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(ABSTRACT)

The relationship between marital negotiation strategies and various context and outcome factors are examined using responses from 249 women and men. Multiple regression analysis confirmed significant links between context factors and negotiation strategies. Self-esteem was important in explaining degree of reliance on some types of negotiation, as was emotional interdependence and perceived past cooperativeness of the marital partner. Training in communication skills did not affect women's style of negotiation but was significant for men. The strategy of simply telling the spouse what is wanted or needed was more important to reaching agreement and having a sense of fairness about the outcome than were strategies like bargaining, reasoning or threatening. These findings are discussed within a theoretical framework that gives consideration to negotiation as a process important to understanding marital power.
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INTRODUCTION

Szinovacz (1987) noted in a recent review of the literature that the study of marital power is multidimensional and that many of its subtleties are still unexplored. She concluded that future research should include more precise definitions of the facets of power under study and should attend to the development and testing of more sophisticated models for the explanation of power. Examining the process of marital negotiation is one way of investigating marital power that lends itself to more precise definition and measurement (Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980).

In this investigation, marital power is viewed as the ability of one marital partner to produce outcomes that are mutually agreeable, fair and of individual benefit during the negotiation process. Certain context variables, such as self-esteem and past spousal cooperativeness, are hypothesized to enter into negotiating behavior and influence the strategies used during marital negotiation, which, in turn, affect the perceived outcomes of the negotiation process (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980). More specifically, the negotiation process, as envisioned in this study, consists of three parts: the context of negotiation, the strategies used as negotiation
is conducted, and the consequences that result from use of particular negotiation strategies.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Theoretical Framework

The need for observing both context and process variables in studying marital negotiation was initially proposed by Scanzoni and colleagues (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Scanzoni & Polonko 1980, Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980) who developed and later tested a hypothetical model of the negotiation process. Their work facilitated organization and conceptualization of the many definitions and measures found in the literature on marital negotiation. These scholars proposed a three part model comprised of context variables, demographic characteristics or resources that each partner brings to the negotiation process; process variables, style of interaction and bargaining behavior; and outcome variables, results of the interaction, that is, who "wins" and how equitable is the outcome perceived by the parties involved.

The model most recently tested by Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) represents the most current investigation to this point of how partners negotiate marital decisions. They examined emotional interdependence, gender-role norms, cooperativeness during past conflict, differences in economic resources and importance of the issue as the context variables that might explain use of cooperative
versus coercive negotiation of a marital issue.

The present study builds on Godwin and Scanzoni's (1989) research by adding self-esteem, communication skills, and perceived influence of the partner to the investigation of context variables. It also expands the process variables to include a broader array of negotiation strategies based on the work of Falbo and Peplau (1980). Moreover, rather than asking who usually wins as a result of the negotiation, this study asks participants to indicate the amount of agreement generally reached, the fairness of the outcome and the perception of gain for each partner.

**Context, Process and Outcome Variables**

Self-esteem has been shown to influence how couples relate to each other during marital decision-making (Szinovacz, 1987). People with low self-esteem appear to induce competitive and coercive behaviors in their partners. Assor and O'Quin (1982) found that participants in a study focusing on bargaining behaviors who scored low on self-esteem exhibited stubbornness in their negotiations. Zartman (1983) similarly reported a significant negative association between use of tough bargaining behavior and low self-esteem. In addition, women who used more coercive negotiation strategies have been found to report low self-esteem (Instone, Major & Bunker, 1983). Several researchers
have noted that self-esteem appears to be gender linked. For example, Komter (1989) found that women report significantly lower self-esteem than men.

Another context variable with influence on negotiation behavior is gender-role orientation. Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) suggested that women who believe in traditional gender-role norms may not feel assertive enough vis-a-vis their husbands to ask for behavior modifications or changes and thus accept decisions that may not be to their liking. Preferences for particular gender-role norms have been conceptualized as falling on a continuum, with one end typically labeled traditional and the other labeled egalitarian or contemporary (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984; Scanzoni, 1978). A traditional gender-role orientation indicates a desire for the status quo, of assigning tasks primarily on the basis of sex, whereas an egalitarian orientation suggests a preference for flexibility in the behavior of men and women.

The importance of assessing gender-role orientation in the realm of power and decision making has been demonstrated (Pearson, 1985; Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). When men indicate a strong preference for traditional gender roles, they tend to bring up topics for discussion with higher frequency than do women. Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980)
suggest that the person who brings up a particular topic is more likely to get his or her way. They further believe that gender-role egalitarian attitudes are becoming increasingly the norm and they assert that power tends to be more symmetrical with egalitarian processes. While some conflicting results have been published (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Sexton & Perlman, 1989), indications are that women who hold less gender-stereotypical views tend to negotiate more egalitarian relationships and appear to have more say in decision-making processes (Scanzoni, Polonko, Teachman, & Thompson, 1989).

Szinovacz (1987) also reported that traditional men bargain more persistently and invoke their "rights as males" more than do egalitarian males. However, with increasing gender equality, women tend to negotiate more egalitarian relationships and there appears to be less tolerance in society for blatantly coercive measures. (Scanzoni et al., 1989).

Skill in negotiation, or what Strauss (1978) called "negotiating experience" also influences the outcome of decisions in a close relationship (Falbo, 1977). The better people's communication skills, the more likely they are to use negotiating strategies that give them desired results (Ritchey & Jankowski, 1989). In the present study, half of
the men and women surveyed were counselors; as part of their training, prospective counselors receive instruction in communication strategies (Douglas, 1985; Dixon & Glover, 1984) and a good portion of their training is devoted to teaching couples cooperative strategies to achieve an outcome that is acceptable to both parties (Stuart, 1980; Motta, 1986). Therapists tend to have exceptional verbal abilities (Marston, 1984) and as a result, both training and practice in communication skills may give the counselor an edge in getting his/her point of view across during marital bargaining (Martin, Slemon, Hiebert, Hallberg & Cummings, 1989).

The negotiation strategies used during decision making also depend on the amount and degree of love felt for the spouse. Safilios-Rothschild (1976) asserted that partners who are "more in love" have less power in the marital relationship. Fitzpatrick (1988) declared that partners who perceived their relationships as more intentionally interdependent were more likely to use cooperative strategies in reaching decisions.

The importance of relationship commitment to negotiating behavior has been extensively noted (Eichler, 1981; McDonald, 1980; Waller 1938). McDonald (1981) found that wives' greater commitment to the marital relationship
explained why they bargained less vigorously. This appears to be borne out by findings of Howard, Blumstein and Schwartz (1986), where women who were more committed to their relationships tended to make greater use of supplication tactics, such as pleading, crying or acting helpless. Similarly, Meyer and Lewis (1976) found that women who insisted on winning disputes with their husbands tended to score lower on measures of love than other wives. And Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) report that the more a woman is committed to the relationship, the less likely she is to use coercive bargaining behavior.

Wives' employment is another context variable that influences the marital power relationship; however, it does not appear to be employment per se, but the disparity of income between spouses that is the important variable (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983; Conklin, 1979). Scanzoni (1979) wrote that higher income strengthens bargaining behavior, while Komter (1989) suggested that employed women are more assertive than nonemployed women in defending their views during negotiation. Howard et al. (1986) indicate that those who have less income relative to their partner use more indirect strategies such as manipulation.

Previous cooperativeness of the marital partner during conflictual situations is an additional context variable
important in explaining how men and women negotiate with each other (Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Huston, 1982). Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) found that women's explanations of their partners' prior cooperativeness was not related to how they negotiated, but that there was a significant negative relationship for men between partners' perceived prior cooperativeness and use of coercive strategies.

The importance of the issue also influences the style of negotiation of each partner. Blood and Wolfe (1960) examined issue importance by including both "masculine" and "feminine" decisioning areas in their study. Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) directly asked their sample what role the importance of an issue played in their decision making. When the issue was very important, Donnerstein and Hatfield (1982) reported that men were more likely to resort to aggression than were women, a finding echoed by Hammock, Rosen, Richardson and Bernstein (1989).

A final context variable to be studied is the degree of influence individuals perceive having over their marital partner. Perceived influence determines how men and women tailor their messages to each other. Major (1987) reported that women expect to assert less influence over their partners than do men and may, as a result, not bargain as persistently with their partners, a finding also reported by
Szinovacz (1987). Yet when women do believe they exert influence over their partners, they negotiate more cooperatively and are more likely to reach agreement (Madden, 1987).

Negotiation strategies have been defined in several different ways in past research, (e.g., Buss, Gomes, Higgins & Lauterbach, 1987; Cody, McLaughlin & Jordan, 1980; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Howard et al., 1986) but studies tend to share common descriptions of behaviors that are used when men and women want to influence their partners. For example, Howard et al. (1986) categorized negotiation strategies as weak, strong or neutral; Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) conceptualized negotiation strategies as cooperative or coercive; and Falbo and Peplau (1980) identified 16 strategies and placed them into four general domains: direct, indirect, unilateral and bilateral. They conceptualized direct-bilateral strategies as more inclusive of the partner in the decision-making process while indirect-unilateral negotiating styles were seen as one-sided and exclusionary. Men used more direct strategies, such as asking or requesting, whereas women used indirect means of influencing, such as hinting or putting the partner in a good mood.
Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) concluded that when decision making has proceeded through the negotiation process, outcome is considered the overall evaluation of what occurred during and as a consequence of the discussions, negotiations or arrangements. Individuals in past research indicated whether they generally reached agreement on marital issues, how much they and their partners gained as a result of the negotiation process and how they felt about the process, i.e., whether they felt it was fair to them. (Hill & Scanzoni, 1982). Scanzoni and Polonko (1980) measured outcome by whether consensus or dissensus had been achieved. They asserted that cooperative verbal strategies are associated with high agreement, consensus or fair exchange, while conversely, competitive and coercive strategies are likely to lead to low agreement.

Taking into account the previous research on marital decision-making, the present study was designed to address two research questions: 1) To what extent do context variables influence the use of negotiation strategies? Specifically, this study identified the types of negotiation strategies used by married men and women during marital decision-making and assessed the relative importance of each context variable in explaining the extent to which each negotiation strategy was used. And 2), what is the
relationship between negotiation strategy use and decisioning outcomes? This investigation was accomplished separately by gender because much of the previous literature indicated gender dissimilarity on the major research variables.
METHOD

Participants and Procedure

A survey was mailed to a representative sample of 400 Licensed Professional Counselors (LPCs) and their spouses randomly selected from the membership list of the Virginia Board of Behavioral Sciences in Richmond, Virginia. Responses were received from 69% of the sample after three follow-up contacts. Data from the 249 men and women who reported being married were used for the present study; 124 were males and 125 were females.

The mean age of the male respondents was 50 years and of the female respondents was 47 years. Men reported having been married an average of 18 years while women reported an average of 17 years. The average number of children for both women and men was two. The median annual individual income for women was $33,500 and for men was $48,500. The majority of respondents were white (98%).

Measurement

Self-esteem was assessed using the Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965). This 10-item inventory was reported along a seven-point continuum from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The Cronbach alpha was .90 in this study.

Commitment was measured by two statements reading: "I am committed to seeing my marriage succeed" and "I expect to still be in my marriage in five years". The responses were
recorded on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Degree of love and caring was assessed by the 12-item Love Scale (Rubin, 1970) which included a 7-point response format ranging from "not at all true" to "definitely true" on statements such as "I would do almost anything for him/her". Cronbach's alpha for the love scale in the present study was .94. Like Godwin and Scanzoni (1989), we combined the responses on the commitment and love scales to create the context variable labeled emotional interdependence (The two scales were correlated at .89).

Previous cooperativeness was measured by 12 items assessing respondents experiences related to past conflict and compromise using a 7-point response scale ranging from "never" to "always". Respondents read the sentence stem "In the past"; followed by statements such as "my partner has been cooperative in making whatever changes we have both agreed to" or "my partner has been retaliatory if things don't go his/her way". Cronbach's alpha was .92.

Gender-role orientation was measured by a 25-item scale (Bird, Bird & Scruggs, 1984) based on the work of Scanzoni (1978) that assessed the degree of traditional vs. nontraditional role-behavior preferences of men and women. An example of a statement that respondents were asked to react to was: "A woman's career should be just as important to her as encouraging her husband in his career". Choices
ranged on a 7-point continuum from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Cronbach's alpha was .90.

To determine which spouse was the counselor and thus had received training in communication skills, a simple question regarding job status was employed. Respondents were also asked what percent of the family income they earned. To assess respondents' attempts to influence each other during marital decision-making, the Negotiation Strategy Scale (Bird, Stith & Schladale, in press) was utilized. Strategies for influencing spouses were tapped by asking to what extent the informant used strategies such as "I simply ask for what I want or need", and "I am especially affectionate; I am loving and romantic". Respondents indicated on a 7-point scale from "Never" to "Always", how frequently they used each of the 26 approaches. Responses from this scale were factor analyzed and seven negotiating strategies were identified; Negative Affect, Reasoning, Bargaining, Threatening, Manipulation, Telling and Persuasion (Table 1). The type of factor analysis used was principal factoring with iteration. This method of analysis extracts the number of factors with eigenvalues greater than or equal to 1.0. The varimax technique was used to rotate the axis orthogonally. The resulting factors were described as dimensions or categories of the variables studied.
The outcome construct, people's perceived consensus regarding decision making, was elicited by questions patterned after Godwin and Scanzoni's (1989) research. Four outcome variables were assessed. The first was the degree of consensus the respondent believed was typically reached during decision making. Possible responses ranged from total disagreement (0) to total agreement (10). Second, respondents were about the fairness of the outcome that was typically reached during marital decision-making. Responses ranged from completely unfair (0) to completely fair (10). Third, respondents were asked to assess how much they typically gained as a result of marital decision-making efforts. Response categories ranged from "none of what I want" (0) to "all of what I want" (10). Finally, respondents were asked about the gains that their partner typically achieved as a result of marital decision-making efforts. This was scored in the same manner as the previous question.
Data Analysis

The pattern of analysis was threefold. First, descriptive statistics for the total sample were examined. Second, seven regression analyses were conducted separately for men and women to determine the influence of each context variable on the use of identified negotiation strategies. Finally, Pearson (r) correlations were calculated to assess the relationship between the use of negotiation strategies and the outcome variables by gender.
RESULTS

Negotiation Strategies for Women

Table 3 reports results of the multiple regression analyses of context variables and negotiation strategies for women. Context variables explained 35% of the variance ($F = 7.32, p = .0001$) in negative affect. Self-esteem ($B = -.34$) and emotional interdependence ($B = -.23$) were negatively associated with use of negative affect, while there were positive relationships between percentage of family income earned ($B = .20$), importance of the issue ($B = .17$) and negative affect. The context variables accounted for 18% of the variation ($F = 2.94, p = .005$) in use of reasoning. Reasoning was used more often during negotiations when the issue was important ($B = .25$) and respondents reported having greater influence on the partner ($B = .23$). Both self-esteem ($B = .19$) and gender-role orientation ($B = .24$) were positively associated with bargaining. Collectively, the context variables accounted for 16% of variance in bargaining.

Table 3 about here

Twenty-three percent of variance in use of threats was accounted for by the context variables ($F = 4.12,$
Women reported less frequent use of threats as a negotiation strategy if their spouse was seen as cooperative in past decision making ($B = -.24$), but were more likely to rely on threats when they contributed a larger share of the family income ($B = .20$). The context variables explained 28% of variance ($F = 5.42$, $p = .0001$) in manipulation. Women with higher self-esteem ($B = -.28$) and a stronger sense of emotional interdependence with their partner ($B = -.28$) were less likely to resort to manipulative tactics during negotiation. Collectively, the context variables accounted for 25% of variance in telling. ($F = 4.52$, $p = .0001$). Use of telling was positively related to reports of feeling loved and emotionally close to the partner ($B = .41$).

The context variables accounted for 32% of the variance in the use of persuasion ($F = 6.38$, $p = .0001$). Persuasion showed a negative relationship with reports of past cooperativeness ($B = -.35$) but a positive connection with the importance of the issue ($B = .35$) and the amount of influence women felt they could exert on partners ($B = .29$).

**Negotiation Strategies for Men**

Table 4 reports the results of the multiple regression analysis of context variables and negotiating strategies for men. Context variables explained 27% of the variance in negative affect ($F = 4.88$, $p = .0001$). Men were less likely
to report using this strategy when they had higher self-esteem ($B = -.25$) or when they felt capable of influencing their partners ($B = -.19$) but did resort to it if the issue to be decided was important to them ($B = .22$).

---

Table 4 about here

---

The context variables studied accounted for 19% of variance ($F = 3.09, p = .0036$) in reasoning. Men who scored higher on emotional interdependence chose this strategy more often ($B = .28$), but there was a negative association between the spouse's past cooperativeness and choice of reasoning ($B = -.42$).

Context factors accounted for 23% of the variance ($F = 3.83, p = .0006$) in manipulation. Men who had communication experience ($B = -.24$) and reported past spousal cooperativeness ($B = -.22$) were unlikely to chose manipulation as a strategy. The context factors explained the greatest amount of variance (30%) in use of telling among the men studied ($F = 5.65, p = .0001$). Communication experience ($B = .30$) and emotional interdependence ($B = .23$) were positively associated with telling. For men, the context variables did not significantly influence use of the strategies of bargaining, threatening or persuasion.
Relationship of Negotiation Strategies to Outcome for Women

Women who relied on telling (simply asking for what they wanted or needed), reported greater spousal agreement with decisioning outcomes ($r = .50$, $p = .001$), perceived outcomes as fairer ($r = .55$, $p = .001$) and indicated that they gained more of what they wanted as a result of the decision-making process ($r = .44$, $p = .001$) (Table 5). Greater use of negative affect during marital decision-making was negatively associated with all outcome variables: agreement ($r = -.26$, $p = .01$), fairness ($r = -.29$, $p = .001$) and own gain ($r = -.18$, $p = .05$).

__Table 5 about here__

Women, who bargained more frequently during negotiation indicated greater agreement with the outcome ($r = .21$, $p = .05$) and reported a higher perception of outcome fairness ($r = .23$, $p = .01$). There were significant inverse relationships between the use of threat and degree of agreement ($r = -.21$, $p = .05$), fairness ($r = -.26$, $p = .01$) and women's sense of their own gain ($r = -.23$, $p = .01$). For women, there was also a significant inverse relationship between use of manipulation and reported agreement ($r = -.28$, $p = .001$) and fairness ($r = -.36$, $p = .001$).
Relationship of Negotiation Strategies to Outcome for Men

For the most part, negotiation strategies did not significantly effect outcome evaluations among men (Table 5). Use of the strategy of telling was positively related to all outcome variables: agreement ($r = .28$, $p = .01$), fairness ($r = .21$, $p = .05$), own gain ($r = .30$, $p = .001$) and spouse's gain ($r = .18$, $p = .05$).
DISCUSSION

This study set out to address the effects of context variables on negotiation strategies and of negotiation strategies on decisioning outcomes. While specific, concrete factors such as percentage of income earned or communication experience resulted in some explanation of style of negotiation, the "softer", less tangible, context variables such as sense of self or feelings about the partner impacted more strongly on negotiation styles. For example, women who scored higher on measures of self-esteem eschewed coercive measures of influencing their partners. They also used fewer negative or indirect strategies such as manipulation or being emotionally punitive during negotiations.

If self-esteem is conceptualized as a resource that adds to a person's power, then these results corroborate the research of Falbo and Peplau (1980). They found that people who perceived themselves as more powerful -- i.e., who esteemed themselves -- used more inclusive and direct strategies. These findings also support Szinovacz's (1987) research that linked coercive behaviors with lower self-esteem.

Women, who indicated greater love towards their spouses and were committed to their relationships (emotional interdependence) more often simply told their partners what
they needed or wanted during marital negotiations. Telling is considered a direct and unilateral approach to influencing others (Falbo & Peplau, 1980). This finding conflicts with Szinovacz's (1987) assertion that a highly committed partner is less powerful, but confirms Godwin and Scanzoni's (1989) results.

Women signifying less emotional interdependence used negative affect and manipulation more often to negotiate marital decisions. This finding is similar to the results reported by Gray-Little and Burks (1983), that the less committed partner is more willing to use coercive control techniques within the marital interaction. Women who reported less love and lower expectation for being married five years hence were more willing to insult their partner and use harsh, angry words during negotiation.

Extent of gender-role egalitarianism did not greatly influence styles of negotiation. One possible explanation for this outcome may be that the sample in this study included both men and women who generally endorsed items high on egalitarianism. However, as Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) had predicted, with increasing gender-role equality, more tough negotiation by women could be expected than in the past. And this was indeed reflected in the present study; women who endorsed more flexible gender roles were
more likely to bargain with their partners during decision making, even to resorting to threat when they felt that was needed.

It was somewhat surprising that communication experience did not influence choice of negotiation strategies among the women sampled. Women reported using similar negotiation strategies regardless of counseling experience. This may be due, in part, to women's socialization. From childhood onward, women receive encouragement from parents and others to be verbally expressive. They are rewarded for pursuing studies that require good verbal skills. In addition, wives are generally responsible for initiating and maintaining communication within the family. An alternative explanation is that women are generally of lower social status and power compared to men (Baker-Miller, 1987). As a consequence, women may develop skills in negotiation in order to survive their less powerful roles (Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Lips, 1986). The training that counselors receive in communication skills, then, may not appreciably add to the verbal competence women have already learned (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Rubin, 1983).

Unlike Godwin and Scanzoni (1989), who found no relationship between past cooperativeness and the way women negotiated, wives in this study who indicated greater
spousal cooperativeness in the past were less likely to use threats or persuasion when negotiating with their partners. These results confirm the findings of other researchers that past experiences influence current behavior and that previous cooperativeness builds good will towards the partner (Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Huston, 1982; Woll, 1989).

Women earning a greater proportion of the family income reported more frequent use of coercive strategies. While coercive strategies were invoked less frequently than cooperative strategies, nevertheless, these women more often displayed negative affect and threatened to leave the relationship if things did not go their way during negotiation. Scanzoni et al. (1989) have noted that women with higher earning power relative to their husbands use stronger negotiation tactics; similarly, women who have less income report less control or power during decision making (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989). The willingness of women in this study to threaten to leave the relationship came as somewhat of a surprise because they generally described themselves as committed to the marital relationship. Perhaps the relatively high socioeconomic status of the women studied enabled them to rely on threats of marital dissolution as a strategy of last resort to convince spouses of the seriousness of their needs. It is possible that threats give
way to discussion and cooperation in some relationships (Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980).

When an issue was evaluated as of greater importance to women, they recounted more often using persuasion, such as repeatedly bringing up the issue, to get their point across. To a lesser extent, they also endorsed the strategy of negative affect and reasoning when they felt the issue was important. It was also true that the more women felt they could convince their husbands to do things their way, the more they used logic, reasoning and persuasive arguments to achieve this; strategies that are considered both direct and inclusive of the partner (Falbo & Peplau, 1980).

As expected, while the behavioral repertoires of men and women relative to marital decision-making were basically similar, the context factors did not always have identical influences on men's and women's actions. Unlike Szinovacz' (1987) assertions regarding bargaining, in this study, women were more attuned to outcome and adopted a more profit-oriented approach to marital negotiations while men expected to win.

Men like women, with higher self-esteem used negative affect less often during negotiations with their partners, but gender-role preferences did not influence men's choice of negotiation strategies. When men endorsed items of
emotional interdependence, they used cooperative strategies such as reasoning or telling and were unlikely to use manipulation during marital decision-making.

While communication skill was not significant to women's choice of negotiation strategies, in this study, male counselors used different strategies than did non-counselors. Men who had received counselor training were less likely to use manipulation, and were more likely to bargain (a style that is inclusive of the partner) and to simply tell their spouses, (a direct approach), what they wanted. Apparently, men derive benefits from communication skills training that they then apply in their intimate relationships.

The strategies men used when they reported greater past cooperativeness on the part of their wives showed some interesting results. While manipulation was less likely to occur when men reported previous cooperativeness, there was a strong inverse connection between past cooperativeness and reasoning. Husbands with cooperative spouses appealed to logic less often and less frequently stated that what they proposed was the right and fair thing to do. It is possible that men felt little need for reasoning when they could count on the spousal cooperation based on previous behavior.
When the issue under discussion was important to men, they were more likely to use negative affect, such as being disagreeable or withholding something to influence their partners. In addition, they were also willing to endorse some "fast talking" or persuasion while negotiating an issue important to them. This is in line with what other researchers have found, confirming that men are willing to use coercion or make repeated appeals to get their way if they deem the issue important (England & Parkas, 1986; Morgan & Sawyer, 1981).
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The present study relied on a three part model of marital negotiation conceptualized by Scanzoni and his colleagues (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980; Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). As proposed, adding self-esteem, communication experience and perceived influence over spouse's decision as context variables enhanced understanding of how individual characteristics impact marital negotiation.

In assessing how context variables affected marital decision-making, some general patterns emerged. It is clear that self-esteem plays an important role in how couples negotiate with each other and this is especially true for women. Contrary to some other research, gender-role orientation did not play an important role in this study in determining use of negotiation strategies. Inquiring about the perception of influence over the partner and the percent of family income earned shed relatively little light on negotiation styles; however, taking into account the importance of the issue under discussion and past spousal cooperativeness proved to be significant to understanding how men and women negotiate. Communication skill was only important to negotiation among the men sampled. In addition, these findings reiterate the importance of examining
how individuals feel about their marital partners when examining the negotiation process. It makes intuitive sense that men and women will use more cooperative than coercive tactics if they experience greater emotional interdependence and this notion was empirically borne out here. Whether this is due to the particular sample used or due to other factors needs to be addressed in future research.

In addition to assessing context variables and in what manner they influenced negotiation strategies, this study also answered questions about decisioning outcomes. Negotiation strategy use was much more influential on women's than men's outcomes. It is possible that women are more pragmatic in their choice of strategies, concentrating greater effort on maximizing their desired outcomes. Men, by contrast, may tend to exhibit a sense of entitlement, expecting to reach an equitable agreement with their spouses without a great deal of effort or planning (Gilbert, 1987; Kidder, Fagan & Cohn, 1984). Future research should address this possibility.

One result clearly stood out from the rest. The negotiation strategy of telling had the most impact on the decisioning outcomes of both women and men. Women who simply told their partners what they needed or wanted during marital decision-making, reported that they and their
spouses more often reached agreement on marital issues. Women also reported that use of telling led to a greater sense of fairness and a greater perception of personal gain. No other strategy studied, be it bargaining, persuading or reasoning, showed such a strong association with outcome. Similar results were found for men.

While it might be expected that repeatedly making a point or expressing a willingness to do something in exchange for something else would increase the likelihood of reaching agreement or arriving at a fair outcome, this expectation was not borne out in this study. Coercive strategies such as threats, manipulation and negative affect all were negatively related to perception of agreement, fairness and gain. For this sample of women, threats were used much less frequently than other, more positive, strategies; possibly indicating that only when other means of negotiating are not successful, do women resort to threats (Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980).

The present study represents a continuing effort to advance knowledge in the area of marital power by identifying efficacious negotiation strategies of married people. While it is clear that income and other tangible resources are important variables to study, it appears that the focus of future research must increasingly take into
account less tangible individual and relational characteristics. A higher income may give women more power and say in the decision-making process, but it seems equally important to consider how men and women feel about themselves, each other and their marital relationship.
REFERENCES


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Loading</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>I discuss the issue heatedly; use harsh, angry words.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I get very emotional; let him/her see how this affects me.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I insult or swear at him/her.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am especially disagreeable.</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I leave the room, house, etc.</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I withhold something I know she/he takes pleasure in.</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>I use my expertise; claim I have a lot of experience in such matters.</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I say it is in his/her best interest.</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I appeal to a sense of fairness; say it's the only fair and right thing to do.</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I use logic and reason; give all the reasons my way is best.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>I try to negotiate something agreeable to both of us.</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I bargain or compromise to resolve our differences.</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I say how very important my request is; how much it means to me.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I say what I would be willing to do in exchange.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>I threaten to get a divorce.</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I threaten to move out.</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>I ignore him/her; refuse to respond until s/he sees reason.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I bring it up in an indirect way; hint or make suggestions.</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am especially affectionate; I am loving and romantic.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I withdraw; become cold and silent.</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>I simply ask for what I want or need.</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I talk about it; discuss our differences and needs.</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>I try to persuade.</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I repeatedly make my point until s/he gives in.</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I do some fast talking.</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations of Context, Negotiation and Outcome Variable by Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Women Mean</th>
<th>Women SD</th>
<th>Men Mean</th>
<th>Men SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Orientation</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emot. Interdependence</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Experience</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperation</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Issue</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Partner</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negotiation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own Gain</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse's Gain</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3
Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Negotiation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.34***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Role Orientation</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interdependence</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Expertise</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperativeness</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$R^2 = .35^{***}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F=7.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$
### Table 4
Summary of Multiple Regression Analyses for Men

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
<th>Manipulation</th>
<th>Telling</th>
<th>Persuasion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-0.25***</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender-Roe Orientation</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interdependence</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Expertise</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.24*</td>
<td>0.30**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperativeness</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.42***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R²=.27***</th>
<th>R²=.19**</th>
<th>R²=.10</th>
<th>R²=.05</th>
<th>R²=.23***</th>
<th>R²=.30***</th>
<th>R²=.13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>F=4.88</td>
<td>F=3.09</td>
<td>F=1.53</td>
<td>F=.68</td>
<td>F=3.83</td>
<td>F=5.65</td>
<td>F=2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
Table 5
Correlations of Negotiating Strategies and Outcome Measures by Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negotiation Strategies</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Fairness</th>
<th>Own Gain</th>
<th>Spouse's Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Affect</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bargaining</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telling</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.55***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persuasion</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
APPENDIX A

Literature Review
Literature Review

The purpose of the following literature review is to describe in greater detail the studies pertinent to the investigation of negotiation strategies of married men and women and the relationship of these strategies to outcome.

Interest in the area of marital power has been considerable since Blood and Wolfe's (1960) pioneering work (Cromwell & Olson, 1975; Komter, 1989; Rodman, 1972; Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980; Scanoni & Szinovacz, 1980). Reliance on global outcome measures as indicators of marital power, however, has proven unsatisfactory in explaining actual power relationships among husbands and wives (Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970). Szinovacz (1987) noted in a recent review of the literature that the study of marital power is multi-dimensional and that many of its subtleties are still left unexplored. She concluded that future research should include more precise definitions of the facets of power under study and should attend to the development and testing of more complex models for the explanation of power.

Examining the process of marital negotiation is one way of investigating marital power that lends itself to more precise definition and measurement. In this investigation, marital power is viewed as the ability of one marital The need for observing both context and process variables in
studying marital negotiation was first proposed by Scanzoni and colleagues (Hill & Scanzoni, 1982; Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980; Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1987) who developed a hypothetical model of negotiation processes. Context variables, the demographic characteristics or resources that a partner brings to the negotiation process, are viewed as falling into at least four clusters; the first is a compositional cluster that includes race, number and ages of children and length and duration of marriage. A second cluster, Scanzoni and Polonko (1980) term resource variables, tangible factors such as income, education and intangibles, such as negotiating skills. A third cluster describes orientation towards bargaining which includes sex role-identity, importance of the issue and self-esteem. The fourth cluster is described as dealing with the partner's previous bargaining behavior and highlights that current bargaining is strongly influenced by previous bargaining actions.

Process variables concern the style of marital interaction and bargaining behavior such as position modification or strategies and tactics (Scanzoni & Polonko, 1980). It is assumed that the aim of negotiation is to arrive at agreement where there is currently disagreement or
conflict. Outcome variables, in turn, are the results of the interaction, that is who "wins" and how equitable is the outcome perceived by the parties involved. Scanzoni & Polonko (1980) concluded that current negotiations and their outcomes provide the context for future negotiations.

The present study builds on Scanzoni's work by investigating a larger number of factors than they examined in Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) as influences of negotiation and decisioning outcomes. Specifically, this study examines the contribution of self-esteem, gender-role orientation, emotional interdependence, communication expertise, past cooperation, percent of family income, importance of issue and influence on partner on the use of seven negotiation strategies; and in turn, explores the relationship between those negotiation strategies and perceived degree of consensus, fairness of outcome and sense of outcome equity of men and women.

The analysis of the data was accomplished separately for husbands and wives. According to Godwin and Scanoni (1989), individual measures (rather than couple data) regarding process variables best fit the theoretical model as currently proposed and their approach was adopted for this study.
History of Marital Power Research

The rationale for using this three part model for purposes of description and analysis of marital negotiation has a long history which begins with Blood and Wolfe's (1960) classic study that focused only on outcome variables. These authors asked 731 Detroit urban wives and 178 farm wives which partner usually decided eight issues in their marriage; items varied from the amount of money to spend on food to which car to buy. Responses were averaged across domains and the person making more of the decisions was assigned the greater power in the marriage. Blood and Wolfe (1960) noted in their book that they queried a representative sample of Michigan women but that income in Detroit in 1960 was almost one fourth higher than the national average.

While Blood and Wolfe's (1960) approach has been subjected to much critical review (Hill & Scanoni, 1982; Meyer & Lewis, 1976; Olson & Rabunsky, 1972; Safilios-Rothschild, 1970), and although frequently found wanting, it is nevertheless the basis for numerous articles published on power and decision making and continues to be used currently (Orleans, Palisi & Caddell, 1989).

The long-lasting appeal of such an approach has been chiefly due to the ease with which it could be administered
and scored. However, with its reliance on the outcome of who makes the final decision, the scale has serious methodological flaws.

In her 1970 review of marital power research, Safilios-Rothschild (1970) criticized the "final say" decision measure of marital power and took issue with some of its assumptions: decisions regarding the purchase of food, for example, were given equal weight with the decision on husband's job, and reliance on "final say" decision making ignored all factors involved in the decision making except the actual outcome.

Cromwell and Olson (1975) echoed Safilios-Rothschild's concern with sole reliance of outcome measures and proposed that decision making be divided into three parts: resources, processes and outcome. The need for greater methodological sophistication was aptly described in a article by Meyer and Lewis (1976) entitled "New Wine from old Wineskins: Marital Power Research". In the article, they contended that most researchers on power and decision making agreed on what was wrong with previous research but that little was done to improve deficiencies. For their research, 331 pairs of married couples not only filled out Blood and Wolfe's (1960) measure of decision making and the Interpersonal Checklist (LaForge & Suczek, 1965) which is a measure of an
individual's perception of him/herself, but in addition, they also included semi-structured interviews to extend their understanding of the dynamics of decision-making. In a decade review of the power literature, McDonald (1980) incorporated Cromwell and Olson's (1975) division of power domains into an overall model of social power. He also reiterated that "focusing on the final outcome of the decision-making process may obscure the intricacies of the interactional process" (p.114).

In 1980, Scanzoni and Polonko analyzed marital decision-making in terms of a three-stage model of social context, processes and outcome. They reported that context variables consisted of at least four clusters (compositional variable, resource variables, orientations governing the use of bargaining power and people's orientation regarding their partners' past bargaining behavior) and that disparity between spouses in the possession of these context variables would influence bargaining strategies and the degree of bargaining power. Further, the authors asserted that both context and process variables affect outcome in the direction of either agreement or disagreement. Their article also stressed that current negotiations have inevitably been influenced by prior bargaining and outcome and that current negotiations and their outcomes provide the context for
future negotiations.

Hill and Scanzoni (1982) further refined their methodology in a subsequent study. They interviewed 55 white, middle-class couples, first separately, then jointly, on a series of questions pertaining to how they made decisions over a range of different household realms. Hill and Scanzoni broke down decision-making into six steps (component units, inherent features, cyclical processes, units in development, outcome as dynamic and integrating past history with present processes). While they admitted that this obviously complicated the task of measuring the phenomenon, nevertheless, they asserted that this approach brought advances in understanding and prediction of marital decision-making. These authors also reported that a process-oriented approach to decision making had a wide applicability to different samples, such as married couples, co-habitating couples or even friends.

As the need for studying decisioning processes became more apparent, researchers applied themselves to finding ways to conceptualize negotiating strategies. Cody, McLaughlin and Jordan (1980), who are investigators in the area of communication research, identified four types of compliance gaining strategies using an open-ended format. Their 128 subjects chose approaches that fell in the range
of direct-rational (e.g., reasoning), manipulation (e.g., flattery), exchange strategies (e.g., negotiation) and threats.

Different strategies were identified by Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980). They saw verbal negotiation strategies as falling into several categories: the first of these was to invoke the well-being of the larger group as justification for persuasion. The second category was an individualistic one where the major emphasis was on the well-being of the individual rather than of the group. And the third category was based on principles of equity, reciprocity and duty. When talking failed, the authors asserted that negotiation may then move to competitive- or coercive-type strategies, such as anger, crying, swearing, pouting or leaving the room.

In another study, Falbo and Peplau (1980) queried 100 undergraduate heterosexual dating couples about how they got their partners to do what they wanted. The resulting essays were scored on power strategies and thirteen strategies were defined. The authors interpreted the results in terms of a two-dimensional model of power strategies in intimate relationships. One dimension described power strategies as varying on a directness continuum, ranging from direct to indirect. Direct strategies were those in which the couples
stated what they wanted outright rather than trying to manipulate the other person through hinting or making subtle suggestions. The other dimension explained the extent to which power strategies involved either unilateral or bilateral decision-making. Bilateral strategies were defined as those in which persuasion is used as opposed to the person unilaterally doing what he or she desired.

Howard, Blumstein & Schwartz (1986) examined influence tactics in 235 heterosexual and homosexual couples (98 heterosexual, 75 male homosexual, and 62 lesbian couples). This sample came from a larger study of 6,000 cohabiting pairs living in the United States. After each partner answered a lengthy questionnaire, intensive interviews were set up for 320 couples who lived in the San Francisco, Seattle and New York City areas. Eighteen months after the interviews, from a follow-up mailing, couples who had remained together were identified and their responses formed the subject matter for this study. The authors identified six categories of influence tactics. Manipulation (e.g., flattering, dropping hints) and supplication (e.g., pleading, crying, acting helpless) were classified as weak strategies. Bullying (e.g., insulting, ridiculing) and autocracy (e.g., insisting, asserting authority) were classified as strong strategies, disengagement (e.g.
sulking, leaving the scene) and bargaining (e.g. compromise, offering a trade-off) were described as neutral strategies. Howard et al. identified several patterns of the effect of interpersonal power on influence tactics. Positions of powerlessness were found to increase the use of supplication and manipulation and positions of strength increased the likelihood of bullying and the use of autocratic tactics.

Buss, Gomes, Higgins & Lauterbach (1987) used written questionnaires to ask 59 couples how they influenced their partners. Choices came from a listing of 35 strategies and respondents were asked to look at each of the items and rate on a seven-point scale how likely they were to use each of these tactics when they were trying to get their partner to do something. From those responses, the authors generated six influence factors (charm, silent treatment, coercion, reason, regression and debasement). The tactic of charm included such actions as complimenting the partner or being especially loving; the silent treatment consisted of acts such as ignoring or not responding; coercion was described by acts that would threaten or demand certain behavior; the reason tactic described acts such as giving reasons for doing something a particular way or explaining a situation; regression consisted of acts of pouting or sulking and debasement included acting humble or "lowering oneself".
Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) conceptualized negotiation strategies as either cooperative or coercive. They queried 188 married couples from the southeastern United States, using both interviews and pencil- and paper-tests to ascertain styles of negotiating. They assigned cognitive, resolving, reconciling and appeasing verbal units to the cooperative category and statements that were coercive or rejecting to the coercive grouping.

Context Factors Under Study

Personality factors have been shown to influence how couples relate to each other during marital negotiations (Szinovac, 1987), but it was not until Godwin and Scanzoni's (1989) research that a systematic effort was made to assess how personality affected the interaction process of spouses as they decided an important marital issue. These authors investigated the level of love and caring of participants for their partners and the degree of commitment to the current marital relationship. They also drew on research that suggested that contemporary gender-role norms stress the interchangeability of partners in their various roles, thus making explicit negotiation between spouses a necessity (Raush, 1977; Scanzoni & Fox, 1980).

Self-esteem is one aspect of personality investigated in the present study. Level of self-esteem is conceptualized
to have important significance to martial interactions. People with low self-esteem appear to induce competitive and coercive behaviors in their decision-making partners (Szinovac, 1987). Assor and O'Quin (1982) studied 44 male and female college students regarding their bargaining behaviors; participants who scored low on measures of self-esteem also exhibited a stubbornness in their negotiating. They suggested that tough bargaining behavior may be an attempt to compensate for feelings of inadequacy, to convince oneself and others that they are good bargainers.

Similarly, Zartman (1983) reported a significant negative association between tough bargaining behavior and self-esteem. Fifty-five pairs of volunteers participated in laboratory studies of bargaining. Participants could either maximize their own gain at the expense of their partner (tough bargainers), or they could use strategies that would allow both participants more modest gains, thus benefitting the dyad. The lower the participants' self-esteem, the more likely they were to be tough bargainers. In a laboratory simulation of 62 undergraduate students, Instone, Major and Bunker (1983) found that women used more coercive strategies with their assigned partner when they were low in self-esteem.
Several researchers have remarked that self-esteem appears to be linked with gender (Dinnerstein, 1976; Eichler, 1981). Komter (1989) studied 60 couples using semi-structured interviews and found in her sample that women reported significantly less self-esteem than men. She ascribed this to the cultural valuation of men over women, and of male characteristics over female characteristics, even though husbands and wives rarely acknowledged this difference in value. The author remarked that in the interviews, husbands and wives strongly asserted that important decisions were made together, while in actual outcome, egalitarian results were the exception in her study.

Preferences for particular gender roles have often been conceptualized as falling on a continuum, with one end typically labeled traditional and the other labeled egalitarian or contemporary (Bird, Bird, & Scruggs, 1984; Scanzoni, 1978). A traditional gender-role orientation tends to indicate a desire for the status quo, of assigning tasks primarily on the basis of sex; whereas an egalitarian role orientation suggests a preference for flexibility in the behavior of men and women.

The importance of assessing gender-role orientation in the realm of power and decision making has been shown by a
number of studies (Pearson, 1985; Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). When men indicated a strong preference for traditional gender roles, they tended to bring up topics for discussion with higher frequency than did women. Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) also suggested that the person who brought up a particular topic was more likely to get his or her way. They further believed that gender-role egalitarian attitudes were becoming increasingly the norm and they asserted that power tended to be more symmetrical with egalitarian processes. While some conflicting results have been published (Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Sexton & Perlman, 1989), indications are that women who hold less gender-stereotypical views tend to negotiate more egalitarian relationships and appear to have more say in decision-making processes (Scanzoni, Polonko, Teachman, & Thompson, 1989). Scanzoni and Szinovacz (1980) suggested that women who behave according to traditional gender-role norms may not feel assertive or courageous enough vis-a-vis their husbands to ask for relationship modifications or changes and thus accept decisions that may not be to their liking.

Skill in negotiation, or what Strauss (1978) called "negotiating experience" is another context variable that can help determine the outcome of decisions in a close relationship (Falbo, 1977). The better people's
communication skills, the more likely they are to use negotiating strategies that give them desired results (Ritchey & Jankowski, 1989). In the present study, half of the men and women surveyed were counselors; as part of their training, prospective counselors receive instruction in communication strategies (Douglas, 1985; Dixon & Glover, 1984) and a good portion of their training is devoted to increasing and sharpening those skills (Motta, 1986). Therapists tend to have above average verbal abilities (Marston, 1984). One study, consisting of 23 participants (10 men and 13 women) looked at the effect of training and experience of counselors on a conceptual mapping task: experienced counselors were found to be superior in understanding the "big picture" over counselors who were only beginning their practicum. Thus, both training and practice in communication skills may give the counselor an edge in getting his/her point of view across during marital bargaining (Martin, Slemon, Hiebert, Hallberg & Cummings, 1989).

The negotiation strategies a person will use during decision making also depends on the amount and degree of love s/he holds for the spouse. Safilios-Rothschild (1976) asserted that the partner who was "more in love" had less power in the relationship, but that men and women who
reported themselves as equally in love also tended to use cooperative strategies in decision-making. Charny (1987), reporting on a study of 300 married couples concluded that those who described themselves as happily married were also more likely to use cooperation to reach agreement; similar findings were documented by Szinovacz (1978) for women. She asked 1,370 Austrian employed wives from both blue- and white-collar marriages about their decision-making styles and found that those who considered themselves in love reported more reliance on cooperative and egalitarian decision-making.

The importance of the concept of commitment to the marital relationship and to negotiating behavior has also been extensively noted. From Waller's (1938) term "principle of least interest" which suggested that the person who was less interested in the relationship had more power through McDonald's (1980) decade review, to Eichler's (1981) feminist analysis, it has been recognized that commitment to the relationship is a variable that may help explain certain anomalies. McDonald (1981) believed that wives' greater commitment to the marital relationship explained why they bargained less vigorously on their own behalf. This appeared to be borne out by findings of Howard et al. (1986), where women who were more committed to the relationship tended to
more frequently use supplication tactics. Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) reported that the more a woman was committed to the relationship, the less likely she was to use coercive bargaining behavior.

Married women have been entering the work force in increasing numbers in the past several decades (Lengermann & Wallace, 1985) and wives' employment is obviously a factor in the marital power relationship. However, it does not appear to be employment per se, but the disparity of income between spouses that is the important variable (Blumstein & Schwartz, 1983). Employed wives, on average, have less income than their husbands (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1981; Waldrop, 1988) and while researchers have tried to explain the persistent gap in men's and women's earnings in different ways (Osmond, 1984), disparity of income remains a significant factor in studies of power. Scanzoni (1979) wrote that greater income strengthens bargaining behavior and Komter (1989) suggested that employed women are more assertive in defending their views during conflict. Howard et al. (1986) indicated that those who had less income relative to their partner used more indirect strategies such as manipulation or negotiation.

Much of the research on bargaining has focused on laboratory situations or labor-management disputes
(Bacharach & Lawler, 1981; Cross, 1969; Zartman, 1976). The process of negotiating with one's spouse, however, involves special consideration (French, 1985). The ongoing nature of the relationship is one such factor. Where subjects in a university study may bargain aggressively to maximize their rewards since they never expect to encounter their fellow subject again, spouses know that they will face their partners daily. Thus, previous cooperativeness during conflictual situations is important in explaining how men and women interact with each other. Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) found that women's prior cooperativeness was not related to how they negotiated, but that there was a significant negative relationship for men between prior cooperativeness and coercive measures.

The importance of the issue influences the style of negotiation of each partner. Researchers addressed this issue in differing ways. Blood and Wolfe (1960) included both typically masculine and feminine areas to be decided when they constructed their scale and Godwin and Scanzoni (1989) directly asked their sample what role the importance of an issue played in their discussions. When the issue was very important, Donnerstein and Hatfield (1982) reported that men were more likely to resort to aggression than were women, a finding echoed by Hammock, Rosen, Richardson and Bernstein (1989).
The perception of influence over their partner
determines how men and women tailor their message to each
other. Major (1987) reported that women expect to assert
less influence over their partners than do men and may, as a
result, not bargain as persistently with their partner, a
finding reported by Szinovacz (1987). In a study that
involved both written questionnaires and personal
interviews, Madden (1987) queried 37 married couples
regarding perceived control and power in their marriages.
She reports that when women felt that they had greater
influence, they were more likely to cooperate in resolving
an issue.

**Process Variables Under Study**

Negotiating strategies have been conceptualized in
several different ways (Buss et al. 1987; Cody et al. 1980;
Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Godwin & Scanzoni, 1989; Howard et al.
1986), but they all tend to share descriptions of behaviors
that are used when men and women want to influence their
partners.

In researching negotiating strategies in intimate
relationships, Falbo and Peplau (1980) identified specific
strategies that they labeled as direct-bilateral, direct-
unilateral, indirect-bilateral and indirect-unilateral. They
conceptualized direct-bilateral strategies as more inclusive
of the partner in the decision-making process while indirect-unilateral negotiating styles are seen as one-sided and exclusionary. These authors also found significant associations between gender, egalitarianism and the types of strategies couples adopted. Men used more direct strategies, such as asking or requesting, whereas women used indirect means of influencing, such as hinting or putting the partner in a good mood.

Conflicting results have been reported as to the cooperativeness or competitiveness of men versus women with some studies suggesting that women tend to give in more readily in a negotiating context while others portrayed men as more cooperative (McCarrick, Manderscheid & Silbergeld, 1981; Rubin & Brown, 1975). In later work, Szinovacz (1987) described research that suggested gender differences: men tended to adopt a profit-oriented approach to bargaining that led them to cooperate or compete depending on which strategy maximized their profits. Women, however, were said to respond to interpersonal cues and thus reciprocated men's cooperative or competitive behavior. Szinovacz (1987) also reported that traditional men bargained more persistently and invoked their right as males more than did egalitarian males. However, with increasing gender equality, women tend to negotiate more egalitarian relationships and there
appears to be less tolerance in society for blatantly coercive measures (Scanzoni, Polonko, Teachman & Thompson, 1989).

Outcome Processes Under Study

When decision making has proceeded through the negotiation process, outcome is considered the evaluation of discussions, negotiations or arrangements that occurred throughout the process (Scanzoni & Szinovacz, 1980). Scanzoni and Polonko (1980) measured outcome by whether consensus or dissensus had been achieved. They asserted that cooperative verbal strategies were associated with agreement, consensus or fair exchange, while conversely, competitive and coercive strategies were likely to lead to disagreement. Later, Hill and Scanzoni (1982) conceptualized outcome as being composed of several additional categories. They distinguished between total agreement, partial agreement, and disagreement and whether husbands and wives were satisfied, resigned or resentful about the outcome. One study of 244 married couples investigated styles of conflict resolution and the actual outcome of marital conflict. Women were found to be more likely than men to compromise to reach an agreement with their spouses (Rands, Levinger & Mellinger, 1981).
In a study of gender differences and competition, McCarrick, Manderscheid and Silbergeld (1981) assessed strategies individuals employ to reach agreement. In a group consisting of 10 married couples, women used submissive strategies when they were talking with their husbands.

The judgement of fairness or equity in a given situation rests primarily on social comparison (Cook & Messick, 1983), but how this is conceptualized may also depend on people's reference group or their perception of the cost/benefit ratio (Austin & Hatfield, 1980). Equity in a relationship occurs when both partners get about the same amount of benefit from the relationship relative to what they put into maintaining the relationship (Brehm, 1985). McDonald (1981) posited that men and women differ in their sense of entitlement, of what is considered just and fair.

In a recent study of 100 couples, both men and women believed that wives contributed more to marriage than did husbands (Sexton & Perlman, 1989). In a laboratory study, Major (1987) investigated the sense of entitlement for a given amount of work done by 30 men and women. She gave men and women identical tasks to complete and then invited them to tell her how much would constitute fair recompense for their time and effort. Men consistently expected more pay or other reward for the same effort than did women (Major,
1987). This sense of entitlement appears to carry over into decision making. England and Farkas (1986) suggested that man bargain more vigorously because they feel they are entitled to a larger share.

If, however, one partner obtains a disproportionately large amount of benefits relative to contributions, this person is described as "overbenefitted" (Brehm, 1985). Donnerstein and Hatfield (1982) believed that in such an instance, men will use more cooperative strategies to reduce their sense of benefitting at their partners' expense. Conversely, when Hammock, Rosen, Richardson and Berstein (1989) studied 54 men on effects of sequential and simultaneous responding on a stressful task (the stress was electric shock), they found that these men resorted to coercive strategies if they believed that they had been treated inequitably.

In studies of equity, consistent gender differences have been observed (Major & Adams, 1983; Swap & Rubins, 1983). Women tended to be more concerned with the interpersonal situation and allocated rewards so that everyone benefitted whereas men gave greater rewards based on performance. Morgan and Sawyer (1981) maintained that norms for equity vs. equality tend to be used primarily to justify action. They asserted that the equity norm (each
according to their performance), tended to be invoked by the strong whereas equality was invoked by the weak.
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APPENDIX B

Methodology
Methodology

This appendix describes in greater detail the research methodology utilized in this study.

Sample

The average age in the study for men was 50 years ($M = 49.98$, $SD = 9.68$) and for women was 47 years ($M = 46.52$, $SD = 8.86$). (Table 7). Four percent of the men and 7% of the women were under 35 years of age while 32% of men and 17% of women were over 56 years of age. The majority of respondents were white: 98% of men and 99% of women identified themselves as white. The remainder of the sample reported being black. Two-thirds of the sample indicated being in their first marriages. The average number of children in these families was two. Eighteen percent of men and 23% of women had no children living at home while 23% of men and 9% of women related that they had three or more children.

Due to the nature of their professions, this was a highly educated group of respondents. Thirty percent of men and 17% of women had earned a doctoral degree while 52% of men and 56% of women reported having a master's degree. Fifty-three percent of men and 52% of women identified themselves as Licensed Professional Counselors.
Individual incomes varied by gender: 6% of men indicated yearly incomes of under $19,999 while 26% of women gave that figure as their individual income. Nine percent of men and 19% of women were in the $20,000 to $29,999 income category; the range of $30,000 to $39,999 showed the most correspondence between men and women, 23% and 24% respectively reported earning this amount. Seventeen percent of men and 13% of women indicated they had earned between $40,000 and $49,999 the past year and 27% of men and 16% of women described their income as being between $50,000 and $69,999 a year. Almost ten times as many men as women reported individual income of more than $70,000 annually (18% vs. 2%).

Procedure

The mailing list of the Virginia Board of Licensed Professional Counselors was used to obtain a sample of 400 Licensed Professional Counselors (800 spouses). A table of random numbers was consulted to choose corresponding pages of the mailing list and the names of these counselors on those pages were printed out. From this sample, names that were ambiguous as to gender were deleted and the sample was adjusted to have an equal number of men and women as participants.
The instrument was printed as a booklet, consisting of three 8"x12" sheets of paper and a cover page folded in the middle and stapled, resulting in twelve pages. Each page was type-set and the cover displayed the title "Marital Decision-Making", the study sponsor, Department of Family and Child Development, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and a graphic illustration (See Appendix D).

A pilot study was implemented in April 1990, using a sample of 18 couples similar to the identified population. Purposes of the pilot were to obtain feedback regarding ambiguous or confusing terminology used in the instrument and to determine adequate variance within response choices. As a result of the pilot, a few items were altered to promote greater understanding of terms.

Each counselor was sent two questionnaires, one each for the husband and wife, along with cover letters for each spouse. The cover letters (Appendix C), one to the counselor and one to his/her spouse, explained the purpose of the study and enlisted the couple's participation. A bright yellow sheet was included in the initial mailing to be returned if the subject was not married. One week later, a post card was sent to all participants to thank them for returning the questionnaire or to urge them to complete and
return the booklet. Two additional follow-up letters were mailed to non-respondents at two-week intervals in order to encourage responses. The final letter again included two copies of the questionnaire. After the deadline stated in the letter had passed, 10% of non-respondents were contacted by telephone to ascertain if non-respondents differed in characteristics from those who did respond and to ask the reason for non-response. Both people who returned the surveys and those who did not shared similar demographic characteristics regarding age, sex, number of children and income.

Responses were received from 69% of the individuals after these three follow-up contacts. The response rate was calculated as the percentage of completed questionnaires divided by the total sample surveyed, after subtracting those individuals who refused, were ineligible or returned unusable questionnaires (Dillman, 1978).
APPENDIX C

Correspondence
9 May 1990

Dear Colleague:

The enclosed survey booklets focus on marital decision-making. The study is concerned with which marital issues are important to couples and how they go about making decisions. As counselors, we are often called on to help clients deal with and resolve problems. By completing the enclosed booklets, you and your spouse will contribute important information to this area of study. The knowledge gained may, in turn, help practitioners and other professionals provide more objective advice to clients.

You have been selected at random from the listing of Licensed Professional Counselors residing in the state of Virginia. In order for the research results to be truly representative, it is crucial that each survey booklet be completed and returned promptly. Please participate in this important project by completing the survey; it will take you approximately 20 minutes. We are also asking that you pass on one of the booklets to your spouse to be completed independently. If you are not married, please return the yellow sheet in the booklet so that you will not receive follow-up mailings.

You may be sensitive to the fact that some of the questions are personal. We hope that you will share these important aspects of yourself in order to insure that the results depict an accurate picture of marital decision-making. The number located on the front cover of your study booklet is to facilitate our record keeping and to check your name off the mailing list when your booklet is returned. However, your name and identifying information will never be linked to your responses. The findings will be reported as group trends and not as individual responses. All your answers will be held in strictest confidence.

Please write or call collect, (703) 774-7010 or 989-5640 if you have any comments, questions or concerns regarding the survey booklets or research project. After you complete the booklet, fold it and put it in the stamped, return envelope and mail it back. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and we extend, in advance, thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Gudrun Freeman, LPC
Project Director
Dear Partner,

The survey booklet, given to you by your spouse, focuses on marital decision-making. The study is concerned with which marital issues are important to couples and how they go about making decisions. Previous research has often focused on only one partner when asking about marital decision-making. With your answers, filled out separately and independently from your partner, you can help us gain a better understanding of this important topic.

Please participate in this project by completing the survey; it will take you approximately 20 minutes. In order for the research results to be truly representative of married couples, it is crucial that each survey booklet be completed and returned promptly.

You may be sensitive to the fact that some of the questions are personal. We hope that you will share these important aspects of yourself in order to insure that the results depict an accurate picture of marital decision-making. The number located on the front cover of your study booklet is to facilitate our record-keeping and to check your name off the mailing list when your booklet is returned. However, your name and identifying information will never be linked to your responses. The findings will be reported as group trends and not as individual responses. All your answers will be held in strictest confidence.

Please write or call collect (703) 774-7010 or 989-5640 if you have any comments, questions or concerns regarding the survey booklets or research project. After you complete the booklet, fold it and put it in the stamped, return envelope and mail it back. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated and we extend, in advance, thanks for your time and effort.

Sincerely yours,

Suddun Freeman, LPC
Project Director
Dear Colleague,

Last week, survey booklets asking about marital decision-making were mailed to you and your spouse. If you have already completed and returned the booklets, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so as soon as possible.

It is extremely important that your response be included in this study to further our knowledge about how couples make family decisions.

If by chance you did not receive the booklets or they were misplaced, please call my office at (703) 989-5640 and I will see that you get replacement copies.

Sincerely yours,

Quadrun Freeman, LPC  
Project Director
30 May 1990

Dear Colleague,

Approximately three weeks ago you and your partner were asked to participate in a study on marital decision-making. If you have already completed and returned your survey booklet, please accept our sincere thanks and our apology for contacting you again. We want you to know that each response is extremely important to the success of the study and we hope that you will take the time to participate in the research.

The number of booklets already returned is very encouraging. However, our ability to accurately describe marital decision-making depends on you and others who have not yet responded. You may have different, yet equally important, perspectives from those who have already returned the booklet. It is critical that your unique contribution to this study is reported.

If by chance you did not receive the survey booklets or they were misplaced, please call either of the numbers below and we will put another set in the mail for you. Also, if you have any concerns or questions about this study, please feel free to call. We certainly understand your need for privacy and will assure you of complete confidentiality.

Thank you for your contribution to the success of this project. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Gudrun Freeman, LPC
Project Director
(703) 989-5640 W
(703) 774-7010 H
Dear Colleague,

As of today we have not received two completed survey booklets from your family. You have been busy and time has probably gotten away from you; however, we are counting on you to make this research project on marital decision-making a success.

This study is one of only a few that addresses the topic of marital decision-making. Your reactions and responses will provide information and insight that is needed to better understand this important area.

We have enclosed replacement survey booklets. The time you and/or your partner take to complete the booklet(s) will be sincerely appreciated. May I urge you to complete and return the booklet(s) before June 20. Each and every response is vital to this research and we appreciate your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Gudrun Freeman, LPC
Project Director
**PART A**

**Negotiation Strategies**

In marriage, most people experience instances where both partners feel very strongly about a situation. Each feels compelled to influence the other to do what s/he wants. When you want to influence your partner, to what extent do you use the following strategies? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I simply ask for what I want or need</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I try to persuade</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I repeatedly make my point until s/he gives in</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I use logic and reason; give all the reasons my way is best</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I bring it up in an indirect way; hint or make suggestions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I talk about it; discuss our differences and needs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I try to negotiate something agreeable to both of us</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I say how very important my request is; how much it means to me</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I say it is in his/her best interest</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I use my expertise; claim I have a lot of experience in such matters</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I am especially affectionate; I am loving and romantic</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I bargain or compromise to resolve our differences</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Always</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I appeal to a sense of fairness; say it's the only fair and right thing to do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I do some fast talking.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I tell a &quot;little white lie&quot;.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I withdraw; become cold and silent.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I withhold something I know s/he takes pleasure in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I say what I would be willing to do in exchange.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I ignore him/her; refuse to respond until s/he sees reason.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am especially disagreeable.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I discuss the issue heatedly; use harsh, angry words.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I get very emotional; let him/her see how this affects me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I insult or swear at him/her.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I leave the room, house, etc.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I threaten to move out.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I threaten to get a divorce.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Influence on Partner Item**

In general, to what extent do you think you can influence your partner's behavior? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART B  Outcome Variables

Every couple is faced with a variety of problems, ranging from the relatively trivial to core relationship issues that require resolutions in terms of reaching some agreement. When you are faced with deciding a marital or family issue, how important is it to you and to your spouse that things usually go your/his or her way?

**How important is it:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. to you that things usually go your way.....</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to your spouse that things usually go his/her way..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How easy or difficult is it to reach an agreement with your partner in the following areas? (Circle number)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Difficulty</td>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money .........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Related Issues for Husband ......</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job-Related Issues for Wife ...........</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children ......................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of Household Tasks ......</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Activities .................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Husband's Relatives ..................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Wife's Relatives ...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Activities ......................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other  .........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. During a typical month, how often would you say that you and your partner disagree over major issues _______ and over minor issues _______? (number)

5. When you and your partner must make a decision concerning an issue about which you disagree, how much agreement do you typically reach? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Disagreement</th>
<th>Complete Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Further, how fair do you think the outcome of these difficult decisions between you typically are? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely Unfair</th>
<th>Completely Fair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. When you and your partner reach an agreement, how much do you believe you typically gain as a result of the decision making? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of What I Wanted</th>
<th>All of What I Wanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Conversely, how much would you say your spouse typically gains as a result of the decision making? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None of What S/he Wanted</th>
<th>All of What S/he Wanted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Over time, do you think it is becoming easier or more difficult to reach decisions with your partner? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much More Difficult</th>
<th>No Change</th>
<th>Much Easier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. When you are deciding an issue with people other than your spouse, are you generally more or less assertive with them? (Circle N/A only if item does not apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Much Less Assertive</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Relatives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Children</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor/Boss</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. If a "tough" bargainer makes high demands but gives few concessions and a "soft" bargainer makes low demands and gives many concessions, circle a number to indicate how you would describe yourself and your partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soft Bargainer</th>
<th>Tough Bargainer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your Partner</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART C  Past Cooperativeness**

Thinking back over your marital history, when you and your partner have disagreed over an important issue and eventually come to an agreement, to what extent has your partner behaved in the following ways? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the Past my Partner has Been:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understanding of my viewpoint</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fair in how s/he negotiates decisions</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Accepting of how I feel about issues</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Trustworthy in carrying through with what we have mutually agreed to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Open about how s/he feels</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cooperative in making whatever changes we have both agreed to</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


7. Flexible in how our decisions are carried out .............................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. Considerate of my needs/desires ...... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. Equitable; giving my opinions equal consideration ........................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. Manipulative in making or carrying out decisions ........................................... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. Fair in carrying out agreements ...... 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

12. Retaliatory if things don't go his/her way .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

**PART D**

After a major marital disagreement with your spouse, how do you usually end up feeling? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I Usually End Up Feeling:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hurt</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angry</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calm and Peaceful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotionally Drained</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense/Anxious</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worried</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleased</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resentful</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relaxed</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustrated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Control</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorry</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often are you physically affected in the following ways by major marital disagreements? (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tension-Related Aches and Pains (headache, stomachache, backpain) .........</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty Falling Asleep or Staying Asleep .......................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounding Heart or Chest Pains ..........................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physically Drained/Low in Energy ......................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in Normal Appetite (Unable to Eat/Overeat) ................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weakness in Parts of Your Body ..........................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizzy or Light-Headed ...........................................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble Catching Your Breath ...................................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART E  Self Esteem**

The following items deal with your current beliefs about yourself. Please give us an honest appraisal of your feelings by circling the number from 1 to 7 to indicate disagreement or agreement with each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself ......................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At times, I think I am no good at all ........................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities ................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people ........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of ................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I certainly feel useless at times ................................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others ....</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I could have more respect for myself ....................................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure ...............................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I take a positive attitude towards myself ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART F Feelings of Love**

In this section, we are interested in how you feel about your spouse. (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not At All True</th>
<th>Definitely True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would do almost anything for him/her ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>If s/he were feeling bad, I would really want to make him/her feel better ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>One of my primary concerns is his/her welfare ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel concerned for his/her well-being ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel that we are part of a team ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>If I could never be with him/her, I would really miss him/her ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>If I were lonely, my first thought would be to seek him/her out ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>It would be hard for me to get along without him/her ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I feel I can confide in him/her about virtually everything ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I do not worry if s/he knows my faults ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel that I can tell him/her my innermost thoughts and fantasies ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I greatly enjoy being confided in by him/her ..........................</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. I am committed to seeing my marriage succeed .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I expect to still be in my marriage in five years .................................................. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Please circle the number on the scale below, which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "Happy", represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy in marriage.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Unhappy</th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Perfectly Happy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART G Gender Role Orientation**

Please indicate how you feel people should behave in the following roles: husband, wife, mother and father. (Circle number)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A wife should have equal authority with her husband in making family decisions...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A married woman's most important task in life should be caring for her family...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A married woman's greatest reward and satisfaction comes through children...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. A mother of young children should work only if the family needs money...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A woman's job should be just as important to her as encouraging her husband in his job...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. A wife should make long-range career plans just as her husband does...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A woman who works should use the same strategies for career advancement that a man does...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. An employed wife should expect to do most of the household chores herself...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A wife should give up her job if it interferes with being a wife and mother...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. A mother should not be upset if her children feel as close or closer to their father as to her...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A woman should find her career as satisfying as being a wife and mother...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A wife should not be concerned if she makes more money than her husband...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. An employed mother can establish just as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a non-employed mother...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A married man's chief responsibility should be his career...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. A married man's most important task in life should be providing financial support for his family...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A father should be just as willing as a mother to miss work to care for a sick child...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. A father can parent a child just as well as a mother can...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A husband should not be upset if his wife's career sometimes requires her to be away from home overnight...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. A married man's greatest reward and satisfaction should come from his career...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A husband should not be concerned if his wife makes more money than he does...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. A husband should have final authority in making major family decisions...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A husband should turn down a promotion if it means spending less time with the family...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Husbands of wives employed full-time should equally share household tasks (e.g. cooking, laundry, vacuuming)...</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Husbands of wives employed full-time should equally share child care tasks (e.g., changing diapers, bathing children, taking children to and from day care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>A husband should be willing to move if his wife is offered a better job in another town</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART H**

Finally, we would like to request some general information.

1. **What is your sex?** (Circle number)
   - 1 MALE
   - 2 FEMALE

2. **What is your date of birth?**
   - (date)

3. **What is your race?** (Circle number)
   - 1 WHITE
   - 2 BLACK
   - 3 OTHER (specify) ________________________________

4. **How long have you been married to your present partner?**
   - (years)

5. **Have you been married previously?** (Circle number)
   - 1 NO
   - 2 YES. . . If YES, how many times? ___________
   - (times)

**IF YOU DO NOT HAVE CHILDREN, PLEASE SKIP TO ITEM NO. 8**

6. **How many children do you have?**
   - (number)

7. **What are the ages of your children living at home?**
   - BOYS __ __ __ __
   - GIRLS __ __ __ __
   - (age) (age) (age) (age)

8. **What is the highest level of education you have completed?** (Circle number)
   - 1 LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL
   - 2 HIGH SCHOOL
   - 3 SOME COLLEGE OR TECHNICAL TRAINING
   - 4 BACHELOR'S DEGREE
   - 5 SOME GRADUATE WORK
   - 6 MASTER'S DEGREE
   - 7 DOCTORAL DEGREE
IF YOU ARE NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED, PLEASE SKIP TO NO. 11

9. What is your occupation? (Circle number).
   1. LICENSED PROFESSIONAL COUNSELOR
   2. OTHER... If OTHER, please give us some information about the type of work you do.

   Job Title: ________________________________
   Kind of Work you do: ________________________________
   Company or Business: ________________________________

10. Approximately how many hours per week do you spend:

    At Work, Including Required Evening Meetings? ________
        (hours)

    At Home, on Job-Related Tasks? ________
        (hours)

11. In 1989, what was your approximate income before taxes? (Please circle a number in both columns)

    YOUR INDIVIDUAL INCOME  YOUR FAMILY INCOME

    1. NO INCOME
    2. Less Than $15,000  1. Less Than $35,000
    3. $15,000 - $19,999  2. $35,000 - $39,999
    4. $20,000 - $24,999  3. $40,000 - $44,999
    5. $25,000 - $29,999  4. $45,000 - $49,999
    6. $30,000 - $34,999  5. $50,000 - $54,999
    7. $35,000 - $39,999  6. $55,000 - $59,999
    8. $40,000 - $44,999  7. $60,000 - $64,999
    9. $45,000 - $49,999  8. $65,000 - $69,999
   10. $50,000 - $54,999  9. $70,000 - $74,999
   11. $55,000 - $59,999 10. $75,000 - $79,999
   12. $60,000 - $64,999 11. $80,000 - $84,999
   13. $65,000 - $69,999 12. $85,000 - $89,999
   14. $70,000 and above 13. $90,000 and above

12. Approximately how much of the total family income do you earn? (Circle number)

    1. Less Than 10%
    2. 10% - 20%
    3. 21% - 30%
    4. 31% - 40%
    5. 41% - 50%
    6. 51% - 60%
    7. 61% - 70%
    8. 71% - 80%
    9. More Than 80%

PLEASE TURN TO INSIDE BACK COVER OF BOOKLET
Thank you for your time, cooperation and consideration in participating in this study. If you have any comments you'd like to make, please feel free to do so in the space provided below.

If you would like a summary of results, please write "Request Summary" on the back of the return envelope and we will see to it that you receive a copy.
APPENDIX E

Supplementary Tables
Table 6
Correlations of Negotiating Strategies and Context Variables by Gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Variables</th>
<th>Negative Affect</th>
<th>Reasoning</th>
<th>Bargaining</th>
<th>Threatening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Orientation</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interdependence</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Experience</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperativeness</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Issue</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Partner</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
Table 6 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context Variables</th>
<th>Negotiating Strategies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interdependence</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Issue</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Partner</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-45 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56 years</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years Married</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 10 years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 30 years</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours Worked per Week</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 39 hours</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 45 hours</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 54 hours</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 55 hours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $19,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000-29,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000-39,999</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000-49,999</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-69,999</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$70,000 and above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $50,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000-74,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000-84,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$90,000 and above</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Role Orientation</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Interdependence</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.26)***</td>
<td>(.24)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Experience</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.09)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Cooperativeness</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.18)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Family Income</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.20)*</td>
<td>(.19)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of Issue</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.26)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence on Partner</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.16)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001  
Men's scores are in parenthesis.
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