>t</i> -tests Comparisons of Means on Individual Items of the Personal Power Subscale of the PPPI	47
12. A Summary of <i>t</i> -tests Comparisons of Means on Individual Items of the Positional Power Subscale of the PPPI	48
13. Predictors of Equity in Husbands and Wives: A Summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations	54

TablePage

14. Predictors of Equity in Husbands: A Summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations	55
15. Predictors of Equity in Wives: A Summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations	57
16. Reduced Model of Predictors of Equity in Husbands	58

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

There have been very few recent studies of power in families. Beginning with Blood and Wolfe's influential work (1960), researchers have focused studies that have been conducted on the provision and control of resources and the outcome of decision making processes as the basis for understanding power in the marital dyad. These studies have failed to take into account the prevalence of the unequal power balance of the marital dyad on a micro and a macro level, and the limitations inherent when one investigates only decision making as an index of marital power (Gray-Little & Burks, 1983). "Power is an inevitable element of any social structure--including marriage--and as such it ought to be systematically investigated for theoretical reasons and for policy reasons, in order to develop sounder value prescriptions for marriage" (Scanzoni, 1979, p. 296). Research, however, has been conceptually and methodologically flawed by a failure to move beyond the micro level and the observational and behavioral study of outcomes (Scanzoni, 1979; Komter, 1989) and by a reliance on self-report measures, primarily those of the wife (Kingsbury & Scanzoni, 1989) to examine power processes. In addition, the feminist postmodern theorists have pointed out that researchers have assumed that the American ideal of equality exists for the marital dyad and have ignored gender inequality issues created and maintained by our patriarchal society within the marital dyad.

This study examined power from a broader perspective, focusing on the relational influence of power within the marital dyad. After a review of the current literature on power and equity from sociological and family science perspectives along with the feminists' critiques of these perspectives, the variables of personal and positional power and socioeconomic resources were examined for their impact upon the perception of equity within the marital dyad.

Power has been conceptualized as belonging to the person who has the authority through provision of resources or through "legitimacy" (Blood & Wolfe, 1960) without consideration being given to the salience that our patriarchal society has lent to this definition of power, i.e., it presumes males have the privilege of power over women in all relational contexts. Power has also been defined as existing in "realms of expertise" or in complementary roles by such theorists as Parson and Bales (1955), Beavers (1982), and Minuchin (1974); i.e., men hold power in the outside world, and women hold power in the home. The conceptualization of power has thus been mystified, couched in concepts that promote a view of equality within the marital dyad while downplaying the power inequity that may exist when men hold valued resource power based on their worldly position and also hold the final authority within the home.

Creating and maintaining an intimate, equal marriage is a goal many would aspire to reach (Napier, 1988). Gray-Little and Burks (1983) have shown that egalitarian marriages --those in which the partners perceive each is relatively equally invested in perpetuating and maintaining the relationship--have the highest degree of marital quality. The process through which traditional marriages are transformed into egalitarian marriages

are concentrated in three areas: power, equity, and sex-role identification (Napier, 1988). Unfortunately, as partners move toward egalitarian relationships, conflicts over power tend to increase in significance as increasing numbers of women attempt to achieve greater equity within the dyad (Scanzoni, 1979).

The purpose of this study was to investigate power beyond decision making processes to include relational aspects of power, and the influence of socioeconomic resources on perceptions of equity in marriage. The predictive value of a model consisting of socioeconomic resources (personal financial resources, educational attainment, and hours of paid employment), personal power, and positional power on the perception of equity was examined for both husbands and wives.

The objectives of this study were as follows:

- *to analyze power from a perspective broader than the traditional patriarchal model;

- *to test the reliability/validity of a scale developed for this study to measure positional/personal power in marriages;

- *to explore the influences of socioeconomic resources of personal financial resources, educational attainment, and hours of paid employment, as predictors of positional and personal power for husbands and wives;

- *to explore husbands' and wives' use of positional and personal power in the marital relationship as predictors of perceptions of equity within the marital relationship.

The hypotheses of the study were as follows:

1. The variables of socioeconomic resources (personal economic resources, educational attainment, hours of paid employment) are related to personal power.

2. The variables of socioeconomic resources (personal economic resources, educational attainment, hours of paid employment) are related to positional power.

3. Personal power and positional power are related to perceptions of equity. Based on a review of the literature, it was predicted that models would differ for husbands and wives.

The definitions used as a basis for this study were as follows:

Positional power was defined as the relational power one individual holds over another through the authority and status given to the individual by society to fulfill societal expectations and sanctions and by the other's sanction through his/her acceptance of societal mores (Hansen, 1965).

Personal power was defined as the relational power one individual has over another when the individual voluntarily acts in such a manner as to meet the interpersonal needs and desires of the other; i.e. individual A has power over individual B because of the gratitude/dependence created in B as a result of A's support, caring, and provision of benefits expected as a tacit agreement of the terms of their relationship (Hansen, 1965).

Equity was defined as the degree to which an individual feels that when all things are considered, the outcome derived from a relationship is proportionate to his/her investment. The individual feels the relationship is fair and that both of the partners are equally contributing to and participating in the relationship (Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985).

Personal economic resources were defined as the amount of personal financial resources that each spouse provided for the family.

Hours paid employment was defined as the total hours worked per week in a formal job setting.

Educational attainment was defined as the highest grade level completed.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

POWER

Sociological Perspective

Sociologists have written that power is a "key notion" (Sprey, 1979), "key to understanding family relationships" (Hesse-Biber & Williamson, 1984), "the main concept," and "the most important aspect of family structure" (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). However, power has been difficult to conceptualize and to measure (Scanzoni, 1979; Gray-Little & Burks, 1983).

The functionalist sociologists (for example, Parsons & Bales, 1955; Pitts, 1964; among others) did not focus on power as a necessary concept for their studies of the family, which accepted without question the legitimacy of the patriarchal family with father as provider of economic resources, as well as the final authority in the family. Power as viewed by the functionalists was synonymous with authority and with the male's ownership of the right to participate in the economic system. The functionalists did not view this inherent power differential as problematic for the family (Scanzoni, 1979).

Waller and Hill (1951, cited in Nye, 1980, and Scanzoni, 1979) began theorizing about power when they developed the "principle of least interest." They theorized that the partner who was least invested in the relationship held the greater power over the partner more interested in maintaining the relationship. They defined power that was unjust or unfairly utilized as exploitation.

Blood and Wolfe (1960) began to develop their resource theory when they conceptualized power as the "potential ability of one partner to influence the other's behavior....manifested through the ability to make decisions" (p. 11). Blood and Wolfe saw the marital dyad as balancing power based on the comparative resources that each spouse contributed to the union. The spouse who contributed the greater resources held the greater weight in the balance of power in decision making processes.

Blood and Wolfe's resource theory is a variation of social exchange theory. Social exchange theory as applied to the marital relationship is basically concerned with costs and benefits, i.e. a perception of a relationship as "good" occurs when the benefits experienced outweigh the costs. Perception of the costs and benefits is determined by the individual, based on characteristics defined as reward, such as frequency, value, saturation, scarcity, and fatigue. In relationships, this reward is derived from the nature and quality of the interaction rather than specific behaviors. Individuals believe that rewards should be in proportion to their investments and formulate subjective impressions based in on-going interaction of both their own and their partner's rewards and costs in the relationship across time. Social exchange theory suggests that one determines his/her satisfaction with a relationship based on his/her impressions of the costs and benefits of the relationship, which are interpreted in the context of comparison levels and alternatives. The comparison level is the average value of all outcomes known to a person. The comparison level alternative is the best currently available alternative to the present relationship. If the comparison level of the present relationship is low and the comparison level of an alternative is high, the satisfaction with the present relationship

is low and the individual's attraction to maintaining the present relationship is low. Therefore, marital satisfaction is determined by assessing the degree of positive affect toward a spouse based on the evaluation that the rewards minus the costs are at the least the degree to which the individual feels that he or she is entitled (Sabatelli, 1984).

According to social exchange theory, power is vested with the person who brings more economic resources to the relationship. Traditionally, men have held greater power in the marital context, based on their economic resources, educational advantages, and occupational prestige, while women have been relegated to the role of "junior partner" at best (Scanzoni, 1982).

Conflict theory posits that marriages exist between persons who compete for authority and control of resources through negotiation, bargaining, and conflict management (Sprey, 1979). Power is considered to be a main concept of conflict theory and is conceptualized as the individual's ability to control others. In a relational context, power is defined as the potential to control the outcome of a joint course of action (Sprey, 1975). Resources are the means through which power is exercised. From the conflict theory perspective, power can also be a resource. Power allows one to control options available to others; however, the "other" may also have the power to demand rewards for his/her compliance. There are two types of power: authority, which is associated with a given social position, and privilege, which is a competitive advantage held by a member at the expense of others. Privilege may be a factor of social position or it may reflect special access to a scarce resource.

Family Systems Perspective

The notion of equality between spouses has been accepted by family theorists. Beavers (1982) wrote that the optimal family has a clear hierarchy of power, with parents forming an egalitarian coalition. Overt power has to be equally divided between parents through complementary roles in order to avoid conflict and competition. Beavers propounded the "separate but equal" theory of marriage (1982). Minuchin also supported this notion of equality, adding his theory of mutually accommodating spouses and families where tasks are completed by the spouse most suited to do so (1982).

A family systems perspective states that the following assumptions of systems theory will apply to the normal development of functional families. Interdependence of every part of the system depends on the other parts for proper functioning; therefore, any change that occurs in the family creates change in the individual, and the converse is also true. Wholeness (the system is greater than the sum of its parts) considers group characteristics which may not be evident in any individual, but which bring about unique power and communication patterns to the system whole. Communication within the system considers all behavior as a transmitted message, with a content aspect and a relationship aspect which facilitates both cohesion and adaptability (Olson, 1986). The rules of the family system are created by patterns of interaction which provide guidelines for understanding the system and which govern all aspects of family life. The ability of the family to cope with developmental stages and crises is called adaptation. The family system is characterized by openness, which is interaction between members of the system as well as interaction with the larger ecosystem which serves to influence behavior within

the system. Families, as described from a systems perspective, have equifinality, the ability to accomplish a goal in many different ways and from many different starting points. The functional family has hierarchical relationships between small groups that must be considered in order to understand the family. Alliances across generational boundaries and triangulation may have negative consequences. Functional family systems also have the ability to process information through communication so relationships within the family can be maintained (Walsh, 1982; Beavers, 1982). Beavers (1982) defined the optimally functioning family as one characterized by a solid parental coalition with clear generational boundaries, where authority is vested firmly in the hands of the parents, who maintain defined limitations for the behaviors of their children. The stability of the family and the security of its members rests in the parents' ability to form a strong parental coalition. Children are not required to fill adult roles and so learn to accept limitations and authority. Leadership is provided by parents in egalitarian coalition with complementary roles.

Family systems theory does not question the influence of patriarchy on the organization of the family. Key concepts are role complementarity (separate but equal roles), reciprocity, circularity, and neutrality. Thus, an equality of adult roles in families is assumed. Power is discussed only in the context of intergenerational or parent-child relationships.

Feminists' Critique

The unequal balance of power in the marital dyad has for the most part been ignored in both the sociological and family science literature. Issues of power and dominance have not been included in traditional descriptions of marriages and love relationships. However, the notion of power being equally shared between men and women is not a political, economical, cultural, or social reality-based assumption--not in the family and not for larger societal systems. In our culture, the family and the economy are structured to insure the perpetuation of a system which has as its underlying basis the power inequality between men and women.

Feminists have pointed to the major flaws inherent in theories about the family: the absence of the concepts of power and gender (Carter, 1992). Goldner (p. 56) has written that "gender and the gendering of power...construct family life in the deepest sense" (McGoldrick, Carter, Papp, & Silverstein, 1989). The impact of the feminist perspective is to view the family through the lens of gender, which serves to highlight the structural power imbalance in families (Carter, 1992). Feminism is defined as. . .

a humanistic framework or world view concerned with the roles, rules, and functions that organize male-female interactions. Feminism seeks to include the experience of women in all formulations of human experience, and to eliminate the domination of male assumptions. Feminism does not blame individual men for the patriarchal social system that exists, but seeks to understand and change the socialization process that keeps men

and women thinking and acting within a sexist, male-dominated framework (Walters et al., 1988, p. 17).

Feminists have pointed out that other theorists have accepted without question the traditional patriarchal family with its "separate but equal" roles, with its systems view of reciprocity and causality, and the perception of the family as a relatively closed system. Families are not closed systems. They are colored by the tradition, the culture, and the society in which they exist. Gender and its accompanying roles and expectations have a great impact on the family (McGoldrick et al., 1989, p. 68-69). In turn, the family and the economic system have created, reproduced, and maintained the system of gender stratification (separate but equal roles) which perpetuates the unequal distribution of power in the family (Chafetz, 1991).

Circularity assumes that action is not linear but circular. A impacts B which impacts A. However, the impact of maleness is much greater than the impact of femaleness. Beginning in a one-down situation does not insure that reciprocity can ever occur. Women cannot have the impact that men do because of the reality of gender stratification and the gendered assignment of types of influence.

The concept of neutrality assumes that either responsibility is shared or that no one assumes responsibility. Again, women are hampered by this view. Women usually lack the power to enforce their will on their husbands; therefore, responsibility for action is not equally shared (Walsh & Scheinkman, p. 16-41, in McGoldrick et al., 1989).

As stated earlier in this review, the accepted organizational basis for the family is that of patriarchy. A key concept of patriarchy is role complementarity--males assume

provider roles or instrumental tasks; women are allowed expressive tasks, the role of nurturer (Walters et al., p. 18; Goodrich et al., p. 16). This division of labor insures that males retain power based on their economic resources and, therefore, women are assigned to positions of dependency and less power. Feminists such as Carter and McGoldrick have suggested that roles should be more symmetrical, with both men and women participating in child rearing, relationship maintenance, and economic provisions for the family.

The view of complementarity--of separate but equal roles--assumes that each partner is equal to the other. If one becomes more powerful, the other will soon achieve equality again or the power balance will shift. It assumes that, overall, equality reigns. Feminist theory points to the fallacy inherent in this assumption. Women, by virtue of their enforced economic dependence, their socialization, and the prevalence of patriarchy in our system, are not allowed to choose their roles, are held more responsible for making the relationship work, and are not defined as equal partners (Walters et al., 1988, p. 23; Goodrich et al., 1988, p. 16-17.). Women, because of their more dependent position, are not allowed the voice of anger. Oppressed people rely on the good will of those in power to survive; hence the fact that women focus on relationships and their maintenance (Hare-Mustin, p. 69, Goodrich et al., 1991.) Men always hold the upper hand, sometimes, both literally and figuratively (Thompson & Walker, 1989; Goodrich, p. 9, Goodrich et al., 1991).

The power men hold in families means that often in times of conflict, women will be disadvantaged. Research has shown that men are more rational and calm during

argument; women are more emotional and irrational (Raush, 1974, cited in Thompson & Walker, 1989). Feminist theory has pointed out the poignancy of this finding: Men can afford to be calm because they know that their own wishes will prevail. Women's emotionality comes from the hopelessness of their own positions. Other research has shown that the weaker partner will tend to monitor the relationship more, use more manipulation, and will move toward resolution when conflict is high (Thompson & Walker, 1989). Power is vested more in the hands of the male, and physical force is sometimes used to gain compliance. If theories ignore gender and power issues and fail to recognize that the norms of society adhered to today foster the inequality in marriage, then those theories compound the oppression of women.

POSITIONAL/PERSONAL POWER

Simply stated, positional power is granted through the authority one holds in a group; personal power involves the power one gains by meeting another's (i.e., the holder of positional power) needs and desires (Hansen, 1965; Chafetz, p. 79). These concepts become more complex when they are applied to the organization of power by gender in our society.

In our society (as well as in almost all other technological societies) labor is divided by gender. Women are primarily responsible for rearing children and for all tasks necessary to maintain the family, that is the domain of "the private sphere;" males are responsible for activities outside the realm of the family, or "the public sphere," through

paid work, education, government, and religion (Okin, 1989). These socially constructed roles have insured that spouses remained separate and unequal, with the "prestige, self esteem, opportunities for self development, and physical and economic security" firmly in the hands of the economic provider (Okin, 1989). Chafetz (1991) wrote that this "unequal ranking and rewarding of tasks" is a result of the unequal balance of power: Men hold greater power, therefore, they can determine on a macro level what resources and what tasks are more valued and more rewarded. Men have been given authority through a belief system of societal values and norms (definitional power) which fostered and promoted gender differences and male supremacy. Through men's access to the more valued resources (resource power) undergirded by definitional power, which legitimizes and forces acceptance of those inequities, men have developed theories to explain and legitimize the created gender differences and power inequities. These theories then are not only a result but also a causal factor.

The traditional, gendered-structured family, with the father as primary economic provider and head of household and the mother as the primary caregiver and nurturer of children, has been held up as the ideal, the accepted societal norm, for centuries by our religious beliefs, by our political and judicial systems, and by our economic systems. These beliefs, created and maintained on the macro level, assure that on the micro level men will have greater access to valued resources and that women will have access to valued resources primarily through their relationship with men--meeting their requests and demands, granting them authority and power (Chafetz, 1991; Okin, 1989). Many theorists have stated that the economic dependency of women on men is the primary reason for

greater male power. This statement, although perhaps correct, is much too simplistic; the economic dependency of women on men is the primary cornerstone of society as we know it.

Men are able to foster economic dependency and thereby gain power over women on both the micro and the macro level. Men, because of the power accrued through their superior earning potential, can refuse to provide any support for child rearing or household duties, thus forcing their wives to work the "second shift" (Hochschild, 1989).

At the macro level, the power allotted to men through definitional power and resource power has placed them in roles of authority and power. Men have been able to "segregate women into low-paying jobs, restrict their opportunities to acquire skills and credentials to achieve better jobs, or bar them from paid employment" (Chafetz, 1991). The reasoning behind this segregation by gender has been based on differences constructed by society: Women take jobs away from men who need to support families; women have to take too much time away from their jobs because of family; women have to leave their jobs when their husbands are transferred, etc.--excuses used to avoid the fact that women are stymied by many men's refusal to accept familial responsibilities beyond that of economic provision.

Okin (1989) described this barrier to a equal distribution of power within the family when she wrote that "the division of labor within the gender-structured family raises both practical and psychological barriers against women in all the other spheres of life" (p. 111). The division of household work is about the same now as it was in the nineteenth century. Goldner found that women do three to five times more domestic

work than do their husbands, even when wives work outside the home. Although it appears that men in dual-earner marriages spend more time in family work, this change may be an artifact of their wives spending less time in family work. Although men and women involved in dual-career marriages espouse the belief that family work should be shared equally within the marital dyad, this attitude does not translate into behavior (Smith & Reid, 1986). Okin (1991) sums up the paradox facing women with the statement that "unless and until the unpaid and largely unrecognized work of the household is shared equally by its adult members, women will not have equal opportunities with men either within the family or in any of the other spheres of distribution--from politics to free time, from recognition to security to money" (p. 116).

How did work done by women come to be less valuable? Again, in gender-stratified societies, those in power define what is valued. Since men hold the definitional power in our society, masculinity and maleness have been defined as superior to femininity and femaleness. Behaviors and traits primarily or readily apparent as female are designated as low status; behaviors and traits seen as primarily male are assigned superior status. Women have come to be defined primarily as wives and mothers; men are seen as individuals, defined by their occupations and not in relationship to their gender nor their family obligations. If women do not behave normatively, they are considered deviant and therefore devalued; if they did behave normatively, they are still devalued as female, and their economic potential stymied, thus reconfirming men's micro and macro power advantage (Chafetz, 1991).

The issues to be explored are not only the equal distribution of power but the acceptance of the notion that, if there is a men's and a women's arena of expertise, then the women's arena of expertise is as valuable as men's; that women's work is as necessary and therefore as valuable as men's. If women's worth were accepted as men's worth is accepted, would the balance of power within the marital dyad cease to be a problematic?

EQUITY

Research has not kept pace with current socio-economic trends which have brought about the emergence of dual-earner marriages. The current literature suggests that dual-earner couples experience increased tensions and face an absence of appropriate role models on which to base their non-traditional lifestyles, which increases role conflict between husband and wife (Sexton and Perlman, 1989).

Societal and economic changes in the roles of women have resulted in wives and mothers who are over-burdened with the responsibilities of the family coupled with the responsibilities of employment. Men traditionally have had the freedom to focus energy and self on their jobs, with the knowledge that their wives would tend to not only their husband's physical needs, but also to his emotional needs and to the needs of any children of the union. The focus of the female's role has been on taking care of all those needs. This basic "interpersonal inequity" led many men to the role of emotional takers and many women to the role of caregivers. Given the finding that men report greater

satisfaction with marriage than do women (Rhyne, 1981), it would appear that men have not questioned their "right" to this inequity in their marriage until they have become forced to do so by the unhappiness of their wives. Scanzoni (1979) reported that when women grow tired of this asymmetrical relationship, men are forced to renegotiate their dominant role.

Scanzoni and Fox (1980) proposed that women hesitate to bargain for equity because of the potentially negative consequences of this action and because of the attitudinal changes it necessitates for not only the woman but also the man. In order for a relationship to become balanced and equitable, each person must feel secure to express his/her own needs assertively, and must also respond sensitively to the other person's needs. Scanzoni (1979) characterized "modernity" as situations in which the interests of women are equal to those of husbands and children, but only if women force the issue of egalitarianism. He further stated that a movement toward egalitarian role structure does not signal the demise of power as problematic. As more women attempt to achieve equality within the marriage, the conflict between spouses will increase in significance (Scanzoni, 1979). Therefore, it would be assumed that equity is associated with the balance of power in the dyad and, as a result, with gender; those with more power will assume more benefits.

Power unequally distributed impacts equity, a necessary component of marital satisfaction, negatively. Traupman et al. (1981) characterized an equitable relationship as one in which the person within the relationship determines that both participants are receiving equal relative gains from the relationship. Spitze (1988) cited literature that

expressed the proportional equity theory: marital partners use standards of fairness to evaluate their relationships, with happiness being equated with equal levels of power. Rank and LeCroy (1983) wrote that a perceived unequal exchange between partners results in conflict. Sabatelli and Cecil-Pigo (1985) defined equity as the degree to which an individual feels that, when all things are considered, the outcome derived from his/her relationship is proportionate to his/her investment. The individual feels his or her relationship is fair and that both of the partners are contributing to and participating in the relationship. Their results suggest that those who perceive the outcomes in their marriages as equitably distributed also tend to hold favorable overall evaluations of their marriages. In their study, relational equity was the most important factor mediating an individual's commitment to his/her marital relationship.

Does perceived equity predict marital quality? It appears that, although equity is a part of marital quality, inequity predicts dissatisfaction with the marital relationship. "If interpersonal relationships are valued on the basis of the equity of exchange, a person with the exchange oriented attitude would be distressed if he or she felt that what was done for the spouse was less than what was received from the spouse-- this quid pro quo tendency chiefly shows itself within unhappy dyads" (Broderick & O'Leary, 1986).

Gray-Little and Burks (1983) found that highest levels of marital satisfaction were found among egalitarian couples. The crucial element contributing to marital satisfaction was not the equal sharing of power, but the perception of equity.

The study of equity within the marital dyad has resulted in conflicting findings in regard to gender. Schafer and Keith (1981) concluded that gender differences are

apparent, with women tending to be more generous, more selfless, and less exchange-oriented toward their relationship with their partner. The Schafer and Keith study found that, although women were more generous, more selfless, and had a lower exchange orientation than males, wives were more likely to perceive negative inequity directed toward themselves, while husbands were more likely to perceive positive inequity directed toward themselves.

Scanzoni and Fox (1980) reported that "women hold stronger egalitarian preferences than men," which appears to be in line with exchange theory but contradictory to the findings of Schafer and Keith. They also stated that the "more modern a woman is, the more likely she is to participate in symmetrical power relationships," which also indicates that a woman involved in work outside the home will have different criteria for perceiving equity in her relationships than does a woman who doesn't work outside the home.

SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

Resource theory states that it is the comparative resources of husbands and wives which determine the balance of power in the dyad (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). Economic resources have been the measure by which resource theory has attempted to explain power within the marital dyad. Economic resources have been largely conceptualized as male provided and controlled. Gillespie (1971) found that men's greater power in families is a result of men's greater resources due to the predisposition of men to marry younger

women, to be more educated than their wives, to command higher earnings, and to hold more prestigious occupations than their wives.

As Fox stated (1973), women's resources must be "specifically taken into account" when studying power. Scanzoni (1971) reported that men's power varies positively with income, education, occupational prestige, or some composite of these, while wives' employment (and thereby their economic resources) increases their power and limited that of their husbands. Blumstein & Schwartz (1983) found in their study of American couples that there was a direct relationship between personal economic resources and power in couples with at least one male. They concluded that money, combined with a traditional assumption of male as provider, creates the imbalance of power in couples where at least one male is present (p. 55-56).

Hesse-Biber and Williamson (1984) have proposed that the resources of physical attractiveness, love, affection, and attention, along with physical strength, be included as resources to be examined when one attempts to determine the balance of power in the marital dyad. However, I would suggest that rather than physical strength, the threat of violence should be construed as the more salient resource.

Although both men and women can act out with physical violence, the impact of violence on the balance of power in the marital dyad is greater for women. According to Walker (1989), women are more frequently and more seriously injured by men than the reverse; over one-half of all female homicide victims are killed by current or former partners; two-thirds of domestic violence deaths are women killed by male partners. No matter how covert the threat of violence may be, it sends a message to the other partner

that he or she may be at risk of physical harm if his/her partner's wishes are not accepted. Women may perceive this threat unconsciously or determine that conflict over most issues is not worth the risks involved. Indeed, research on battered women has led researchers to conclude that husbands' violence is a deliberate attempt to control their wives (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Ptacek, 1988; both cited in Thompson & Walker, 1989). Scanzoni and Fox (1980) reported that women hesitated to bargain for equity because of the potentially negative consequences of their action.

SUMMARY

Power is a process fraught with difficulties for scholars and therapists, as well as for their clientele. In a society that embraces the notions of equality, individuality, and family, it is difficult to accept that our ideals cannot coexist; in fact, that the notion most of us hold of family insures inequality. Our society was founded on the American ideal of equality; unfortunately, that equality in reality was far more available to white males. Our patriarchal society insures that power--the wheels on which our world turns--is primarily in the hands of men through their great presence in and control over the public sphere: our legal, economic, religious, governmental, and educational systems. It is difficult to imagine that our ideal of family actually contributes to the incidence of family violence, incest, and rape. The study of power shakes the very foundation of our world, structured as it is on male privilege. Change is difficult for both men and women for it involves changing the very fabric of the familiar world in which we live.

It has been suggested that men and women view power in different ways; that men and women hold power in different venues. The present study sought to determine if personal and positional power are experienced differently by men and women in a relational context, and along with control of economic resources, if they influenced perceptions of equity within the marriage.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

SAMPLE

Selection

The subjects, all residents of a mid-sized southern city or its immediate surrounding area, were solicited from four facilities: a university medical center, a clothing manufacturing plant and its management offices, and the regional office of a major financial institution.

Potential subjects at the clothing manufacturing facilities and at the financial institution were given letters at their workplace which described the project and explained that participation in the study would allow the participants to become eligible to win free university football tickets from the researchers as a way of showing appreciation to those subjects who responded (see Appendix A). Those interested potential subjects were then issued packets containing letters of introduction to the project (see Appendix C), as well as letters of informed consent (see Appendix D), two project surveys, and two self-addressed stamped return envelopes so that the subjects (employee and spouse) could return the project surveys separately.

A letter explaining the project and the football ticket raffle (see Appendix B) and an addressed stamped postcard which interested employees were requested to return to the researchers were distributed to hospital employees with their paychecks. Packets containing letters of introduction to the project (see Appendix C), letters of informed

consent (see Appendix D), two project surveys, and two addressed stamped return envelopes were mailed to hospital employees and their spouses who returned postcards expressing interest in participating in the project. Eligibility for the study was restricted to those subjects who were currently married and residing with their spouse and whose marriage was dual-earner.

Description

The sample for this study resided in Knoxville, Tennessee, and its surrounding suburban area. Of the 92 subjects participating, 50 are wives and 42 are husbands. Letters of introduction issued at the hospital facility numbered 4,500; 85 packets of materials were distributed at the clothing manufacturing and management facility; and 15 packets of materials were distributed at the financial institution.

The ethnic or racial background of the sample was primarily Anglo-American, with 90 participants who were Anglo-American, one participant who was African American and one participant who was Native American. The average subject was 42 years old, had been married for 15 years, and had 1 child. Thirty-seven (37) percent had a previous marriage (see Table 1). The average number of hours a week in paid employment was 36. The median personal income of was approximately \$17,500 (see Table 2).

Access to resource power external to the family was an important variable in terms of understanding relational power. Therefore, a table was constructed for family income

Table 1. Age, Hours in Weekly Employment, and Length of Marriage for Husbands and Wives.

Data	Wives (n=50)			Husbands (n=42)			Combined (n=92)		
	Range	Mean	SD*	Range	Mean	SD*	Range	Mean	SD*
Years of Age	23-66	40.64	10.40	25-70	44.55	12.39	23-70	42.42	11.46
Hours in Paid Weekly Employment	0-78	35.71	14.92	0-99	37.03	22.10	0-99	36.31	18.43
Length of Marriage							1-43	15.03	11.90

**SD = Standard Deviation*

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of Personal Income

Range	Wives (n=50)		Husbands (n=42)		Combined (n=92)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Below \$5,000	3	6.0	3	7.1	6	6.5
\$5,000 - 7,499	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.0
\$7,500 - 9,999	2	4.0	2	4.8	4	4.0
\$10,000 - 14,999	12	24.0	10	23.8	22	24.0
\$15,000 - 19,999	10	20.0	2	4.8	12	13.0
\$20,000 - 24,999	9	18.0	8	19.0	17	18.5
\$25,000 - 34,999	9	18.0	9	21.4	18	20.0
\$35,000 - 49,999	4	8.0	3	7.1	7	8.0
\$50,000 or more	0	0.0	5	11.9	5	5.0

using the midpoint of ranges as reference points (see Table 3). The sample was non-representative in terms of the number of couples where wives earned more than their husbands (32 percent), and in couples where each earned the same (29 percent). Couples in which one spouse had no income were not included in this table; only five couples were deleted. One spouse was disabled, one retired, one currently unemployed, and two were homemakers.

Over half of the sample had attended some college (53 percent); 10.9 percent had undergraduate degrees and 10.9 percent had graduate degrees. Women were more likely to have attended college than men (56 percent compared to 45 percent); however, men were more likely to hold graduate degrees (14 percent compared to 8 percent; see Table 4).

Forty-two (42) percent of the sample described their employment position as "professional and technical" (40 percent of men; 44 percent of women) (see Table 5). Average personal income (not including spouse's income) was \$22,500 for husbands; wives' average personal income was lower at \$17,500 (see Table 2).

Overall, the subjects reported that they were satisfied with their job, their employment environment, and their supervisor (see Table 6). Religion was reported to play an important part in the lives of the subjects, with 77 percent citing membership in an organized church. Seventy-nine percent of the men said that religion was important in their lives; 94 percent of the women said that religion was important in their lives. Religion also played an important role in the marriages of the sample: 62 percent of the

Table 3. Family Income

Couple Type	N	%	Range of Difference	Mean of Difference	Mean of Family Income
Wife earns more	12	32	\$3,750 - \$20,000	\$10,521	\$46,770
Husband earns more	15	39	\$5,000 - \$41,250	\$16,767	\$56,667
Earn the same	11	29	----	----	\$40,455

\$48,388 - mean family income for couples.
N = 38 in sample.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Educational Attainment

Category	Wives (n=50)		Husbands (n=42)		Combined (n=92)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Grade School	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.1
Junior High School	1	2.0	4	9.5	4	4.3
High School	20	40.0	18	42.9	38	41.3
Some College	17	34.0	10	23.8	27	29.3
Bachelors	7	14.0	3	7.1	10	10.9
Masters	3	6.0	4	9.5	7	7.6
Doctorate	1	2.0	2	4.8	3	3.3
Other	1	2.0	1	2.4	2	2.2

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Employment Status

Status	Wives (n=50)		Husbands (n=42)		Combined (n=92)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Professional or Technical	22	44.0	17	40.5	39	42.4
Managers, Officials, or Proprietors	2	4.0	5	11.9	7	7.6
Clerical or Sales	7	14.0	3	7.1	10	10.9
Crafts People or Crew Managers	0	0.0	3	7.1	3	3.3
Machine Operators	12	24.0	3	7.1	15	16.3
Laborers	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	1.1
Farmers or Miners	1	2.0	1	2.4	2	2.2

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of Satisfaction with Employment

	WIVES (N=50)		HUSBANDS (N=42)		COMBINED (N=92)	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
SATISFACTION WITH JOB						
very satisfied	5	10	7	17	12	13
pretty satisfied	32	64	26	62	58	63
not too satisfied	8	16	3	7	11	12
not satisfied	4	8	2	5	6	7
SATISFACTION WITH JOB ENVIRONMENT						
very happy	6	12	8	19	14	15
pretty happy	30	60	24	57	54	59
not too happy	11	22	5	12	16	17
not happy	2	4	1	2	3	3
SATISFACTION WITH JOB SUPERVISOR						
very well	20	40	16	38	36	39
pretty well	26	52	17	41	43	47
not too well	1	2	2	5	3	3
not well	--	--	1	2	1	1

men said that religion influenced their marriages; 82 percent of women said that religion influenced their marriages (see Table 7 for data on religion).

Men and women felt that the roles of husband and wife were equally demanding for the most part and the majority did not wish to exchange roles with their spouses. For those husbands and wives who did not feel their roles were equally demanding felt that males had an easier life than females (33.3 percent of husbands felt that they had the easier life compared to 17 percent of the husbands who felt that their wives had the easier life; 32 percent of the wives felt that their husbands had the easier life compared to 12 percent of the wives who felt that the wives had the easier life). The sample overwhelming would not change roles with their spouses; however, women were more apt to desire to exchange roles (16 percent of women would change compared to 5 percent of men; see Table 8).

INSTRUMENTATION

The sociodemographic data was gathered by the use of a personal history inventory (see Appendix E) developed for this study. It included questions about age, gender, marital status, length of marriage, ethnic background, personal income, educational attainment, presence of children and their ages, and employment status. Selected questions about the social context of the individual were also included.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of the Religiosity Variables

	WIVES (N=50)		HUSBANDS (N=42)		COMBINED (N=92)		
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	
IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION IN LIFE							
	very important	22	44	15	36	37	40
	pretty important	25	50	18	43	43	47
	not too important	3	6	8	19	11	12
	not important	--	--	1	2	1	1
INFLUENCE OF RELIGION ON YOUR MARRIAGE							
	very much	21	42	12	29	33	36
	pretty much	20	40	14	33	34	37
	not too much	9	18	11	26	20	22
	not much	--	--	5	12	5	5
ATTENDANCE AT RELIGIOUS SERVICES DURING PAST MONTH							
	0	1	2	5	12	6	7
	1-2	17	34	16	38	33	36
	3-4	18	36	9	21	27	29
	5-6	4	8	2	5	6	7
	7+	7	14	5	12	12	13

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of Life Situation Variables

	WIVES (N=50)		HUSBANDS (N=42)		COMBINED (N=92)	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
WHO HAS EASIER LIFE?						
you	6	12	14	33	20	22
spouse	16	32	7	17	23	25
equal	28	56	21	50	49	53
WOULD YOU EXCHANGE ROLES WITH YOUR SPOUSE?						
yes	8	16	2	5	10	11
no	41	82	40	95	81	88
IF YOU COULD START A NEW LIFE, WOULD YOU?						
yes	29	58	24	57	53	58
no	21	42	18	43	39	42

Personal/Positional Power Inventory

The Personal/Positional Power Inventory (PPPI), developed for this study, consisted of a 37-item Likert-type self-report inventory. It was conceptualized to include two subscales which measured personal and positional power. Item scores were summed separately for the two subscales, with higher scores denoting more positional or personal power. All items were recoded with the exception of items 13 and 28.

A Pearson correlation matrix for the 37 items of the PPPI was constructed. Items which failed to meet the selected criteria for inclusion (the item must be correlated with at least ten other items with a coefficient greater than .20) were dropped. Items 4, 6, 20, 22, 26, 34, 35, and 36 were deleted from the scale based on the results of the analysis.

Items which remained after the correlation coefficients were calculated were factor analyzed to determine if the theoretically constructed scale would indeed fall into two constructs. The method used for the analysis was the varimax rotation.

Factor analyses revealed that the scale did load into two dimensions. Criteria for factor loading was .40; criteria for split-loading was .35 (see Table 9 for loadings).

The personal power subscale (see Appendix F) consisted of ten items: items 8, 11, 12, 13, 19, 21, 23, 24, 32, and 37. The subscale was tested for internal consistency using Cronbach's coefficient alpha (1951). Reliability was .70 for the present sample.

The positional power subscale (see Appendix G) consisted of thirteen items: items 1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 14, 15, 16, 17, 25, 27, 29, 30, and 33. Items 2 and 14 were conceptualized as personal power items. The use of affection between spouses occurs on a daily basis; i.e., the roles of husband and wife include use of affection. However, this conscious use

Table 9. Factor loadings for PPPI

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
13	-.72092	-.25533
32	.71441	.06145
11	.70881	.02928
23	.65097	-.02937
21	.61017	.27855
8	.59087	.23686
12	.57306	.14247
24	.54632	.01785
37	.50321	.13769
19	.50261	.25225
28	-.44408	-.25551
31	-.42269	.03466
10	.40941**	.40118
5	.39363*	.09742
15	-.03738	.67439
3	.06941	.64510
25	.01385	.61249
27	.05244	.60581
29	-.13811	.59119
9	.38118	.58493
7	.22581	.57843
18	.42816**	.52758
30	.30144	.52514
2	.04425	.52403
17	.24644	.49815
1	.12536	.48799
16	.24045	.48164
14	.14882	.47308
33	.28866	.43679

Note: *Minimum for inclusion < .40

**Minimum for split half < .35

of affection to "get my way" is positional power rather than personal power. The subscale was tested for internal consistency using Cronbach's coefficient alpha (1951). Reliability was .84 for the present sample (see Appendix H).

Relational Equity Scale

The Relational Equity Scale (see Appendix I) was designed to examine the degree of perceived equity within a dyad (Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985). Items were summed, with higher scores denoting higher perceived equity. Items 2, 3, 8, and 9 were recoded. Cronbach's coefficient alpha was .93 for the present sample.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

Personal power was defined by the sum score on the personal power subscale of the PPPI. Higher scores denoted more personal power. All items were recoded, with the exception of item 13.

Positional power was defined by the sum score on the positional power subscale of the PPPI. Higher scores denoted more positional power. All items were recoded.

Equity was defined by the sum score on the relational equity scale (Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985). Higher scores denoted more perceived equity within the relationship.

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES

Prior to the collection of data, a pilot study was conducted with five couples to test the clarity of the overall data collection procedure. One member of each couple was a staff member of the College of Human Ecology at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Corrections and modifications to the instructions, methods, and instruments were made on the basis of the findings of the pilot study to facilitate ease of completion for the subjects.

After the pilot study was completed, the researchers began the present study. Researchers handed out initial informational memorandums which briefly outlined the survey procedure and solicited the employee's and their spouse's participation to employees during their lunch break at the manufacturing facility. Interested employees were handed a packet containing instructions, the letter of informed consent, project questionnaires, self-addressed stamped return envelopes, a letter which explained the incentive for participation (a football ticket lottery), and postcards which the participants filled out in order to be entered into the football lottery. Employees were given duplicate materials for their spouses. Participants and their spouses who returned completed questionnaires were eligible to participate in the football ticket lottery, which the researchers used as a way to elicit participation and to show appreciation to those who participated in the survey.

Management-level employees of the manufacturing facility were notified by a co-worker that information about a research project was available in their conference room.

Interested employees at this facility were handed packets identical to the manufacturing facility's employees, containing letters of introduction, letters of informed consent, two self-addressed stamped return envelopes, two project questionnaires, letters describing the football lottery, and postcards to be entered into the lottery. Employees were given duplicate materials for their spouses.

Employees at the university medical facility were informed about the study through a letter describing the project and the football lottery incentive distributed with their paychecks. Interested employees were instructed to return the enclosed postcard to receive packets through the mail. The packets included letters of introduction to the project, letters of informed consent, project questionnaires for the employee and the spouse, and stamped, self-addressed return envelopes for each participant.

The fifteen married employees at the financial institution regional office were notified about the research project by a co-worker who distributed packets identical to those discussed previously. The packets included letters of introduction, letters of informed consent, project questionnaires, letters detailing the football ticket incentive, postcards to return to be included in the lottery drawing, and two stamped, self-addressed envelopes.

All participants were asked to refrain from discussing the questionnaires with their spouses until after the spouses had completed their own questionnaire (if at all). Participants were requested to mail back their own questionnaires in envelopes separate from their spouses. Employees at the financial institution were given the option of using

a drop box at the workplace. The researchers placed one follow-up call to interested subjects, requesting their participation.

DATA REDUCTION AND TRANSFORMATION

As the completed questionnaires were received, the data were entered into computer data files structured from a project codebook compiled by the researcher prior to the collection procedure. All data were doubled checked by the researcher and one other person. Missing data were treated by substituting the mean score for that item. Items requiring reverse keying were recoded and sum scores for each variable were computed. Computer printouts were compared to raw data as an additional measure for accuracy.

DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were computed to develop sociodemographic data on the sample. Multiple regression analyses were conducted to assess the predictive value of positional power, personal power, educational attainment, hours worked per week, and personal income on equity for the sample, followed by testing of models for husbands and wives as separate groups. Forced entry multiple regression analysis was used to assess the predictive value of a reduced model consisting of personal and positional power for equity in husbands and wives.

All data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences-X (SPSS-X) at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Computing Center, Knoxville, Tennessee.

In view of the fact that this was an exploratory study utilizing a newly developed measure, a .10 level of probability was selected.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

One expects to find that gender differences exist when one studies husbands and wives. The men and women of this sample, however, provided a glimpse of what may be a new reality for some marriages.

COMPARISONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES

The husbands and wives who comprised this sample were similar in many respects. Husbands and wives did not differ on levels of personal income ($t(79) = 1.26$, $p < .21$); on degree of education attained ($t(82) = -.14$, $p < .89$); or on hours worked each week in paid employment ($t(66) = .32$, $p < .75$). Although data were reported for income and education in categorical form, they were converted to interval level data for analyses. For example, categories were coded from lowest category to highest category with corresponding numerical values.

For Knox County, Tennessee, the median family income for the latest year available (1989) was \$32,614. Fifty-four (54) percent of families in Knox County reported having two workers. Sixty-three (63) percent of men who worked in 1989 worked 35+ hours per week; 46 percent of women who worked in 1989 worked 35+ hours per week. Twenty (20) percent of males in Knox County were not employed

during 1989; 36 percent of females were not employed during 1989 (1990 Census of Population and Housing Summary Tape File 3A, Metropolitan Planning Commission, Knox County, Tennessee). In comparing the sample to the broader population of Knox County, Tennessee, it appeared to be representative in terms of family income and hours worked per week. It was very non-representative in terms of the percentage of dual-earner families and employment status.

Husbands' and wives' means did not differ on the positional power subscale of the PPPI ($t(81) = -.08, p < .94$), nor on the equity scale ($t(88) = .94, p < .35$; see Table 10). However, husbands' and wives' means on the personal power subscale of the PPPI were significantly different ($t(85) = -1.69, p < .095$; see Table 11).

T-tests were conducted on the means of individual items of the subscales of the PPPI and are reported in Tables 11 and 12. None of the means for items on the positional power subscale differed significantly. Examination of group means on items revealed that spouses disagreed with the notion that it was acceptable to make decisions about issues of possible conflict without consulting with the other partner. They also disagreed with the statement, "I get my way by letting my spouse know how much I love and care for him/her." Husbands and wives disagreed with the statement, "My opinion carries more weight in the decisions we make because of my importance in providing for my family's economic well-being," perhaps because both were responsible for providing economic resources for the family.

Spouses responded to the items which described some of the most aggressive uses of positional power with the most disagreement of all responses they made to the items

Table 10. Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges on Personal and Positional Power and Equity.

Scale	Wives (n=50)			Husbands (n=42)			Combined (n=92)			Cronbach's Alpha
	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	Range	Mean	SD	
Personal Power	11-33	26.18	2.28	20-32	25.37	2.29	13-33	25.81	2.31	.70
Positional Power	14-44	28.44	5.75	2-42	28.34	6.16	2-44	28.11	5.93	.84
Equity	12-50	35.68	9.27	20-51	37.42	8.34	12-51	36.46	8.87	.93

Table 11. A Summary of t-test Comparisons of Means on Items of the Personal Power Subscale

Item	WIVES		HUSBANDS		t	Probability Level
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev		
8	2.48	.974	2.22	.725	-1.46	.148
11	2.88	.799	2.61	.703	-1.72	.09*
12	2.66	.798	2.56	.673	-.64	.522
13	2.74	.751	2.95	.631	1.46	.148
19	2.68	.768	2.66	.656	-.14	.886
21	2.16	.710	2.05	.669	-.77	.445
23	2.42	.785	2.29	.642	-.85	.397
24	2.90	.707	2.76	.582	-1.06	.290
32	2.80	.833	2.34	.728	-2.80	.006*
37	2.91	.905	2.38	.794	-2.89	.005*

*Note: * $p < .10$*

Table 12. A Summary of t-test Comparisons of Means on Items of the Positional Power Subscale

Item	WIVES		HUSBANDS		t	Probability Level
	Mean	Std Dev	Mean	Std Dev		
1	1.94	.652	1.90	.617	-.27	.791
2	2.02	.820	2.0	.50	-.14	.887
3	1.92	.695	1.95	.705	.21	.833
7	1.80	.763	1.63	.698	-1.05	.297
9	1.74	.664	1.63	.623	-.78	.436
14	2.46	.734	2.37	.623	-.66	.510
15	1.94	.620	2.02	.612	.65	.517
16	2.06	.652	2.07	.608	.10	.921
17	2.02	.742	1.88	.812	-.86	.391
25	2.34	.872	2.44	.743	.58	.560
27	2.36	.693	2.29	.680	-.47	.642
29	2.22	.786	2.26	.780	.27	.788
30	1.96	.605	1.93	.565	-.27	.788
33	1.88	.480	1.90	.490	.22	.827

*Note: * $p < .10$*

of the positional power subscale. The item "I can get what I want from my spouse by giving him/her an ultimatum" and the item "When my spouse and I are extremely angry with each other, I use threats and/or intimidation to get my spouse to back off" received mean scores of 1.63 from husbands (a score of 1 being "strongly disagree;" a score of 2 being "disagree"). Wives also gave these two items their lowest mean scores: the ultimatum item received a mean score of 1.8 from wives; the threats/intimidation item received a mean score of 1.74. Another item dealing with the threat of violence, "When my spouse and I have a big fight, I act out my anger by slamming doors, throwing things, or hitting things" received a 1.88 mean score from the husbands, a 2.02 mean score from the wives.

Husbands and wives reported generally more agreement for items which reflected perceived authority. Both men and women agreed with the item, "My spouse would say that I have more authority over our household than he/she does." This item received the highest mean score for men with a 2.44; it received a 2.34 for women. For the item, "My spouse would say that I have more authority over how we spend our money that he/she does," women gave it a mean score of 2.36 and men gave the same item a mean score of 2.29. The last authority item was "My children would say that I am the final authority in our family." Husbands and wives responded with scores of 2.26 and 2.22 respectively.

In response to the item "When my spouse and I disagree, I can get my way because my spouse and children depend on me to keep our household working," both

wives and husbands generally expressed disagreement. They also disagreed with the item, "If my spouse gets his/her way, it makes me weak."

For the item, "If my spouse and I cannot find a way to settle a dispute, I decide," husbands and wives tended to agree with the statement. Both spouses disagreed with the idea of attempting to control the environment in a positive way before a discussion about unpleasant or conflictual topics. The item "I can sometimes get my spouse to do what I want by teasing or being playful," received the highest mean score for wives (2.46); husbands also used this technique to diffuse conflict, with a mean score of 2.37 for males (the second highest mean score for males).

For the personal power subscale, *t*-tests revealed that means on three items were significantly different. For item 11 "When we disagree, I am much less willing to negotiate with my spouse if I think I am being criticized" ($t(89) = -1.46, p < .09$), wives scored the item with a mean of 2.88; husbands scored the item with a mean of 2.61. Item 32 "During a disagreement, I can't say all I want to because my feelings overcome me" received a mean score of 2.8 from wives, and a mean score of 2.34 for husbands ($t(89) = -2.80, p < .006$). Mean scores for item 37, "When stress occurs in our family, our children look first to me for reassurance" were 2.91 for wives, and 2.38 for husbands ($t(81) = -2.89, p < .005$). Two additional items from the personal power subscale approached significance. The item, "When I am unhappy with my spouse, one way I show my anger is by making it a point to ignore him/her" had a mean score of 2.48 for wives and a mean score of 2.22 for husbands. The item "When my spouse and I disagree, he/she finds my

opinions silly" had a mean score of 2.74 for wives and a mean score of 2.95 for husbands.

For the item "I wait until my spouse is in a good mood before I bring up issues that may cause us to fight/argue," both husbands and wives were neutral, with the means reflecting neither disagreement or agreement.

Two items focused on using solitary activities to deal with conflict or to register displeasure with one's spouse. Both husbands and wives gave the item "When my spouse and I have had a disagreement, it makes me less tense if I focus on my work or hobbies more than usual" a mean score of 2.66 and 2.68 respectively. For the item with a more punitive connotation, "One way I show my displeasure to my spouse is by leaving him/her out of my activities, i.e. hobbies, leisure activities," spouses were less likely to agree with the item, with wives scoring the item 2.16, and husbands scoring the item 2.05.

Women and men were likely to agree with the notion that their spouses had greater control over discussions concerning decision-making than did they (mean score for women, 2.42; mean score for men, 2.29). Both men and women agreed with the item, "When I am upset or angry, everyone in the family feels it."

T-tests were also conducted on the means of the individual items for the equity scale. The first three items of the equity scale appear to focus on the commitment or investment one has toward the marital relationship. For the item, "I often feel I put more into our relationship than I get out," both husbands and wives were neutral towards disagreement. The next two items dealt with equality: "I would say that my partner and

I are equally dependent upon one another" and "All things considered, my partner and I contribute equally to our relationship." Both husbands and wives were in agreement to these statements.

The next three items had a negative connotation and dealt with manipulation. For the item, "I often feel taken advantage of by my partner," both men and women disagreed. For the item "My partner seems less interested in our relationship than I am", both husbands and wives also disagreed. For the item "I often feel manipulated by my partner," both husbands and wives disagreed.

The next two items dealt directly with power issues. For the item "I feel less powerful than my partner," husbands disagreed while wives reported neutral to disagreement. The means were significantly different. The other power item was "My partner and I equally share the power in our relationship." The husbands and wives scored this item in the neutral to agree range, with no gender differences.

The remaining two items of the equity scale dealt with decision making. "When my partner and I argue about decisions, we usually reach a fair solution" received a response of agree from both husbands and wives. For the item "There are times in our relationship when I have felt cheated," women's response was neutral, while men's response was neutral to disagree. The mean difference was significant.

The comparison of husbands and wives revealed striking similarities rather than differences between groups. Husbands and wives appeared to be economically interdependent in terms of resource power external to the family. Their perceptions of

positional power and equity were also similar. The one area of difference was the perception of personal power.

REGRESSION ANALYSES

Regression analyses using the variables of hours worked in paid employment, personal income, educational attainment, and age to predict personal power for both husbands and wives were conducted. The models were not significant for predicting variance in personal power ($F= 1.10$, $p < .3907$ for husbands; $F= 1.02$, $p < .43$ for wives).

Regression analyses using the variables of hours worked in paid employment, personal income, educational attainment, and age to predict positional power in both husbands and wives also were conducted. Again, the model using resource power variables as predictors for positional power was not significant ($F= .26$, $p < .97$ for husbands; $F= .36$; $p < .92$ for wives).

A regression analysis using the variables of hours worked in paid employment, personal income, educational attainment, personal power, and positional power to predict equity for husbands and wives combined was tested. None of the socioeconomic variables were significant predictors for equity (see Table 13); however, positional power was a predictor variable for equity in husbands and wives combined when univariate analyses were examined ($t= -1.84$; $p < .07$).

Regression analyses were then conducted for husbands and wives as separate groups. As shown in Table 14, the full model predicted 26 percent of the variance in

Table 13. Predictors of Equity in Husbands and Wives.

A summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations. (N=92)

Predictor Variables	Equity				
	r	B	t	Significance of t	Tolerance
Highest Degree of Education	-.067	-.075	-.625	.533	.81
Hours Worked in Paid Employment	-.036	-.036	-.278	.78	.71
Personal Power	-.018	-.037	-.328	.744	.92
Positional Power	-.195	-.202	-1.84	.069*	.99
Personal Income	-.021	-.004	-.025	.980	.61
Multiple Correlation (R) = .215 Multiple Correlation Squared (R ²) = .046 F-Value = .788 Significance of F = .561					
Note: r = Pearson Correlation B = Standardized Beta * p<.10					

Table 14. Predictors of Equity in Husbands.

A summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations. (N=42)

Predictor Variables	Equity				
	r	B	t	Significance of	Tolerance
Highest Degree of Education Obtained	.025	.046	.263	.794	.73
Hours Worked in Paid Employment	.039	.0187	.10	.921	.64
Personal Power	.258	.254	1.54	.132	.82
Positional Power	-.455	-.424	-2.76	.009*	.95
Personal Income	.053	.034	.177	.861	.59
Multiple Correlation (R) = .51 Multiple Correlation Squared (R^2) = .26 F-Value = 2.35 Significance of F = .063*					
Note: r = Pearson Correlation B = Standardized Beta * p<.10					

equity for husbands ($F= 2.35, p < .06$). For wives, the full model was not significant (see Table 15). Regression analysis testing a reduced model through forced entry of variables into the equation was conducted for husbands. As shown in Table 16, the reduced model of personal power and positional power predicted 27 percent of the variance in equity for husbands ($F= 7.19, p < .002$). The strongest predictor of equity for husbands was positional power, and it was an inverse relationship. Thus, the more use of positional power, the less perceived equity. The relationship of personal power was positive. Thus, the more use of personal power, the more the marriage was seen as being equitable. Tolerance limits for all predictor variables indicated a lack of multicollinearity.

Table 15. Predictors of Equity in Wives.

A summary of Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations. (N=50)

Predictor Variables	Equity				
	r	B	t	Significance of t	Tolerance
Highest Degree of Education Obtained	-.146	-.126	-.791	.434	.86
Hours Worked in Paid Employment	-.136	-.043	-.243	.81	.70
Personal Power	-.173	-.214	-1.38	.177	.90
Positional Power	-.029	-.033	-.218	.829	.98
Personal Income	-.131	-.116	-.605	.549	.60
Multiple Correlation (R) = .278 Multiple Correlation Squared (R^2) = .077 F-Value = .705 Significance of F = .623					
Note: r = Pearson Correlation B = Standardized Beta * p<.10					

Table 16. Reduced Model of Predictors of Equity for Husbands.

A summary of Forced Entry Multiple Regression and Bivariate Correlations. (N=42)

Predictor Variables	Equity				
	r	B	t	Significance of t	Tolerance
Personal Power	.247	.228	1.65	.10*	.99
Positional Power	-.471	-.46	-3.34	.001*	.99
Multiple Correlation (R) = .52 Multiple Correlation Squared (R ²) = .27 F-Value = 7.188 (sig of .002)					
Note: r = Pearson Correlation Coefficient B = Standardized Beta * p<.10					

CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS
CONCLUSIONS FROM THE STUDY

1. Personal and positional power as measured by the PPPI did not appear to be influenced by the extent of access to resource power external to the marriage.

2. Husbands and wives reported similar levels of positional power for both the subscale as a whole as well as for individual items comprising the subscale.

3. Husbands and wives did report significantly different levels of personal power.

4. Husbands and wives did not differ on perceptions of the equity of their marriages.

5. Personal and positional power predicted a significant amount of variance in perceptions of equity for husbands. Positional power was inversely related to equity and personal power was positively related. Univariate analyses revealed that positional power was the more powerful predictor.

DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY'S CONCLUSIONS

Researchers in the past have focused their studies of power on provision and control of resources and/or on legitimate power, i.e., the person who has authority through position. The PPPI was conceptualized with the belief, supported by previous theory and research, that men would hold greater positional power. Feminist critiques indicated that

perhaps women also had a power base, personal power drawn from the interpersonal influence that one could exert through use of authority based on one's relationships with others in the family.

It was hypothesized that these two venues of power would be differentiated by gender, and that husbands' and wives' perceptions of equity in their marriages would be influenced by both resource and relational power. However, this was not the case.

Perhaps the most surprising result was that husbands and wives did not differ in terms of resource power as defined by access to economic resources external to the family. Indeed, if a sample of spouses had been sought in which economic interdependence seemed so clear, it would have been thought almost an impossible task to identify such a sample at a lower-to-middle class level of socioeconomic status based on earlier research. Probably volunteer bias moved the sample in this direction, but it created a sampling problem that may have been somewhat serendipitous. It allowed the examination of a group of husbands and wives for whom the economic dependence of wives was not the case. Rather, it allowed an opportunity to examine marriages characterized by genuine economic interdependence. Although the present sample was not representative, and thus limits the extent to which findings from the present study can be generalized, it presented a somewhat unique opportunity to look at dual-earner marriages from a fairly representative sample in terms of socioeconomic status (not just middle-class) in which access to resource power was not differentiated by gender. Based on earlier research, such an opportunity would have been assumed to be difficult to

achieve. It is indeed encouraging to document that although these couples are clearly non-representative, they do exist!

The present sample then provided a context in which an examination of relational power uncontaminated by differential access to resource power for husbands and wives. Again the findings were encouraging. both men and women held personal power and positional power. In fact for this sample, power as conceptualized by the two subscales of the PPPI, was not clearly divided by gender at all, but was somewhat shared, albeit in slightly different ways.

The "traditional" basis for positional power for men was shared fairly equally with women; therefore, men's claim to that power was not as strong as one would expect to find with a more representative sample. Women had no clear monopoly on personal power; men also held personal power in the family. Perhaps interdependence in terms of resource power allows women and men more equivalent access to both positional and personal power in the context of the family.

One could surmise from this study that some marriages are undergoing metamorphosis. When economic interdependence can be achieved, both men and women are allowed access to authority based on the interpersonal aspects of their relationships as well as positional power. When both spouses have equivalent access to economic resource power external to the marriage, a climate for a more equitable relationship becomes possible. Positional power no longer becomes the domain and the prison of the husband; personal power no longer becomes the domain and the prison of the wife.

When men and women are economically interdependent, there is no gendered assignment of power, and bases of power appear to be shared rather than a potential battleground.

The factor analyses of the PPPI provided information that helped clarify the conceptualizations of both positional and personal power. Items which loaded on the personal power factor seemed to focus on the use of the accessibility or availability of affection, and/or attention to exert influence as well as items that assessed how spouses structured and participated in interactions.

Using solitary activities to regulate accessibility of attention and/or affection with one's spouse would be effective only if the spouse would be impacted by the loss of affection or attention. Thus, personal power is predicated on the basis of an interpersonal relationship between spouses in which attention and/or affection is mutually desired and appreciated. Two items had a somewhat more negative connotation, with the ideas of ignoring the spouse, or leaving the spouse out of activities. The other item had a less negative connotation, with the idea that the spouse would simply focus on work or hobbies more than usual. This response appeared to be more frequently used by both husbands and wives; however, women were more inclined to agree with the notion that limiting access to affection and/or attention was descriptive of their behavior.

The other aspect of the personal power subscale dealt with setting the stage for interaction with the spouse when the interaction would involve disagreement, and how much involvement during conflict with the spouse one achieved. This aspect involved perceptions of the role of the spouses during the disagreement, the impact of affective

states during disagreements, the control of conversation, and the effect of disagreements on the family as a whole.

Wives reported that feelings tended to overcome them during a disagreement, which hindered their articulation of concerns. They also reported being more sensitive to their husbands' criticisms. Wives also reported that children looked to them first for reassurance when stress occurred in the family. These are all gender-based aspects of the roles men and women enact in families.

Women may be somewhat less able to articulate their concerns when affective responses are intense. More simply stated, it may be that women are more likely to cry, and men to talk when emotions are running high.

Perhaps because of their sense of identity being primarily founded in their roles as wives and mothers, women reported being more adversely affected by criticism from their spouses than did men. This finding seems to indicate that if husbands want wives to negotiate when disagreements occur, criticism may be counter-productive.

The parental role in the family does seem to offer women an opportunity to exercise personal power based on their importance in maintaining their childrens' sense of security and emotional well-being. It appears that mothering and fathering in families, though both crucial, are somewhat different processes.

For the positional power subscale of the PPPI, the scale was conceptualized along the lines of gender roles--husband, wife, father, mother--and the obligations and expectations that those roles entail. The subscale carried items with both positive and negative connotations. Husbands and wives did not report differences. However, such

similarity would not have been anticipated based on earlier research. Thus, a discussion of "the lack of differences" seems warranted.

Three very negative items dealt with the use of threats of violence, whether emotional or physical. All three of these items received strong disagreement scores from husbands and wives. This finding seems to support the idea that, in the context of economic interdependence, the use of aggression as a way of dealing with conflict is minimized. Perhaps when men have access to more positive ways of exerting authority in families (i.e., personal power), they are no more likely than wives to use aggression as a way of dealing with frustration and conflict even though they have been culturally given the prerogative to do so based on their position as males.

It was interesting that in items regarding perceived authority, both spouses saw it as shared rather than the domain of husbands. Perhaps when couples achieve economic interdependence, both husbands and wives have access to positional power.

Positional power and personal power predicted 27% of the variance in equity for husbands. This finding supports the conclusion that men's perceptions of their access to power in marriage influences the relationship being seen as equitable. The influence of positional power was somewhat expected; finding that personal power was influential was surprising. Men have traditionally held positional power in marriage based on their access to economic resources, but they also have carried the full load of provision of those economic resources. The findings suggest that as men are freed from greater exclusive access to positional power, they can share the traditional power base of wives, personal power.

Relational power was influential for husbands' perceptions of equity, but not for wives. As marriages hopefully move toward greater egalitarianism and interdependence, men need to see that it does not necessitate a loss of power for them in an absolute sense, but rather that spheres of influence or power are available to them that were traditionally assigned to wives. Of particular importance is the husband's ability to relinquish positional power as his primary way of exerting authority in the family, given the inverse relationship revealed in the regression analysis. Clearly, if husbands are to see their marriages as fair, they must see themselves as having power. However, the bases for power may change. Findings from the present study support the conclusion that perceptions of relational power are related to perceptions of equity for husbands but not for wives. As some men find themselves in economically interdependent and equitable marriages, their perception of themselves as having power is important. However, it must be defined more broadly than just resource power or positional power.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY

Fox (1973) stated that women's access to economic resources contributed to a symmetrical power relationship within the dyad. For this sample, this appears to be true. The wives in this sample earned only slightly less than did their husbands. For couples in the present study, positional power was symmetrical.

Conflict theory proposes that control of resources is a means by which authority is exercised. Thus economic interdependence may offer more alternatives for managing

conflict within the dyad. The subjects in the present study appeared to be less inclined to engage in behaviors that would create a "win-lose" approach to conflict with their spouses. Economic interdependence and the use of personal power by both husbands and wives may create a context in which a "win-win" approach to conflict is more likely to occur.

Beavers (1982) suggested that optimum families had a clear hierarchy of power with complementary roles in order facilitate family functioning. McGoldrick (1989) has suggested that more emphasis should be placed on symmetry and task completion, and less on fulfilling societal assigned roles. Other theorists have suggested that more focus be placed on similarities between the genders, rather than the apparent current focus on gender differences. It appears that as women achieve equal partner status with their spouses in terms of access to external resources, both positional and personal power are more equally shared between spouses. This finding offers support for moving beyond traditional and gender bound conceptualizations of family roles and processes. "Separate but equal" may be replaced by shared and symmetrical.

Theorists (Fox, 1973; Scanzoni, 1982; Okin, 1989; Chafetz, 1991) have stated that the economic dependency of women on men is the foundation for the greater power of husbands. Certainly, this study lends credence to that assumption.

Feminist theorists (Okin, 1989; Chafetz, 1991; for example) have hypothesized that equal access to external resources would neutralize the power differential for men and women. For the present sample, this assumption theory appears to have validity. Yet, it is important to note the differential influence of relational power and the perceptions

of marital equity for husbands and wives. As power becomes more balanced and shared in marriage, it is important for men to maintain a clear sense of their power (though perhaps derived from different bases than the traditional bases of power) if they are to see their marriages as fair. This finding does not appear to apply for wives.

IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE

The issue of power and the negative consequences that an unequal balance of power creates within the marital dyad must be addressed by theorists and practitioners of family therapy. Power for the most part has been viewed as the domain of the economic provider. This study has attempted to look at power from another perspective, one that included personal authority within the family. Findings from the present study have important implications for family therapy.

Women's access to external resource power appear to foster the sharing of power. withIf women desire more egalitarian marriages, then the benefits of economic interdependence should be emphasized. Women should be encouraged to create opportunities for themselves and to seek out advantages such as job training programs and other ways of gaining access to opportunity structures in the world of work.

Women have been socialized to view power as a male domain and as such, detrimental to their relationships and their femininity. Women must be led to the understanding that power can be positive for both themselves and their spouses. The notion of a "powerful woman" is not a picture of a masculinized and emasculating female.

Rather, it describes a woman capable of a symmetrical power balance in a marriage characterized by partnership and interdependence.

Women have been socialized to suppress and deny their anger. Women have been taught that anger is destructive to themselves and to the people for whom they care. Women have been taught that their anger is disruptive to the marital relationship, upon which they are economically dependent in many cases. Women often have difficulty in articulating their anger and, thus, tend to internalize anger, turning it into depression or other unproductive behaviors, such as nagging or complaining. Women need to learn to acknowledge their anger, to articulate their anger, to deal with healthy expressions of anger, and to understand that they too are allowed to possess and exhibit anger as are men. Lerner (1986) offered some very useful strategies for helping women learn to deal with their anger in constructive ways.

Practitioners should enable men to view themselves not only as having power by their provision of economic resources for the family and their position in the family, but also as having power based on the relationships within the family. They, too, have been socialized to see their authority in the family in this sphere as peripheral to that of their wives. Men should be helped to an awareness of, and an appreciation for, personal power that they can hold with spouses and children. Families are not just the domain of wives/mothers on an interpersonal level. Husbands/fathers involvement in this domain benefits everyone in the family. Nurturant men are not feminized and powerless or weak. Rather, they are freed to be partners with their spouses and emotionally present fathers to their children.

Husbands and wives in this sample were well satisfied with their jobs, their supervisors, and their work environments. The facilities where these people worked were employee-centered and focused, with good salaries and benefits for women. Employees have access to educational programs and to counselors within the work place. The satisfaction and self-worth that employees receive from the workplace may contribute to their feeling of well-being, creating an atmosphere within the family that would foster equity. Certainly, this study should validate employers' efforts to create humane, sensitive job environments for their employees and to develop broad-based employee assistance programs.

IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

Further research is warranted on the Personal/Positional Power Inventory. Other studies sampling populations with less equitable access to economic resources for men and women, with ethnic diversity, and with larger numbers should be conducted. For this particular sample, power does not appear to be problematic; however, power may indeed create difficulties for samples with more economic difficulties, or less interdependence in the providing of economic resources.

In the future, studies should be conducted using the constructs of personal and positional power as they influence variables other than equity. Studies which explore the influence of personal and positional power on commitment, threat of violence, intimacy,

marital satisfaction, communication, divorce, and parenting styles, among others, would be warranted.

Longitudinal studies need to be conducted. It has been theorized that women are more vulnerable to power differentials during certain stages of the family life cycle (McGoldrick, cited in Carter & McGoldrick, 1989). Certainly this issue is one that needs to be explored. Another focus for longitudinal studies could be the shifts in power that occur throughout the family life cycle. The peaks and valleys of personal and positional power for husbands and wives would be of great significance for theorists and for family therapists.

The study of power and how it is measured and conceptualized needs to be continued. Perhaps the PPPI is the first step toward a reconceptualization of power; however, additional studies must be conducted with the PPPI, using more diverse populations. Another concern is that the PPPI may have omitted important aspects of power. Perhaps qualitative studies are warranted to discover more effective ways to measure such an important and complex construct.

In terms of methodological implications, it was apparent during the data collection that the researchers' amount of personal contact with the subjects made a great difference in the response rate. A greater response rate was observed for those subjects who were approached in person and were given a chance to interact with the research team versus those subjects who received only written information about the study. Certainly, it appears to be beneficial to increase as much as possible the personal contact between the researcher and a prospective study population.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited by the inherent qualities of a self-report instrument and a self-selected sample. It is possible that only those people for whom work and family hold no difficulties choose to participate in the study. A high percentage of those who returned questionnaires stated that they were well satisfied with their jobs; perhaps this phenomenon created a biased sample, particularly since subjects were recruited in the work-place. It is also possible that those persons for whom power is problematic or for whom marriage is not equitable chose not to participate in the study; they may have anticipated their spouses' refusal to fill out the questionnaire. Other sampling limitations are reflected in the low response rate.

Findings from the present study should only be generalized to husbands and wives with lower-to-middle class socioeconomic status who have equivalent access to resource power external to the family. Further, they should be in work situations they generally perceive to be satisfying.

SUMMARY

The findings of this study support the assumption that when husbands and wives achieve economic interdependence, they are also able to achieve equitable marriages. Economic interdependence moves both husbands and wives toward a "win-win" situation if they are able to see that they are not losing their traditional bases of power but rather

are adding new bases of power. Men can have personal power without losing their masculinity; women can have positional power without losing their femininity.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Beavers, R. (1982). Healthy, midrange, and severely dysfunctional families. In F. Walsh (Ed.), Normal family processes, (pp. 45-66). New York: Guilford.
- Blood, R., Jr., & Wolfe, D. (1960). Husbands and wives. New York: The Free Press.
- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). American couples. New York: William Morrow & Co.
- Broderick, J. & O'Leary, K.D. (1986). Contribution of affect, attitudes & behavior to marital satisfaction. Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology, 54, 514-517.
- Carlson, C.I. (1989). Criteria for family assessment in research and intervention contexts. Journal of Family Psychology, 3(2), 158-176.
- Carter, B. (1992). Stonewalling feminism. Networker, 16(1), 64-69.
- Chafetz, J.S. (1991). The gender division of labor and the reproduction of female disadvantage: Toward an integrated theory. In R. Blumberg (Ed.), Gender, family, and economy: The triple overlap (pp. 74-94). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. Psychometrika, 16, 297-334.
- Filsinger, E.E., & Wilson, M.R. (1984). Religiosity, socioeconomic rewards, and family development: Predictors of marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 663-670.
- Fox, G.L. (1973). Another look at the comparative resources model: Assessing the balance of power in Turkish marriages. Journal of Marriage and Family, 35, 718-730.
- Gillespie, D. (1971). Who has the power? The marital struggle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 445-458.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MS: Harvard U. Press.
- Goldner, V. (1989). Generation and gender: Normative and covert hierarchies. In McGoldrick, M., Anderson, C., & Walsh, F. (Eds.) Women in families: A framework for family therapy (pp. 42-60). New York: W.W. Norton.

- Goodrich, T.J. (Ed.) (1991). Women and power: Perspectives for family therapy. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Goodrich, T.J., Rampage, C., Ellman, B. & Halstead, K. (Eds). (1988). Feminist family therapy: A casebook. New York: W.W.Norton.
- Gray-Little, B., & Burks, N. (1983). Power and satisfaction in marriage: A review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 93(3), 513-538.
- Hochschild, A.R. (1989). The second shift. New York: Viking.
- Kingsbury, N., & Scanzoni, J. (1989). Process power and decision outcomes among dual-career couples. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 20(2), 231-246.
- Komter, A. (1989). Hidden power in marriage. Gender and Society, 3(2), 187-216.
- Lerner, H. (1986). The dance of anger. New York: Harper and Row.
- McGoldrick, M. (1989). Women and the family life cycle. In B. Carter & M. McGoldrick (Eds.) The changing family life cycle, p. 29-68. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Miller, B.C., Rollins, B.C., & Thomas, D.L. (1982). On methods of studying marriages and families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 851-873.
- Napier, A. (1988). The fragile bond. New York: Harper & Row.
- Olsen, D. (1986). Circumplex model: Validation studies and FACES III. Family Process, 25, 337-351.
- Okin, S.M. (1989). Justice, gender, and the family. New York: Basic.
- Rachlin, V.C. (1987). Fair vs. equal role relations in dual-career and dual-earner families: Implications for family interventions. Family Relations, 36, 187-192.
- Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R.N. (1975). Men, women, and equity. The Family Coordinator, 24(4), 421-432.
- Sabatelli, R. (1984). The marital comparison level index: A measure for assessing outcomes relative to expectations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46, 651-662.
- Sabatelli, R., & Cecil-Pigo, E. (1985). Relational commitment in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 931-937.

- Scanzoni, J. (1979) Social processes and power in family. In W. Burr et al. (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, 1, New York: The Free Press.
- Scanzoni, J. (1982). Sexual bargaining: Power politics in the American marriage. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Scanzoni, J., & Fox, G. (1980). Sex roles, family and society: The seventies and beyond. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4), 743-748.
- Schafer, R., & Keith, P. (1981). Equity in marital roles across the family life cycle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43, 359-367.
- Schumm, W.R., Bollman, S.R., & Jurich, A.P. (1982). The "marital conventionalization" argument: Implication for the study of religiosity and marital satisfaction. Journal of Psychology and Theology, 10, 236-241.
- Schumm, W., & Kirn J. (1982). Evaluating equity in the marital relationship: An alternative approach. Psychological Reports, 51, 759-762.
- Sexton, C. & Perlman, D. (1989). Couples' career orientation, gender role orientation, and perceived equity as determinants of marital power. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 933-9, 41.
- Smith, A.D., & Reid, W.J. (1986). Role expectations and attitudes in dual- earner families. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 392-402.
- Spitze, G. (1988). Women's employment and family relations: A review. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50, 595-618.
- Sprey, J. (1979). Conflict theory and the study of marriage and the family. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F.I.Nye, I. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, 2, p. 130-159. New York: The Free Press.
- Thomas, D.L. & Cornwall, M. (1991). Religion and family in the 1980s: Discovery and development. In Booth, A., Contemporary families: Looking forward, looking back p.265-274. Minneapolis, Minnesota: National Council on Family Relations.
- Thompson, L., & Walker, A.J. (1989). Gender in families: Women and men in marriage, work, and parenthood. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 845-871.
- Traupmann, J., Petersen, R., Utne, M., and Hatfield, E. (1981). Measuring equity in intimate relations. Applied Psychological Measurement, 5, 467-480.

- Walker, L.E.A. (1989). Psychology and violence against women. American Psychologist, 44(4), 695-702.
- Walsh, F. (1982). Conceptualizations of normal family functioning. In F. Walsh (Ed.), Normal family processes, p. 3-42. New York: Guilford.
- Walsh, F. & Scheinkman, M. (1989). (Fe)male: The hidden gender dimension in models of family therapy. In McGoldrick, M., Anderson, C.M., & Walsh, F. (Eds) Women in families: A framework for family therapy, p. 16-41. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Walters, M., Carter, B., Papp, P., & Silverstein, O. (1988). The invisible web: Gender patterns in family relations. New York: Guilford.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DESCRIBE YOUR MARRIAGE & HAVE A CHANCE TO
WIN 4 TICKETS TO A UT FOOTBALL GAME!

I am a professor in the Department of Child and Family Studies at UT. I have taught courses about families and carried out studies of families at UT since 1972. I am married and have two small children and I am very aware of juggling the demands of work and family. I am very committed to helping gather information about families so strategies can be identified to help families cope with the many tasks that face them today.

I am conducting a study of marriages and would like to invite you to participate. There is much we need to know about how men and women function as husbands and wives. All the information we gather from you will be confidential and will be reported only in group form. I am pleased that Levi-Strauss has given me access to their employees and I will provide information to Levi-Strauss that may prove helpful in planning services and programs for best meeting the needs of their personnel.

The study involves completing a questionnaire that will take 30-45 minutes of your time. The questions ask you to describe your marriage. I would also like for your spouse to participate, and questionnaires for both of you to complete will be mailed to you at your home address. If you are interested in participating, please fill in the information on the attached postage-paid postcard and mail it to me.

As a way of showing appreciation for your investment of time in completing the questionnaires, a drawing from cards filled out by those returning questionnaires will be held. The winner will receive four tickets to a home UT football game this fall!

You can help other families by giving a little of your time to me. Please help me to accumulate much needed information about families such as yours. Such information is crucial if policies and programs are to be planned in ways that can support and strengthen families.

Sincerely,

Priscilla White Blanton, Ed.D.
Child and Family Studies

APPENDIX B

DESCRIBE YOUR MARRIAGE & HAVE A CHANCE TO
WIN 4 TICKETS TO A UT FOOTBALL GAME!

I am a professor in the Department of Child and Family Studies at UT. I have taught courses about families and carried out studies of families at UT since 1972. I am married and have two small children and I am very aware of juggling the demands of work and family. I am very committed to helping gather information about families so strategies can be identified to help families cope with the many tasks that face them today.

I am conducting a study of marriages and would like to invite you to participate. There is much we need to know about how men and women function as husbands and wives. All the information we gather from you will be confidential and will be reported only in group form. I am pleased that The University of Tennessee Medical Center at Knoxville has given me access to their employees and I will provide information to The University of Tennessee Medical Center at Knoxville that may prove helpful in planning services and programs for best meeting the needs of their personnel.

The study involves completing a questionnaire that will take 30-45 minutes of your time. The questions ask you to describe your marriage. I would also like for your spouse to participate, and questionnaires for both of you to complete will be mailed to you at your home address. If you are interested in participating, please fill in the information on the attached postage-paid postcard and mail it to me.

As a way of showing appreciation for your investment of time in completing the questionnaires, a drawing from cards filled out by those returning questionnaires will be held. The winner will receive four tickets to a home UT football game this fall!

You can help other families by giving a little of your time to me. Please help me to accumulate much needed information about families such as yours. Such information is crucial if policies and programs are to be planned in ways that can support and strengthen families.

Sincerely,

Priscilla White Blanton, Ed.D.
Child and Family Studies

APPENDIX C

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to complete the accompanying questionnaire. We are gathering information from couples like you and your spouse, who are currently married and who are interested in helping us learn more about the family.

Please respond to ALL of the statements and questions, answering them as quickly as you can according to the way you feel at the moment (not the way you usually feel or felt last week). If you want to talk over your responses to the questionnaire with your spouse, please wait until you have both finished filling out the surveys. Also, please do not make any changes on the form, either during or after any such discussion.

Read each question or statement carefully. If you have trouble giving the exact answer to a question, answer the best you can but be sure to answer each one. There are not right or wrong answers. Again, answer according to the way you feel at the present time.

Before beginning the "Marriage Survey," please find the enclosed Informed Consent Form, explaining confidentiality and the reporting of group data from the project. After reading the Consent Form, please continue on to the "Marriage Survey."

When you have completed the survey, please return the survey as soon as possible in the stamped, addressed envelope provided. Again, your time and effort are greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Priscilla Blanton, Ed.D
Professor

Jen Gilliard
Ph.D. Student

Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley
Ph.D. Student

115 Jessie Harris Building
Department of Child and Family Studies
University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996-1900
phone: 974-5316

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

We would like for you to understand our commitment to the following safeguards in your interest:

1. The purpose of this study is to gather information about families in order to better understand how men and women function as husbands and wives.
2. Your confidentiality as a participant will be maintained by the use of code numbers instead of names on all materials. The data gathered will be reported in summary form with no reference to you personally. Individual data and participant identities will not be shared with anyone.
3. You are free to withdraw your consent and to discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty.
4. Answers to any questions you may have about the procedures of this study are available at any time. Contact:

Dr. Priscilla White Blanton
Department of Child and Family Studies
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, TN 37996
phone: 974-5316

5. We do not anticipate that participation in our project will involve any risks for you, but if responding to the questionnaire creates concern for you and/or your spouse, we will be happy to refer you to a trained professional. In addition to the insight you may gain from reflecting on yourself and your family, the group results from this study may be of interest to you and will be available to you upon your request.
6. It will probably take about 45 minutes of your time to complete the "Marriage Survey."

RETURNING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE INDICATES THAT YOU HAVE READ THIS FORM AND, ON THE BASIS OF INFORMED CONSENT, AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY.

APPENDIX E

Demographic Profile

Subject Identification Number _____

Age _____

Gender: _____ Male _____ Female

How would you describe your ethnic or racial background? (optional)

_____ White/American, Caucasian _____ Latin American, Hispanic

_____ African American/Black _____ Oriental American, Asian Pacific

_____ Native American, Indian

Present Marital Status:

_____ Single _____ Married but Separated

_____ Married _____ Widowed and Remarried

_____ Widowed _____ Divorced and Remarried

_____ Divorced _____ Other (please specify) _____

Length of present marital status: _____

Have you been married previously?

_____ Yes _____ No

Number of children currently living in your household:

_____ Daughters _____ Ages: _____

_____ Sons _____ Ages: _____

Highest degree earned:

_____ Elementary school (grades K-5)

_____ Junior High (grades 6-8)

_____ High School (grades 9-12)

_____ Some College

_____ Bachelors

_____ Masters

_____ Doctorate

_____ Other _____

What is your religious affiliation? (Please give the full name of your denomination) _____

On the average, how many hours a week do you work in paid employment? _____

What is your personal pre-tax income? Please do not count your spouse's income but do include your other income allowances (i.e. car allowance, house allowance, social security allowance)

_____ less than \$5,000 _____ \$10,000 to \$14,999 _____ \$25,000 to \$34,999

_____ \$5,000 to \$7,499 _____ \$15,000 to \$19,999 _____ \$35,000 to \$49,999

_____ \$7,500 to \$9,999 _____ \$20,000 to \$24,999 _____ \$50,000 or more

What is your current employment position or title? _____

In which of the following categories would you say your current job fits? Please choose only one category.

- _____ Farmers and miners
 _____ Service workers, including private household
 _____ Craftspeople, crew managers, and kindred workers
 _____ Managers, officials, and proprietors, except farm
 _____ Laborers, except farm and mine
 _____ Machine Operators
 _____ Clerical, sales, and kindred workers
 _____ Professional, technical, and kindred workers

Who has the easier life?

_____ You _____ Spouse _____ Equal

If you could start a new life, would you plan it in a different way?

_____ Yes _____ No

Would you want to exchange roles with your partner?

_____ Yes _____ No

Circle the appropriate response for the following.

How satisfied are you with your job?

1	2	3	4
Very Satisfied	Pretty Satisfied	Not Too Satisfied	Not Satisfied At All

How happy are you with your job environment?

1	2	3	4
Very Happy	Pretty Happy	Not Too Happy	Not Happy At All

All in all, how well do you get along with your supervisor?

1	2	3	4
Very Well	Pretty Well	Not Too Well	Not Happy At All

How important are your religious beliefs in guiding how you live your life?

1	2	3	4
Very Important	Pretty Important	Not Too Important	Not Well At All

How much influence would you say religious teachings have on your understanding of marriage?

1	2	3	4
Very Much	Pretty Much	Not Too Much	Not Much At All

How often have you attended religious services in the past month?

0 times _____
 1-2 times _____
 3-4 times _____
 5-6 times _____
 7+ times _____

APPENDIX F

PERSONAL POWER SUBSCALE OF THE PPPI

	1	2	3	4
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
8.	When I am unhappy with my spouse, one way I show my anger is by making it a point to ignore him/her.			
11.	When we disagree, I am much less willing to negotiate with my spouse if I think I am being criticized.			
12.	I wait until my spouse is in a good mood before I bring up issues that may cause us to fight/argue.			
13.	When my spouse and I disagree, he/she finds my opinions silly.			
19.	When my spouse and I have had a disagreement, it makes me less tense if I focus on my work or hobbies more than usual.			
21.	One way I show my displeasure to my spouse is by leaving him/her out of my activities, i.e. hobbies, leisure activities.			
23.	When we discuss decisions, I feel that my spouse has greater control over the conversation than I do.			
24.	When I am upset or angry, everyone in the family feels it.			
32.	During a disagreement, I can't say all I want to because my feelings overcome me.			
37.	When stress occurs in our family, our children look first to me for reassurance.			

APPENDIX G

POSITIONAL POWER SUBSCALE OF THE PPPI

1	2	3	4
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	If I know my spouse and I are going to disagree about a decision, I just go ahead and make the decision and explain it later.		
2.	I get my way by letting my spouse know how much I love and care for him/her.		
3.	My opinion carries more weight in the decisions we make because of my importance in providing for my family's economic well-being.		
7.	I can get what I want from my spouse by giving him/her an ultimatum.		
9.	When my spouse and I are extremely angry with each other, I use threats and/or intimidation to get my spouse to back off.		
14.	I can sometimes get my spouse to do what I want by teasing or being playful.		
15.	If my spouse and I cannot find a way to settle a dispute, I decide.		
16.	If I think my spouse and I may disagree about something I want, I try to do things I know h/she enjoys before I bring the topic up.		
17.	When my spouse and I have a big fight, I act out my anger by slamming doors, throwing things or hitting things.		
25.	My spouse would say that I have more authority over our household than he/she does.		
27.	My spouse would say that I have more authority over how we spend our money than he/she does.		
29.	My children would say that I am the final authority in our family.		
30.	When my spouse and I disagree, I can get my way because my spouse and children depend on me to keep our household working.		
33.	If my spouse gets his/her way, it makes me weak.		

APPENDIX H

FACTOR LOADINGS AND HUSBANDS' AND WIVES' MEANS OF PPPI ITEMS.

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING	WIVES MEAN	HUSBANDS MEAN
Personal Power Subscale			
13. When my spouse and I disagree, he/she finds my opinions silly.	-.72092	2.74	2.95
32. During a disagreement, I can't say all I want to because my feelings overcome me.	.71441	2.80*	2.34*
11. When we disagree, I am much less willing to negotiate with my spouse if I think I am being criticized.	.70881	2.88*	2.61*
23. When we discuss decisions, I feel that my spouse has greater control over the conversation than I do.	.65097	2.42	2.29
21. One way I show my displeasure to my spouse is by leaving him/her out of my activities, i.e. hobbies, leisure activities.	.61017	2.16	2.05
8. When I am unhappy with my spouse, one way I show my anger is by making it a point to ignore him/her.	.59087	2.48	2.22
12. I wait until my spouse is in a good mood before I bring up issues that may cause us to fight/argue.	.57306	2.66	2.56
24. When I am upset or angry, everyone in the family feels it.	.54632	2.90	2.76
37. When stress occurs in our family, our children look first to me for reassurance.	.50321	2.91*	2.38*
19. When my spouse and I have had a disagreement, it makes me less tense if I focus on my work or hobbies more than usual.	.50261	2.68	2.66
Positional Power Subscale			
15. If my spouse and I cannot find a way to settle a dispute, I decide.	.67439	1.94	2.02
3. My opinion carries more weight in the decisions we make because of my importance in providing for my family's economic well-being.	.64510	1.92	1.9

ITEM	FACTOR LOADING	WIVES MEAN	HUSBANDS MEAN
25. My spouse would say that I have more authority over our household than he/she does.	.61249	2.34	2.44
27. My spouse would say that I have more authority over how we spend our money than he/she does.	.60581	2.36	2.29
29. My children would say that I am the final authority in our family.	.59119	2.22	2.26
9. When my partner and I argue about decisions, we usually reach a fair solution.	.58493	1.74	1.63
7. I feel less powerful than my partner.	.57843	1.80	1.63
30. When my spouse and I disagree, I can get my way because my spouse and children depend on me to keep our household working.	.52514	1.96	1.93
2. I would say that my partner and I are equally dependent upon one another.	.52403	2.02	2.00
17. When my spouse and I have a big fight, I act out my anger by slamming doors, throwing things or hitting things.	.49815	2.02	1.88
1. I often feel I put more into our relationship than I get out.	.48799	1.94	1.90
16. If I think my spouse and I may disagree about something I want, I try to do things I know he/she enjoys before I bring the topic up.	.48164	2.06	2.07
14. I can sometimes get my spouse to do what I want by teasing or being playful.	.47308	2.46	2.37
33. If my spouse gets his/her way, it makes me weak.	.43679	1.88	1.90

Footnote: All items were re-coded to indicate increasing power with increasing numerical value.

**p < .10*

APPENDIX I

RELATIONAL EQUITY SCALE

1	2	3	4	5
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1.	I often feel I put more into our relationship than I get out.			
2.	I would say that my partner and I are equally dependent upon one another.			
3.	All things considered, my partner and I contribute equally to our relationship.			
4.	I often feel taken advantage of by my partner.			
5.	My partner seems less interested in our relationship than I am.			
6.	I often feel manipulated by my partner.			
7.	I feel less powerful than my partner.			
8.	My partner and I equally share the power in our relationship.			
9.	When my partner and I argue about decisions, we usually reach a fair solution.			
10.	There are times in our relationship when I have felt cheated.			

VITA

Sharon Jeffcoat Bartley was born on August 17, 1953, in Monroe, Louisiana, to Buron Dewell Jeffcoat and Lois Gray Jeffcoat. After attending public school in Dubach, Louisiana, she received both her B.S. and her M.S. from Louisiana Tech University, Ruston, Louisiana. She will receive her Ph.D. from The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in August, 1993.

The author is a member of Kappa Omicron Nu, The National Council of Family Relations, and upon graduation will be an associate member of American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists.