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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Men and women are different biologically and interpersonally. Biological differences will always be a differentiating factor between men and women, whereas gender differences tend to fluctuate because of the external learning involved in the socialization process. In combination, these two factors result in many differences between men and women (Osmond & Thorne, 1993). Given these differences, men and women tend to approach marital issues differently (Unger & Crawford, 1992), such as with decision-making power (Cowan & Cowan, 1988), conflict communication (Christensen & Heavey, 1990), and how committed each spouse is in giving of themselves towards the betterment of the marriage (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Because all of these issues are common topics in marital therapy (Noller, 1993), knowing how they are related is useful information in the assessment and treatment planning process in therapy.

Although the ideas of gender, decision-making power, conflict communication style, and commitment to invest in marriage have demonstrated some degree of intercorrelation, the degree to which this is so could use further validation according to previous studies (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993; Beach & Broderick, 1983; Katz, Long, & Beach, 1995; Noller, 1993). This study takes on that task, but more importantly, it helps show which of the four of these and other key demographic variables in combination most uniquely and efficiently predicts marital commitment to invest. Accordingly, this study builds three prediction models for each gender and for the couple to target key areas for therapy during marital assessment and treatment planning in conjunction with level of marital commitment to invest.

Theoretical Links

According to social learning theory, the origins of behavior and behavioral change
take place through two main methods: response consequences and modeling (Bandura, 1977). Learning through response consequences, "the more rudimentary form of learning," refers to learning through direct, personal experience with the environment (Bandura, 1977, p. 17). Basically, successful (reinforcing) forms of behavior are selected, whereas ineffectual activity (punishing or otherwise non-reinforcing) is discarded or eventually becomes extinct.

Learning through modeling involves the following: "Through observing others, one forms an idea on how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions, this coded information serves as a guide for action" (Bandura, 1977, p. 22). This form of learning is often quicker, easier, and safer than personal experience. According to Crain (1992, pp. 177-178), four components are typically required for modeling to occur: (a) attentional processes (paying attention to the model), (b) retention processes (memory mechanisms such as visual imagery or verbal coding), (c) motor reproduction processes (the physical requirements necessary to perform the observed behavior), and (d) motivational processes (observing the model's behavior resulting in apparently positive, desirable outcomes).

Social learning theory, with its emphasis on response consequences and modeling, is the main theoretical base of behavioral marital therapy (Baucom & Epstein, 1990). Behavioral marital therapy (or BMT) is a form of couples therapy based upon a simple premise for why a marriage is the way it is and how change can occur: "The behavior of both partners in a marital relationship is shaped, strengthened, weakened, and modified by environmental events, especially those events involving the other spouse" (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991, p. 97). In therapy, the clinician and the marital partners work to pinpoint the ways in which the spouses simultaneously, mutually, and reciprocally act towards each other, along with the degree of marital satisfaction associated with these behaviors. When certain spousal behaviors are associated negatively with satisfaction, new behaviors are brainstormed and implemented through
response consequences and/or modeling behaviors. Systematically, marital satisfaction increases as new satisfying behaviors replace the old dissatisfying ones.

To make this process become effective and to produce change, clients are expected to participate actively in challenging homework assignments with the aim of improving their marriage. Furthermore, the structure of therapy sessions often requires clients to verbally participate, offer ideas and suggestions, create goals, and make other active efforts during in-session interventions (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991).

Statement of Purpose

Sometimes, one or both partners come to marital therapy uncommitted or unmotivated to do what is necessary to promote relational change. Spouses may even have the hidden agenda of sabotaging therapy in an effort to show their partner that the marriage should end. If one or both clients are not committed to do what may be necessary for marital improvement, then the therapeutic effort may be hampered or even in vain. Therefore, finding out how committed each partner is towards investing their time, resources, and energy for the betterment of the marriage could be critical information for therapy. Furthermore, knowing other factors that contribute towards the couple's commitment level to invest would further assist the therapist in figuring out what other factors to examine during BMT treatment planning.

Several variables have been shown to have been associated with this concept of "commitment to invest in marriage," including power (Baucom & Epstein, 1996), gender role orientation (Murphy, Meyer, & O'Leary, 1994), and conflict communication style (Noller, 1993). Furthermore, many studies have shown gender, decision-making power, and conflict resolution style to be associated with each other (Gerber, 1991; Gruber & White, 1986; Noller, 1993; Rosenthal & Hautaluoma, 1987). Commitment to invest in the marriage, gender issues, power, demand-withdraw communication, and mutually constructive communication issues have been
associated with marital stress, conflict, and other problems (Noller, 1993). No previous study, however, has empirically tested all four of these variables together in conjunction with relevant demographic variables.

Therefore, the purpose of this study was to take the variables of gender, decision-making power, and conflict communication style (demand-withdraw or mutually constructive)—four variables shown to have links with each other and with commitment to invest—along with several demographic variables and create a regression model that bests predicts commitment to invest in marriage in the most efficient manner possible. This study helps to show which combination of these variables lends the most unique predictive power towards commitment to invest for the couple, as well as individually according to gender. This model helps establish a case for why spousal commitment levels are what they are in accordance with salient predictive factors. Accordingly, the purpose of this additional information is to help therapists know relevant background factors to address when working with couples with low and/or unbalanced commitment levels to invest.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous studies on gender, power, and conflict communication style have helped generate a respectable pool of literature relevant to this study. How these variables relate to marital commitment to invest is the primary focus of this study. Accordingly, a brief review of these variables is given not only to show how these variables are intercorrelated, but also how they and the other variables may predict commitment to invest in marriage. Finally, a brief review is given regarding behavioral marital therapy and social learning theory in relation to this study.

This literature review will cite supportive studies of the following predictions tested in this thesis: that the more demand-withdraw behaviors occur, the less egalitarian the marital partners are, the less equal spousal decision-making power is, and the less mutually constructive conflict communication occurs, the higher spousal commitment to invest will be. Along the same lines, the literature cited also supports the following alternative predictions of this study: that the less demand-withdraw behaviors occur, the more egalitarian the marital partners are, the more equal spousal decision-making power is, and the more mutually constructive conflict communication occurs, the higher spousal commitment to invest will be. In addition, other demographic variables with projected relevance to commitment to invest have been reviewed.

Gender

Gender refers to the different attitudes, behaviors, and roles males and females are socialized (and expected) to follow in accordance with their biological sex (Unger & Crawford, 1992). The extent to which a person displays traditionally "gendered" attitudes and behaviors has been studied through a wide variety of measures (Beere, 1990).
Gender studies have produced a large amount of literature regarding socialized “male” and “female” attributes. Feminist studies show that most gender differences come not from set biological influences, but from culture, the media, tradition, and other nonbiological influences that socialize males and females to behave according to their prescribed gender roles (Unger & Crawford, 1992). Feminists hold that society begins to instill these gender differences immediately after birth, and continues to do so throughout the entire lifespan (Arnold & Kuo, 1984).

According to Hare-Mustin and Marecek (1990), the process of gender socialization occurs like this: Males are presented with and rewarded for participating in “male” activities and attitudes, such as being aggressive, independent, and dominant. Females are likewise gendered, being rewarded for participating in “female” attitudes and activities, such as nurturance, caring, and dependency. When either sex participates in activities against their gender norm, they are punished and discouraged from continuing them.

Specifically, society genders males to be leadership-oriented, dominant, aggressive, and independent, and to be the final authority in disputes (Bem, 1974; Unger & Crawford, 1992). In contrast, females are socialized to be sensitive, understanding, dependent, and submissive to the male’s final authority (Bem, 1974; Unger & Crawford, 1992). In addition, females are also socialized to be relationship-oriented, as well as ultimately responsible for the success or failure of a relationship (Aciteli, 1992). Finally, females are socialized to monitor personal relationships more closely, and to sense the “pulse” of relationships more so than males (Honeycutt, Cantrill, & Greene, 1989).

In marriage, men and women have been traditionally relegated to distinct roles and functions. Historically, in most societies, men and women both had important roles in the economic structure. However, since the industrial revolution, the traditional role for women has become defined as housewife and mother, and the traditional role for men has been that of
material provider and protector (Larsen & Long, 1988). Over time, these traditional roles have extended. Women have also come to be viewed as the relationship experts and doctors (Burnett, 1984), are often seen as ultimately responsible for the relationship (Acitelli, 1992), and tend to adopt roles of dependency (Bem, 1974). Men, on the other-hand, have adopted the extended role of final authority in most matters (Bem, 1974; Unger & Crawford, 1992).

In the recent past, women who rejected their traditional gender roles were often considered maladjusted. For instance, previous studies have declared that women naturally lose their interest in the vocational world as their thoughts turn to marriage (Tiedman, 1959), and that a female aiming for a career is likely to be frustrated and dissatisfied as a woman (Lewis, 1968).

In contrast to traditional marital roles, “egalitarian” marriages consist of balanced, flexible, and negotiable marital roles and gender attitudes (Unger & Crawford, 1992). Larsen and Long (1988) claim that egalitarian views in marriage are increasing, but traditionally socialized marital roles are still significantly entrenched. According to Mason and Lu (1988), a large majority of married women (and an increasing number of married men) are developing and expressing nontraditional attitudes about gender roles, and this trend is increasing as time goes on. The reason more egalitarian marital roles have not been adopted, according to Unger and Crawford (1992), is that many women do not see their current traditional role as unequal or in need of change, especially when “this is the way it has always been” (p. 397).

Traditional gender-orientation has implications for how committed each spouse will be to invest in their marriage. By definition, egalitarian marriages will tend to show equal levels of commitment to invest (high, medium, or low, depending on the couple). The reason for this is assumed to be because the relative power structure and ultimate responsibility for the success of the relationship will be approximately equal between the two spouses (Unger & Crawford, 1992).

On the other-hand, the traditional gender role scenario logically leads to women possessing more of a commitment to invest in the marriage than men for the main reason that
women have more to lose—how they view themselves, how others view them, and how they will survive without a provider (Cromwell & Olsen, 1975; Noller, 1993; Unger & Crawford, 1992). Traditionally, husbands tend to feel they have done their investment by just providing—because that is their main contribution to the marriage, with the rest being up to the wife (Acitelli, 1992; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Hence, the implication is that traditionally oriented husbands will not feel as committed to invest in the marriages as women beyond matters involving material support.

The main conclusion is that traditional gender differences tend to lead to imbalances in how committed males and females will be towards making the marriage work—with traditionally gender-oriented women tending to show higher commitment levels in part because they have more to lose. This conclusion is in accordance with the principle of least interest. Here, the person with the lower commitment in the relationship cares less if the marriage succeeds, and will therefore exercise more control over the relationship (Cox, 1993). Conversely, the more committed person in the relationship is more vulnerable and therefore often goes to great lengths to placate and please her (or his) mate. Over time, this scenario creates tension as the partner with the greater commitment becomes resentful of the less committed partner’s noninvolvement and indifference (Cox, 1993).

In summary, gender differences relate to nonbiological, cultural, socialized traits that have implications for the differing attitudes and behaviors of men and women. Specifically, males are socialized to be independent, dominant, achievement-oriented, and leadership-oriented, whereas females are socialized to be dependent, submissive, relationship-oriented, and subservient (Unger & Crawford, 1992). Since the industrial revolution, traditional male roles in marriage have been that of main material provider and protector, whereas the traditional roles for women have been that of housewife and mother (Larsen & Long, 1988). Conversely, egalitarian marriages are based upon balanced, flexible, and negotiable marital roles and gender attitudes (Unger & Crawford, 1992). In relation to commitment to invest, the hypothesis of this study was
that spouses with egalitarian marriages would tend to have higher levels of commitment, whereas partners with traditionally oriented marriages would tend to display lower levels of commitment.

Power

Many studies have also illuminated the effects of power on relationships. “Power” in a relationship has generally rested with males, and can be divided into three categories: (a) power bases: the personal resources (such as knowledge, skills, or rewards) that form the basis of one partner’s control over another, (b) power processes: the interactional techniques (such as assertiveness, persuasion, problem-solving, or demandingness) that individuals use in their attempts to gain control, and (c) power outcomes: who makes the final decisions (Cromwell & Olsen, 1975). With males traditionally having greater access to power bases, they have also developed the power processes and outcomes to complement them (Babcock et al., 1993). In short, males have traditionally had greater access to power than women in all forms (Unger & Crawford, 1992).

According to Henley and Kramarae (1991), men’s greater power outcomes concerning money have given them the power to pay less attention to women’s concerns and complaints, while demanding to be heard and get their way when they have a concern. Noller (1993) described the three rules people in power (generally males) abide by. They: “(1) fail to reinforce or acknowledge the other person’s contribution, (2) act as though (they) are above the normal rules of conversation, and (3) take every opportunity to act as though (they) are an expert” (p. 138). Hence, greater power outcomes for males typically go hand-in-hand with traditional gender roles (Christensen & Shenk, 1991).

The person with the power in the relationship (usually the male) has the power to terminate discussions on uncomfortable subjects by withdrawing (Christensen & Shenk, 1991). Accordingly, the demand-withdraw pattern tends to result in female demand/male withdraw when
the husband has most of the power, and male demand/female withdraw tends to occur when females have most of the power in the relationship (although this is more of a rarity) (Christensen & Heavey, 1990).

As with traditional gender role orientation, the person with the most power in the relationship (usually the husband) also tends to feel less of a need to commit further investment in the marriage because he or she already tends to possess more personal assets, authority, and decision-making power—that is their investment (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Also, people with less decision-making power may not be as committed to invest in their marriage because they may not be as satisfied in their present arrangement because of their subservient position (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). On the other hand, in accordance with the previous definition of power in relationships (Cromwell & Olsen, 1975), a marriage in which partners are of similar power outcomes (decision-making power) will possess a relationship in which spouses have similar dependence on each other. This similar dependence will more likely result in marital partners being equally committed to invest in the marriage because both have a higher stake in making the marriage succeed and continue (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993).

In summary, “power” is a general term that relates to the degree individuals possess the bases, processes, and outcomes to achieve personally desired results. As males have generally had greater access to power bases, it follows that males have developed the power processes and outcomes to compliment these resources (Cromwell & Olsen, 1975). Furthermore, the person who possesses greater decision-making power (power outcomes) also tends to possess a greater degree of power bases and more dominant power processes than others. Power inequalities also imply lower spousal commitment to invest in the marriage because of the imbalanced value each spouse places on the marriage.

The hypothesis of this study was that spouses with less equality in their decision making would tend either to feel their power bases are all of the investment they need to offer (high
decision-making power), or that they are unhappy in their subservient position (lower decision-making power). Either way, they will be less committed to making the marriage work (Noller, 1993). In sum, more equally distributed spousal decision-making power was predicted to be tied with higher commitment to invest, and less equal spousal decision-making power was predicted to be tied to lower commitment to invest.

Conflict Communication Style

Marital conflict usually begins when one partner behaves in a way that is unpleasant for the other. When this happens, the couple can decide to either engage in or avoid a discussion of the issue. If the couple decides to engage in a discussion of the issue, they can approach it in one of two ways: either they can engage in a constructive discussion consisting of mutual validation and direct negotiation, or they can engage in negative processes that escalate the conflict (without validation or negotiation) (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). These conflict resolution patterns have been deemed “mutually constructive communication” and “the demand-withdraw pattern” respectfully (Christensen & Sullaway, 1984).

The demand-withdraw pattern is as follows: one spouse attempts to engage in a problem-solving discussion, often resorting to pressure and demands, while the other spouse attempts to avoid or withdraw from the discussion (Heavey, Layne, & Christensen, 1993). Generally, this is where, in the face of conflict, a spouse (usually the woman) increasingly expresses negative affect and complaints while the other spouse (usually the man) increasingly withdraws and cuts off contact, such that each partner stimulates an exaggeration from the other (Markman, Silvern, Clements, & Kraft-Hanak, 1993). Although this definition is independent of who initiates the discussion, the demand-withdraw pattern has been shown to occur somewhat more when the female initiates the discussion because the husband is more likely to perceive the wife as demanding in this scenario (Christensen & Heavey, 1990).
Most studies on demand-withdraw have shown this pattern to be highly divided across gender lines—with females tending to demand more and males tending to withdraw more during the encounter (Christensen & Shenk, 1991; Heavey et al., 1993). Furthermore, in a conflict, studies have also shown that the person in the relationship with more of the decision-making power will tend to be the one to withdraw (Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Noller, 1993). These power studies on the demand-withdraw pattern complement the gender studies on this subject, providing support for a feminist explanation of why this is a gendered pattern.

Although more of a rarity, male demand/female withdrawal does occur. This is usually when men begin the discussion, the decision making power is skewed more to the wife, and/or the couple has adopted more nontraditional gender roles (Heavey, Christensen, & Malamuth, 1995). Heavey et al. (1995) found that over time, reverse-ruled demand-withdraw couples are even more likely to experience long-term difficulties than those in female demand/male withdraw behaviors—possibly because of the social pressures and feelings associated with gender role violations. Therefore, marriages utilizing this destructive pattern are more likely to have long-range problems, in addition to the short-range frustrations and tensions that accompany a largely ineffective conflict resolution style (Heavey et al., 1993).

Speculation as to the origins of the demand-withdraw pattern have come from several sources, most involving gender socialization and decision-making power. Christensen and Heavey (1990) reviewed three theories—all of which involve some sort of gender-socialization and/or a power influence. One gender theory goes as follows: Men are socialized to search for separation and greater autonomy, whereas women are socialized to search for relationships, attachment, and intimacy. With these different socializations, the demand-withdraw pattern is a natural result: Women demand because they are threatened by separation and feeling responsible for the relationship, and men withdraw because they are threatened by intimacy and attachment (Napier, 1978).
Another theory concerns both gender and power: one spouse (the demander) fears rejection and abandonment, whereas the other person (the withdrawer) fears intrusion and engulfment by the other. This theory follows a gender socialization approach: Women are socialized to be relationship-oriented and expressive, and thus fearful of rejection and abandonment in relationships, whereas men are socialized to be independent and in charge, and thus fearful of intrusion and engulfment in relationships (Napier, 1978).

A third theory of the demand-withdraw pattern mainly concerns power issues: Women demand because they are dissatisfied with their lack of power and status—especially because women do the burden of the housework and childcare. Dissatisfied with this situation, women initiate more demand behaviors to change the balance of power and their undesirable situation. Men, on the other hand, withdraw in order to maintain their power and position by striving to keep the status quo (Christensen & Heavey, 1990).

Marital participation in demand-withdraw behaviors serves to perpetuate undesirable gender stereotypes, such as the nagging, intrusive wife, or the aloof, angry, and withdrawn husband (Baucom & Epstein, 1990). In addition, the demand-withdraw pattern has been related with marital distress and longitudinal declines in marital quality (Bradbury & Karney, 1993; Smith et al., 1990), adjustment difficulties (Heavey, Larson, Zumtobel, & Christensen, 1996), declines in wife marital satisfaction over time (Heavey et al., 1995), and an increase in male physiological disturbance (Kiecolt-Glaser et al., 1996).

The opposite of demand-withdraw behaviors, “constructive communication,” is where conflict communications revolve around three themes: mutual discussion, expression, and negotiation (Heavey et al., 1996). “Mutual discussion” occurs when both members try to discuss the problem, “mutual expression” occurs when both members express their feelings to each other, and “mutual negotiation” occurs when both members suggest possible solutions and compromises (Heavey et al., 1996, p. 798).
Constructive conflict communication behaviors have been positively identified with increased marital adjustment (Christensen, 1988), increased relationship satisfaction and stability (Gottman, 1994; Heavey et al., 1993), lower levels of distress (Markman et al., 1993), and lower levels of demand-withdraw behaviors (Christensen & Shenk, 1991). "Mutually constructive communication" is a conflict communication style that includes mutual validation and direct negotiation (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). After one partner raises an issue, the other is responsive, and both discuss the issue until some sort of a resolution or agreement can be attained by both (Heavey et al., 1996).

In summary, two opposing styles of conflict resolution are the demand-withdraw pattern and mutually constructive communication. Demand-withdraw behaviors consist of, given a conflict, one person demanding to deal with the issue, whereupon the other person ends the discussion by withdrawing and cutting off communication. Female demand/male withdraw is the most common pattern, with many studies pointing to gender differences and power issues as large influences. On the other hand, mutually constructive communication involves a conflict resolution style involving themes of mutual discussion, expression, and negotiation, and where conflicts are talked out to a point of resolution, or at least mutual validation.

Conflict communication style (either demand-withdraw or mutually constructive communication) is a variable that has not been studied in relation to how willing marital partners are to invest in their marriage. Therefore, this variable will represent a somewhat exploratory element in this study. However, it has been shown that conflict communication style has been shown to relate to issues of power (Babcock et al., 1993; Noller, 1993) and gender (Heavey et al., 1993; Markman et al., 1993), which have themselves been separately studied with commitment to invest.

Demand-withdraw behaviors have been linked to more traditional gender orientations in marriage, whereas mutually constructive communication has been associated with more
egalitarian marriages (Markman et al., 1993). Furthermore, demand-withdraw behaviors have been associated with discrepancies in marital decision-making power, and mutually constructive communication has been associated with equal marital decision-making power (Noller, 1993).

For this study, it was hypothesized that conflict communication style would relate to commitment to invest in much the same manner as gender and power, namely, that lower levels of demand-withdraw behaviors, higher levels of mutually constructive communication, egalitarianism, and equal decision-making power would be associated with higher spousal commitment to invest in the marriage. Conversely, it was also hypothesized that lower levels of mutually constructive communication, along with higher levels of demand-withdraw behaviors, traditional gender roles, and unequal spousal decision-making power, would be associated with lower spousal commitment to invest in the marriage.

Demographic Variables

Demographic approaches to research are based on the premise that marital problems and instability are linked to a diverse set of personal demographic variables (Kurdek, 1993). These variables, such as age, education, and income, can represent large individual differences among spouses that put extra pressure and risk on a marriage. When large demographic incompatibilities exist among spouses, this creates incompatible vantage points, which often reflect a lack of marital commitment to invest and constructive conflict communication and resolution skills (Kurdek, 1993).

Nine particular demographic variables have been included in this study because all have been shown to be predictive of divorce (Gottman, 1994; Kurdek, 1993). These demographic variables represent factors found to put spouses at risk for divorce. They include the following: younger age, lower years of formal education, lower household income, spouses not pooling their
resources together, spouses not knowing each other for very long, prior divorces, premarital pregnancies, lower numbers of one’s own children, and higher numbers of stepchildren.

These demographic variables are exploratory in relation to commitment to invest, but the logical connection is that these particular variables are associated with spousal risk of lower and/or unbalanced commitment to invest in marriage. As pointed out by Kurdek (1993), marriages of persons who are young, possessing less education, and earning lower incomes are at risk because such people are generally ill-equipped to perform marital roles and have higher occurrences of stressful life changes. In addition, people who remarry after divorce may be quick to identify marital problems and may be hesitant to invest in the marriage.

Furthermore, spouses who marry soon after meeting each other may have premature commitment because they have not had the time to develop constructive conflict resolution patterns. Next, spouses who do not pool their resources often have the stress of less major capital because of failure to combine incomes and invest wisely (such as with a home). Finally, pre-marriage pregnancies interfere with normal life responsibilities (such as finishing school), whereas taking on stepchildren is a daunting task because of the vague legal and social roles a stepparent endures in U.S. culture. Such additional challenges may have an impact upon spousal commitment to invest in marriage.

Commitment to Invest in Marriage

Commitment to invest in marriage relates to how committed marital partners are to give of themselves in order to support and improve their marriage—even if their efforts may cause pain and/or be received negatively or indifferently by their spouse (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). As stated previously, how committed partners are to invest in their marriage has logical bearings on the effectiveness of marital therapy—especially for those therapy styles that rely heavily on “in session” participation and homework assignment effort from clients (Katz et al., 1995). Although
commitment to invest is a relatively new area for therapy research, other related areas, including current level of marital commitment (Beach & Broderick, 1983) and current level of marital satisfaction (Snyder, 1979), have produced useful information for clinicians and researchers in their respective subject matters (Katz et al., 1995).

A specific finding with direct implications for this study comes from Rusbult and Buunk’s (1993) study of interdependence theory. They found that there are four basic aspects of the relationship spouses take into account when deciding how committed they are to invest in their marriages: (a) “degree of dependence”: the degree to which they depend on their spouse’s personal resources, (b) “mutuality of dependence”: the degree to which the partner and their spouse need each other equally (emotionally, spiritually, etc.), (c) “correspondence of outcomes”: the degree to which the partners’ preferences for mutual outcomes correspond or conflict, and (d) the “basis of dependence”: the degree to which dependence involves joint versus individual control.

According to these four points of interdependence theory, both partners would be more willing to invest in their marriage if they were to have more of an “egalitarian marriage” with equal decision making power (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). In this form of marriage, both partners (a) bring and contribute approximately equal resources to the marriage, (b) need each other equally, such as with emotional support and gratification, (c) largely prefer joint outcomes rather than conflicts of self interest, and (d) possess joint control of their outcomes, not dominance/submissiveness (Larsen & Long, 1988; Noller, 1993; Unger & Crawford, 1992).

On the other hand, the flip side of this scenario is a traditional marriage with implications for lower spousal commitment to invest in their marriage. Specifically, the more traditional, dependent spouse (often the wife) may be more committed to invest in the marriage because she will have more to lose materially (and perhaps socially if seen as a deviant gender bender). However, she may be less committed to invest in the marriage out of dissatisfaction.
The traditional, independent spouse (often the husband) will have less to lose materially and will therefore have less of an incentive to invest in the marriage (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Hence, gender, power, and, indirectly, conflict communication style have ties with how committed spouses will be to invest in their marriage, along with the demographic variables mentioned previously.

Support for Rusbylt and Buunk’s (1993) interdependence theory relating to commitment to invest has come from a number of studies. Accordingly, various factors found to influence how committed partners are to invest in their marriage include the following: the perceived overall rewards (emotional, physical, etc.) in comparison to the overall costs of the relationship (Sabatelli & Shehan, 1993), the strength of the emotional bonds built over time (Berscheid, 1983), perceived obligation (Johnson, 1991), and how good the available alternatives are when compared with the relationship (Steil, 1984).

In summary, commitment to invest relates to how willing marital partners are to give of their personal time, energy, and efforts to sustain, support, and improve their marriage—even if their efforts may cause pain and/or may be received negatively or indifferently by their spouse. Furthermore, commitment to invest has logical and empirical ties to gender, power, conflict communication style, and several demographic variables.

Behavioral Marital Therapy and Social Learning

In accordance with behavioral marital therapy’s focus on social learning theory (Baucom & Epstein, 1990), human tendencies may be seen as the primary result of learning through response consequences and/or modeling (Crain, 1992). According to BMT, marital partners are shaped by environmental events—especially those involving the other spouse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991). BMT’s (and social learning theory’s) modeling and response consequences help explain the development of the four variables of this study. BMT proposes
that change will take place after these variables are identified and are seen as problematic. Then, positive behaviors can be substituted in their place through further shaping (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991).

The development of the four main independent variables and the dependent variable of this study are viewed here according to BMT and social learning theory. Hence, with traditional gender orientation, if a woman grows up seeing her mother reinforced for behaving in a dependent, submissive manner, she will likely imitate these same attributes in marriage (Unger & Crawford, 1992). With decision-making power, if a man grew up watching his father successfully possess and utilize the final say in most matters, he will likely grow up to imitate these behaviors in his own marriage (Unger & Crawford, 1992).

With conflict communication style, if one marital partner begins demanding behaviors, and the other partner is reinforced when he or she withdraws (through successfully avoiding the confrontation and diverting the tension), this interaction will likely repeat itself (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). Or, on the flip side, if one partner begins mutually constructive and validating communication, that produces an environment where the other will be reinforced for reciprocating and be rewarded for behaving in a like manner. Finally, with willingness to invest in marriage, a spouse receiving a large amount of material support from the other spouse will likely be more committed to work towards the survival and betterment of the marriage (Katz et al., 1995).

In summary, BMT and social learning theory maintain that learning occurs through response consequences and modeling, such as with the four variables of this study (Baucom & Epstein, 1990). These two learning processes account for how spouses develop their presenting issues in marital therapy (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991), including the common issues of gender conflict, power issues, conflict communication, and marital commitment to invest (Noller, 1993). The process of BMT is to assess such marital complaints and to promote spousal
satisfaction through substituting positive behaviors in place of the previously problematic or otherwise unsatisfying activities (Baucom & Epstein, 1990; Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1991).

Synthesis of Literature

Behavioral marital therapy (or BMT) maintains that spousal learning occurs through response consequences and modeling (Baucom & Epstein, 1990). Gender, power, and conflict communication styles are the four main, interconnected independent variables of this study. Gender socialization becomes a powerful influence over people's identities as they become socialized into constructed "male" and "female" roles (Osmond & Thorne, 1993). Males have generally been afforded more power in our society, which is best reflected in their possession of greater decision-making power (Babcock et al., 1993). The typical conflict communication style of female demand/male withdrawal is a reflection of gender and power inequalities (Noller, 1993).

The dependent variable for this study is how willing marital partners are to invest in their marriage. This has implications for marital therapy treatment planning, and is tied to various factors including gender (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993), power (Murphy et al., 1994), several demographic variables (Gottman, 1994), and, indirectly, conflict communication style. Each of the variables in this study will be analyzed separately according to the gender, and averaged for each couple to offer both individual and couple prediction models. These two avenues of prediction models will give two different angles when utilizing these results for implications for therapy.
Hypotheses

This study tests the following questions and null hypotheses: (a) What relationship does gender have on commitment to invest in marriage? (H1 for husbands and H2 for wives: There is no relationship between gender and commitment to invest in marriage). (b) What relationship does decision making power have on commitment to invest in marriage (H3 for husbands and H4 for wives: There is no relationship between decision making power and commitment to invest in marriage). (c) What relationship do demand-withdraw behaviors have on commitment to invest in marriage? (H5 for husbands and H6 for wives: There is no relationship between demand-withdrawal communication and commitment to invest in marriage). (d) What relationship does mutually constructive communication have on commitment to invest in marriage? (H7 for husbands and H8 for wives: There is no relationship between mutually constructive communication and commitment to invest in marriage). (e) What model consisting of a combination of the 13 independent variables best predicts individual commitment to invest in marriage? (H9 for husbands and H10 for wives: None of the of four measure variables or the nine demographic variables of this study will be predictive of commitment to invest in marriage). (f) What model consisting of a combination of the 13 independent variables best predicts couple commitment to invest in marriage? (H11 for couples: None of the of four measure variables or the nine demographic variables of this study will be predictive of couple commitment to invest in marriage).
CHAPTER III

METHODS

Design

The study is a cross-sectional design where the data are collected only once on respondents of different ages (Miller, 1986). The cross-sectional design was chosen for this study with the assumption that the age differences in the areas of interest for this study have resulted from changes the subjects have experienced as they have aged, and not for any other qualitative reasons (Miller, 1986).

Sample

In this study, two avenues were utilized to locate married couples to complete the questionnaires. Upon asking contacted respondents if they would be willing to participate in this study, all initially agreed to do so, provided that their spouse was also willing. The respondents were told that their answers would be kept confidential and that they each needed to fill out the questionnaires separately. However, they were told that they could collaborate with each other on the demographic questions if necessary. All respondents were called after 4 days to remind them to each complete their questionnaires, and that they were due within the next 3 days. No questionnaires were accepted after 7 days.

In the first avenue of data collection, 12 married employees and affiliates of an urban, Northern Utah United Way Agency called “The Family Connection Center” were asked to participate in this study. Of these 12 pairs of questionnaires, 10 were returned within 1-week’s time to a mailbox at the front desk of the agency, with two pairs not being returned. Of these two pairs of questionnaires that were not returned, one reported that her husband refused to fill it out
because he “didn’t feel like it.” With the other questionnaire, the respondent simply failed to return the questionnaires to the Family Connection Center within the 1-week time frame.

In the second avenue of data collection, the researcher gathered local phone numbers out of an Ogden area telephone directory of as many married couples as possible located around a centralized area of Harrisville. Eventually, 31 married couples were located and contacted on the phone and/or through knocking door-to-door. The researcher introduced himself as a Harrisville graduate student from Utah State giving local married couples a set of questionnaires to be analyzed for a master’s thesis. Each spouse that was directly contacted (either over the phone or in person) initially agreed to fill out the questionnaires, provided their spouse would also be willing.

Between the sixth and seventh day of the study, 26 of the 31 Harrisville couples had their questionnaires available to be picked up. Of the remaining five couples who did not complete the questionnaires, three were women who said their husbands “didn’t feel like it,” and two were women who refused to do the questionnaires on “matters of confidentiality” after reading the “sensitive” subject matter. Even when the process of confidentiality was explained on the phone, they repeated their concern and still refused to participate.

In total, 43 pairs of questionnaires were handed out, with 36 couples returning them: 10 out of 12 couples from the United Way Agency, and 26 out of 31 couples from the Harrisville area. Of the total seven pairs of questionnaires that were not returned, four were from couples where the husband refused to participate because he “didn’t feel like it,” two were from women concerned with confidentiality because of the sensitive subject matter, and one was from someone who failed to return the questionnaires to the Family Connection Center within the 7 days. In total, 36/43 couples returned their questionnaires for a .84 successful response ratio.

As shown in Table 1, the respondents from this study produced a sample with an average age in the mid-30s, an average of 2 years of post-high school schooling, and an average
Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations for Demographic Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>M 36.89 SD 12.11</td>
<td>M 35.36 SD 13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of formal education</td>
<td>M 14.03 SD 1.80</td>
<td>M 14.11 SD 2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household income (in thousands)</td>
<td>M 40.34 SD 11.37</td>
<td>M 39.06 SD 12.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of people sharing bank accounts</td>
<td>M 1.11 SD 0.75</td>
<td>M 1.00 SD 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months knowing spouse</td>
<td>M 169.81 SD 140.04</td>
<td>M 162.60 SD 138.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number divorces prior to current marriage</td>
<td>.42 SD .87</td>
<td>.28 SD .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of pregnancies responsible for prior to current marriage</td>
<td>.17 SD .45</td>
<td>.11 SD .23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological children at home</td>
<td>M 1.67 SD 1.49</td>
<td>M 1.85 SD 1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stepchildren at home</td>
<td>M .28 SD .96</td>
<td>M .19 SD .75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.

household income around $40,000. These and the other demographic variables of interest for this study are listed in Table 1.

The administration of the questionnaires to the married couples took about 20 minutes per person, and used a simple paper-and-pen approach. Subject confidentiality was kept through having the questionnaires not containing the actual names of the respondents, and randomly stacking the paired questionnaires together at the time of collection. The only identifying data consisted of general demographic information, such as subject age, gender, and income level.
The only possible stress entailed the four subject matters from the questionnaires—
traditional versus egalitarian gender role orientation, decision making power, conflict
communication style, and marital commitment to invest. These questions asked personal
questions about potentially sensitive issues. However, considering the confidentiality upheld in
the data collection, it is assumed that the stress levels associated with completing these measures
were not too taxing on the respondents. As projected, these data collection procedures involving
human subjects were approved by the review board for use of human subjects in research (see
Appendix A). If any of the respondents felt the issues were too sensitive for them to answer, they
were allowed to drop out of the study as a couple (see Appendix B).

Measures

In this study, four questionnaires representing traditional or egalitarian gender
orientation, decision making power, conflict communication, and marital commitment to invest
were used. Also, an additional measure was utilized to identify demographic variables to be used
in the regressions.

For the dependent variable “commitment to invest in marriage,” the 30-item Willingness
to Invest in Marriage Scale, Form A (Long & Beach, 1992) was utilized. For the four
independent variables cited above, the 20-item Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role scale measured
gender (TESR; Larsen & Long, 1988), the 24-item Who Does What Questionnaire measured
decision making power (WDW; Cowan et al., 1978), and the mutually constructive
communication and demand-withdraw behavior subscales of the 35-item Communication Pattern
Questionnaire measured the two types of conflict communication style (CPQ; Christensen &
Sullaway, 1984). The remaining independent variables were collected through a 10-item
demographics questionnaire taken straight from Gottman’s (1994) study of variables that predict
divorce.
Demographics

The demographics sheet consisted of a total of 10 fill-in-the-blank questions—1 related to respondent gender and the 9 other items to be used as independent variables in the regressions (see Appendix C). The first question asked the respondent’s gender. This question of spousal gender does not represent an independent variable by itself, but will be used to aid in data analysis between husbands and wives. The remaining 9 questions were of a continuous-level nature and were related to the nine independent variables discussed in the literature review section of this study. These nine variables were chosen to be added to the regression analysis of this study because of their relationship as predictors of divorce and commitment to invest in the marriage (Gottman, 1994; Kurdeck, 1993).

Accordingly, the remaining questions asked respondents: (a) their gender, (b) their age, (c) their years of formal education, (d) their household income, (e) whether they pool their resources with their spouse and/or with others, (f) the number of months they have known their spouse, (g) how many times they have been divorced, (h) how many premarital pregnancies they have been involved with, (i) how many children they have, and (j) how many stepchildren they have. Refer to Table 1 for the demographic means and standard deviations of this sample. Also from Table 1, note that for total number of people sharing bank accounts with, total number of divorces prior to current marriage, and total number of pregnancies responsible for prior to current marriage, the means are all less than 1. Even though none of these single items could ever be less than 1 in the real world, the purpose of these decimals show how close these averages approach the nearest whole number for all subjects in total.

The Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scales

No prior marital commitment measure has existed that directly and singly measures how willing partners are to give of themselves for the betterment of the marriage. The Willingness to
Invest in Marriage Scales (WIMS) were designed in an effort to help directly provide this useful information to marital therapists (Katz et al., 1995; Long & Beach, 1992). The WIMS were created specifically to assist therapeutic assessment in marital therapy. It is recommended that the WIMS be used with all couples to best assess and plan the direction of marital therapy contingent upon which of the partners is and is not willing to do whatever it takes to improve their marriage—in and out of therapy (Katz et al., 1995).

The WIMS (Long & Beach, 1992) consists of two 30-item interval-level instruments in a nominal true/false format. Questions ask whether or not respondents would be willing to participate in certain behaviors related to marital investment, with “true” answers counting as one point and “false” answers counting as zero points. The range of scores for each scale is between 0-30. WIMS Forms A and B ask parallel questions in two general formats: (a) questions asking if a partner would be willing to participate in certain marital investment behaviors—even if their partner would not reciprocate or may even be displeased with the action, and (b) questions asking if a partner would participate in similar investment behaviors if the action would be difficult or upsetting to themselves. Each “true” answer scores one investment point for the partner, with 30 being the maximum score a partner can obtain on each scale. The higher the separate or combined score, the more willing partners are to invest in the marriage.

As related by Katz et al. (1995), the 60 questions selected for the two Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scales were originally taken from “a pool of 600 items relating constructive behaviors performed despite potential obstacles...gathered on the basis of nominations by behaviorally oriented marital therapists” (p. 139). After testing, the 60 questions with the highest item-total correlations were retained. Reliability has been accomplished in a measure of parallel forms, where the coefficient alphas were computed to be .87 for Form A questions and .87 for Form B questions. In addition, the two forms were found to correlate strongly with each other (r = .85; Katz et al., 1995).
The WIMS are specifically designed to measure willingness to invest in marriage, and they have shown statistically significant correlations with other couples’ questionnaires in demonstrations of construct validity (Katz et al., 1995). Accordingly, the WIMS correlated significantly with the following related measures: (a) a global marital satisfaction and adjustment scale (Dyadic Adjustment Scale; Spanier, 1976) correlated with Form A at $r = .34$ and with Form B at $r = .37$; (b) the Broderick Commitment Scale (Beach & Broderick, 1983) correlated with Form A at $r = .22$ and with Form B at $r = .35$; and (c) a marital satisfaction and divorce considerations scale (Marital Satisfaction Inventory; Snyder, 1979) correlated with Form A at $r = -.18$ and with Form B at $r = -.29$. Therefore, the WIMS have demonstrated construct validity through correlations with questionnaires measuring similar concepts (Miller, 1986).

There were no tested gender differences in mean WIMS scores for either Form A or Form B. The average scores from the initial testing of the WIMS had partners scoring an average of 24.42 on Form A ($SD = 5.20$), and 24.62 for Form B ($SD = 5.11$), with a range from 4 to 30. Thus, taking into account the negative skew from these results, therapists can determine how willing clients are to invest in their marriage accordingly: 24 or higher may demonstrate that a partner is highly willing to invest in his/her marriage, whereas a score of less than 24 may show a lower willingness.

For purposes of this study, Form A was used only for efficiency purposes (see Appendix D), though either could have been chosen because of the similarly high degree of reliability and validity for both scales. The variable of commitment to invest is the dependent variable of this study, and was involved in the testing of all four hypotheses.

Scores higher than 24 are meant to represent “high” commitment to invest (Katz et al., 1995). As shown on Table 2, the husband’s average commitment to invest (26.22) and the wife’s average (25.94) for this sample are both much higher than the averages tested in the original
measure (24.42). Also, the husband’s standard deviation (3.71) and the wife’s standard deviation (3.91) are relatively small compared to the original standard deviation of 5.20 (Katz et al., 1995).

The Communication Patterns Questionnaire

The first independent variable, conflict communication style, was measured using the Communication Patterns Questionnaire (Christensen & Sullaway, 1984). The CPQ is a 35-item, Likert-scale self-report measure that addresses spouses’ behavior during three stages of conflict: (a) when a problem in the relationship arises, (b) during a discussion of a problem in the relationship, and (c) after a discussion of a problem in the relationship (see Appendix E). The three subscales of this measure concern demand-withdraw communication, demand-withdraw roles, and mutually constructive communication, and are scaled on a Likert-scale format (1 = very unlikely to 9 = very likely). For purposes of this study, only the demand-withdraw communication and the mutually constructive communication subscales were scored and analyzed. The five questions of the mutually constructive communication subscale have a range of 5-45, and the six questions of demand-withdrawal communication subscale have a range of 6-54.

The CPQ is the most widely used measure in assessing demand-withdraw behaviors (Heavey et al., 1993) and has demonstrated reliability and validity. As cited by Touliatos et al. (1990), a study of reliability demonstrated that men and women correlated their answers with each other on all three of the subscales in a range from $r = .73$ to $.80$. In addition, Cronbach’s alpha with wife scores came out to be $.73$ for demand-withdraw communication and $.78$ for mutually constructive communication, whereas husband alpha scores resulted in $.74$ for demand-withdraw behaviors and $.73$ for mutually constructive communication (Christensen & Heavey, 1990). Finally, the mutually constructive communication subscale was found to have high internal consistency with alphas of $.91$ for men and $.89$ for women (Heavey et al., 1996).
In studies of construct validity, a measure of marital satisfaction correlated at $r = .79$ with the CPQ mutually constructive communication subscale, and $r = -.55$ with demand-withdraw communication subscale scores (Christensen, 1987). Also, the mutually constructive communication subscale correlated with the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976) at $r = .69$ for the husband’s marital adjustment and $r = .78$ for the wife’s marital adjustment (Heavey et al., 1996).

As it is set up from the original measure, “high” levels of mutually constructive communication are represented by scores that are higher than 25, and “low” levels of demand-withdrawal behaviors are represented by scores that are lower than 30 (Christensen & Sullaway, 1984). As shown on Table 2, this sample yielded high mutually constructive communication scores: husbands averaged 32.00 and wives averaged 33.14. Conversely, both husbands and wives also scored low averages of demand-withdrawal communication: husbands averaged 23.64 and wives averaged 23.42. Following prediction and previous studies, spouses who score high on mutually constructive communication will also tend to score lower on demand-withdrawal behaviors, because the two constructs are negatively correlated opposites (Christensen & Shenk, 1991).

The Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role Scale

The second independent variable concerned gender role attitudes as measured with the Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role Scale (TESR; Larsen & Long, 1988). This scale consists of 20 questions derived from a pool of 120 items from feminist speeches, books, articles, and related research (Beere, 1990). Twelve of the items represent traditional gender role attitudes, and 8 represent egalitarian attitudes (see Appendix F). Questions are answered on a 9-point Likert scale format with 1 representing “seriously disagree” to 0 representing “strongly agree.” Ranges of scores are therefore between 20-180.
This scale has demonstrated reliability and validity. In tests of reliability, the TESR produced a split-half reliability of .85 and a Spearman-Brown reliability of .91 when administered to 83 college students (Beere, 1990). Furthermore, in tests of construct validity by Larsen and Long (1988) with the same 83 college students, the TESR was significantly correlated with the following: Brogan and Kutner’s (1976) Sex Role Orientation Scale ($r = .79$), a four-item measure of authoritarianism ($r = .36$; Lane, 1955), a six-item measure of religious orthodoxy ($r = .30$; Putney & Middleton, 1961), a 20-item same-sex touching scale ($r = .44$; Larsen & LeRoux, 1984), the Rape Myth Acceptance Scale ($r = .49$; Burt, 1980), a divorce attitude scale ($r = .42$; Hardy, 1957), and a conservative attitudes towards sexuality scale ($r = .47$; Kerr, 1946).

As shown on Table 2, husbands scored an average of 135.64 and wives scored an average of 143.11. These averages are higher and more egalitarian than the averages attained in the original sample: 105.20 for males and 111.08 for females, with over 100 representing more egalitarian attitudes (Larsen & Long, 1988).

The Who Does What Questionnaire

The third independent variable, who has more of the decision-making power, was measured with the Who Does What Questionnaire (WDW; Cowan, Cowan, Coie, & Coie, 1978). The WDW consists of 36 Likert-scale items—12 regarding the division of household tasks, 12 regarding child-related tasks, and 12 regarding decision-making power in the marriage (see Appendix G). For this study, subjects answered all 36 questions, but only the 12 questions regarding decision-making power were scored for analysis because only this part of the questionnaire is directly measuring the variable of interest. The decision-making power questions consist of 12 items concerning who makes the decisions in particular areas of the relationship, according to a Likert scale of 1 (she does it all) to 9 (he does it all). Therefore, with the decision-making subscale, the scores ranged from 12-108.
Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Measure Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure variables</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to invest in marriage</td>
<td>26.22</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender orientation</td>
<td>135.64</td>
<td>25.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making power</td>
<td>59.25</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>32.00</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.

The WDW has demonstrated reliability and validity on tests combining all three scales. In tests of reliability, the WDW produced a Cronbach’s alpha of .92 and a Spearman-Brown’s split-half reliability of .99 (Touliatos, Perlmutter, & Straus, 1990). In measures of construct validity, the WDW significantly correlated with the following other measures: the Marital Satisfaction Survey (r = .45; Starr, 1985), the Ideas About Parenting Scale (r = .24; Baumrind, 1971), and the Psychological Role Involvement and Satisfaction Inventory (r = .51; Cowan & Cowan, 1988).

On the WDW, scores of 60 represent a perfect decision-making balance, scores under 60 represent higher wife decision-making power, and scores over 60 represent higher husband decision-making power (Cowan et al., 1978). The sample on the original measure demonstrated a somewhat higher average of stronger husband decision making: husbands scored 66.61 and wives
scored 67.40 (Cowan et al., 1978). As shown on Table 2, the mean scores attained by this sample on the WDW represent very equal decision making power: 59.25 for the husbands and 59.03 for the wives.

Procedures

After receiving written approval from the IRB for Human Subjects, data collection procedures commenced as described in the sample section. Subjects were called and asked to fill out questionnaires on marital issues, and told that the questionnaires were needed from both spouses and that they would take about 20 minutes to complete. Each couple had up to 1 week (but no longer) to fill out their questionnaires before they were picked up by the researcher. After the data collection process was complete, the data were analyzed in a correlation and regression procedure, as described in the following chapter. Finally, the results were put to interpretation and conclusions were drawn.
Several questions were left unanswered in the demographic sections of the questionnaires. Adjustments were made for this through a listwise procedure in which all of the variables in the study with missing values were retained, but any individual missing values within them were deleted (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Because very few values were missing in this study, this procedure was selected because all of the variables could still be retained without altering the statistical results to any notable degree.

The internal reliability estimate known as “coefficient alpha” (“Cronbach’s alpha”) was run to assess the inter-item equivalence of how each question contributes to or detracts from the total reliability within each of the measures (Miller, 1986, pp. 57-58). In other words, this test was calculated to help estimate how consistently respondents tended to answer in certain ways across individual items within each measure. Higher alphas reflect higher consistencies, whereas lower alphas reflect lower consistencies across questions within a measure (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). As shown on Table 3, all of the measures except the decision-making power scale yielded alphas of at least .63, which is supportive of previous studies as cited in the literature section of this study (Beere, 1990; Heavey et al., 1996; Katz et al., 1995).

Previous studies supported the Who Does What questionnaire as demonstrating strong internal reliability (Touliatos et al., 1990). However, contrary to previous studies, the subjects of this study produced low coefficient alphas for both husbands and wives. As shown on Table 3, the husband decision-making reliability alpha was just .39, and the wife decision-making alpha was but .48. These alphas led to a further examination of the data, revealing that for this study, both husband and wife respondents who scored higher on decision-making power for certain questions sometimes scored quite a bit lower on other similar questions (and vice versa). Hence,
Table 3

Internal Reliability Alphas for Measure Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure variables</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to invest in marriage</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional gender orientation</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision-making power</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually-constructive communication</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.

The internally inconsistent WDW scores cast suspicion on their utility for the statistical analyses in this study.

Correlations

Hypotheses 1-8 were tested by conducting t tests between the non-demographic variables and commitment to invest before being running correlations between them. All five variables in the t tests were of continuous-level data: traditional gender orientation, decision-making power, demand-withdrawal communication, mutually constructive communication, and commitment to invest in marriage.

The main assumptions for correlations are that each set of scores has: (a) paired scores, (b) a linear relationship, (c) similarly shaped distributions, and (d) continuous data (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). Assumptions (a) and (d) were already assumed to be fulfilled before the analyses: The four questionnaires produced continuous, interval-level data that were combined to
produce paired scores. Assumption two—that the paired variables form linear relationships—was assessed through observing the visual degree of linearity from scatterplots of each paired variable correlation. Assumption three—that the paired variables come from similarly shaped distributions—was assessed through comparing how each variable’s ratio of mean to standard deviation compared with each other. The closer the ratio between distributions, the better this assumption was assumed to be upheld (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). How well the correlations fit the assumptions of linearity and similarly shaped distributions is discussed in the following sections.

Husbands

As shown on Table 4, the husband correlation results for each hypothesis (H1, H3, H5, and H7) were as follows: The first hypothesis, H1, was that there is no relationship between gender and commitment to invest in marriage \((p > .05)\). Because the probability level of this test is greater than .05, the null hypothesis is retained and the conclusion is made that there is no relationship between gender and commitment to invest in marriage. The third hypothesis was that there is no relationship between decision-making power and commitment to invest in marriage \((p > .05)\). Because the probability level of this test is greater than .05, the null hypothesis is retained and the conclusion is made that there is no relationship between decision-making power and commitment to invest in marriage.

The fifth hypothesis, H5, was that there is no relationship between demand-withdrawal communication and commitment to invest in marriage \((r = -.43, p < .01)\). Because the probability of this result was less than .05, H5 was rejected and conclusion was made that there is likely a relationship between demand-withdrawal communication and commitment to invest in marriage.

The seventh hypothesis, H7, was that there is no relationship between mutually constructive communication and commitment to invest in marriage \((r = .40, p < .05)\). Because the probability of this result was less than .05, H7 was rejected and the conclusion is made that there is a
Table 4

Husband Correlations among the Dependent Variable and Independent Variables from Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment to invest in marriage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.43**</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traditional gender orientation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.37*</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decision-making power</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.66**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.
*p < .05. **p < .01.

relationship between mutually constructive communication and commitment to invest. Therefore, from these statistical results, H1 and H3 were retained, and H5 and H7 were rejected.

In sum, husband commitment to invest was correlated at a statistically significant level with both demand-withdrawal communication and mutually constructive communication as expected in an exploratory part of this study. As husband commitment rose, mutually constructive communication rose and demand-withdrawal communication lessened. However, contrary to what was expected, husband commitment to invest did not correlate at a statistically significant level with decision-making power or gender.
Scatterplots of each husband measure correlation found to be statistically significant were visually examined to check for the correlation assumption of linearity (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). How well the plots produced a linear, football-shaped, positive or negative pattern visually illustrated linearity. The scatterplots between the husband correlations of commitment to invest with demand-withdrawal communication and mutually constructive communication displayed definite linear patterns with the correlations found statistically significant, with few outliers.

Also, in checking for the assumption of similarly shaped distributions between variables (Glass & Hopkins, 1996), the mean to standard deviation ratios between the statistically significant correlations were examined. These ratios demonstrate how spread out the variable scores are from their center, thus illustrating the approximate shape of the distribution.

Accordingly from Table 2, the means to standard deviation ratios were as follows:
commitment to invest (7.07 : 1) with demand-withdrawal communication (2.50 : 1) and
commitment to invest (7.07 : 1) with mutually constructive communication (3.45 : 1). Because commitment to invest’s mean to standard deviation ratio is somewhat more spread out than the other two distributions (Glass & Hopkins, 1996), the distributions are only somewhat similarly shaped, so conclusions between these variables should be made somewhat tentatively.

Wives

As shown on Table 5, the wife correlation results for each hypotheses (H2, H4, H6, and H8) were as follows: The second hypothesis, H2, was that there is no relationship between gender and commitment to invest in marriage (p > .05). Because the probability of this result was greater than .05, H2 was retained and the conclusion is made that there is no relationship between commitment to invest and traditional gender-orientation. The fourth hypothesis, H4, was that there is no relationship between decision-making power and commitment to invest in marriage (p > .05). Because the probability of this result was greater than .05, H4 was retained and the
Table 5

Wife Correlations among the Dependent Variable and Independent Variables from Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Commitment to invest in marriage</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traditional gender orientation</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Decision-making power</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.34*</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.56**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36.
*p < .05.  **p < .01.

Conclusion is made that there is no relationship between decision-making power and commitment to invest.

The sixth hypothesis, H6, was that there is no relationship between demand-withdrawal communication and commitment to invest in marriage (p > .05). Because the probability of this result was greater than .05, H6 was retained and the conclusion was made that there is likely a relationship between demand-withdrawal communication and commitment to invest in marriage.

Finally, the eighth hypothesis, H8, was that there is no relationship between mutually constructive communication and commitment to invest in marriage (r = .49, p < .01). Because the probability of this result was less than .05, H8 was rejected and the conclusion was made that
there is likely a relationship between mutually constructive communication and commitment to invest in marriage. Therefore, from these statistical results, H2, H4, and H6 were retained, while H8 was rejected.

In sum, wife commitment to invest was correlated at a statistically significant level with mutually constructive communication as expected in another exploratory part of this study. As wife commitment to invest rose, mutually constructive communication also rose. However, contrary to what was expected, husband commitment to invest did not correlate at a statistically significant level with demand-withdrawal communication, decision-making power, or gender.

A scatterplot of the wife correlation from the measures was visually examined to check for the correlation assumption of linearity, provided the correlation resulted in statistical significance (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The scatterplot of the correlation between wife commitment to invest and mutually constructive communication revealed linear patterns with the correlations found statistically significant, with few outliers.

In addition, the correlation variables’ mean to standard deviation ratios were compared to check for the assumption of similar shaped distributions (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). As calculated from Table 2, the ratios were as follows: wife commitment to invest in marriage (6.63 : 1) to mutually constructive communication (4.14 : 1). Because commitment to invest’s mean to standard deviation ratio is slightly more spread out than the mutually constructive communication spread, the distributions are close enough to be considered of similar shapes (Glass & Hopkins, 1996), so this assumption is tentatively concluded to be upheld in this case.

Regressions

A stepwise regression analysis for each gender tested the last two hypotheses, H9 and H10. Here, there was a combination of interval and ratio-level data throughout all of the 13 independent variables with the interval-level commitment to invest in marriage. The four
independent variables from measures were all of interval-level data: traditional gender orientation, decision-making power, demand-withdrawal communication, and mutually constructive communication.

On the other hand, all nine of the demographic variables included in the regression were of a continuous-level nature, and included years of formal education, household income, number of shared bank accounts, months knowing spouse, prior divorces, premarital pregnancies involved with, biological children at home, and stepchildren at home. In the stepwise regression procedures for both genders, the probability to enter the $F$-values was $p < .05$ and the probability to remove the $F$ values was $p > .10$.

**Husbands**

The ninth hypothesis for husbands, H9, was that none of the four measure variables or the nine demographic variables of this study will be predictive of commitment to invest in marriage: traditional gender orientation, decision-making power, demand-withdrawal communication, mutually constructive communication, years of formal education, household income, number sharing finances with, months knowing spouse, prior divorces, premarital pregnancies involved with, biological children at home, and stepchildren at home. As shown on Table 6, a model with two variables was statistically predictive of commitment to invest in a stepwise regression procedure, so H9 is rejected. Therefore, the conclusion was made that demand-withdrawal communication and months knowing one's spouse were predictive of commitment to invest in marriage. None of the other variables were statistically significant predictors in the model.

Table 6 shows three things that illustrate each variable's individual contribution at each step of the regression model: $B$, $SE_B$, and $P$. From Glass and Hopkins (1996): (a) $B$ is the unstandardized regression coefficient, or the amount of variance explained by a particular regression variable in its raw form, (b) $SE_B$ is the standard error of the estimate, or the standard
Table 6

Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting Husbands’ Commitment to Invest in Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand-withdrawal communication</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months knowing spouse</td>
<td>-8.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36; $R^2 = .25$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .33$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).

The regression hypothesis for wives, H10, was that none of the four measure variables or the nine demographic variables of this study will be predictive of commitment to invest in marriage: traditional gender orientation, decision-making power, demand-withdrawal communication, mutually constructive communication, years of formal education, household
income (in thousands), number sharing finances with, months knowing spouse, prior divorces, premarital pregnancies involved with, biological children at home, and stepchildren at home.

As shown in Table 7, a model with one variables on one step was statistically predictive of commitment to invest in a stepwise regression procedure. Therefore, the null hypothesis, H10, was rejected and the conclusion was made that it was likely that mutually constructive communication is predictive of commitment to invest in marriage. None of the other variables were statistically significant predictors in the model. From Table 7, approximately .27 of the variance of commitment to invest is predicted by mutually constructive communication.

Couples

For the couple regression, the individual measure scores of the 36 spouses were averaged together to create a single, unified score. The intent of this third regression was to predict what factors were most predictive of commitment to invest for the marriages as a whole to yield further insight. The couple regression hypothesis, H11, was that none of the four measure variables or the nine demographic variables of this study will be predictive of commitment to invest in marriage: traditional gender orientation, decision-making power, demand-withdrawal communication, mutually constructive communication, years of formal education, household income (in thousands), number sharing finances with, months knowing spouse, prior divorces, premarital pregnancies involved with, biological children at home, and stepchildren at home.

As shown in Table 8, a model with two variables on two steps was statistically predictive of commitment to invest in a stepwise regression procedure. Therefore, the null hypothesis, H10, was rejected and the conclusion was made that mutually constructive communication and total number of months knowing one's spouse is predictive of commitment to invest in marriage. None of the other variables were statistically significant predictors in the model. From Table 8,
Table 7

Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting Wives’ Commitment to Invest in Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Step 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. n = 36; R² = .28 for Step 1; (p < .05).

Approximately .45 of the variance of commitment to invest is predicted by mutually constructive communication and total number of months knowing one’s spouse.

Regression Assumptions

For the couples’ variables and the two gender variables entered into the model, the regression residuals for all entered variables with commitment to invest were examined to investigate the three assumptions of regression: normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity of variance (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). In general, all three regressions of this study upheld these assumptions, as demonstrated by an examination of each regression scatterplot. These scatterplots all tended to reveal a general pileup of residuals in the center of the plot at each value of predicted scores, with a normal distribution of residuals trailing off symmetrically from there (normality). In addition, each scatterplot tended to yield a general rectangular shape of the residuals (linearity), with the residuals creating a band approximately equal in width at all values of the predicted dependent variable (homoscedasticity of variance).
Table 8

Summary of Stepwise Regression for Variables Predicting Couples' Commitment to Invest in Marriage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutually constructive communication</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months knowing spouse</td>
<td>-7.60</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* n = 36; $R^2 = .38$ for Step 1; $\Delta R^2 = .45$ for Step 2 ($p < .05$).
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Internal Reliability of Measures

As seen on Table 3, the internal reliability tests gave evidence that subjects answered the questionnaires fairly consistently within all of the measures in this study other than with the Who Does What scale (Cowan et al., 1978). These findings supported earlier studies of internal reliability studies with these measures, including the Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scales (Katz et al., 1995), the Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Roles questionnaire (Beere, 1990), and the Communication Pattern Questionnaire (Christensen & Heavey, 1990; Heavey et al., 1996; Touliatos et al., 1990).

For the decision-making power scale, the reliability alphas of .39 for husbands and .48 for wives showed that even though total decision-making averages were roughly equal among the genders (see Table 2), many inconsistent decision-making differences existed within the measures (see Table 3). These findings were surprisingly low in contrast to the previous internal reliability alphas of over .90 for both husbands and wives on the Who Does What measure (Touliatos et al., 1990). In other words, the average decision-making scores of this study may not have accurately reflected how respondents rated on this variable because of surprising internal inconsistencies. Therefore, because the decision-making scores in this study are surprisingly suspect, the conclusions concerning them have been made tentatively.

Correlations

Although the husband and wife results of conflict communication correlations with marital commitment to invest were exploratory, the correlation results of this study generally agree with the projections where gender studies (Heavey et al., 1993; Markman et al., 1993) and
decision-making power studies (Babcock et al., 1993; Noller, 1993) tied conflict communication style to marital commitment to invest in the manner as found in this study.

From Table 4, as expected, husband commitment to invest displayed a positive relationship by tending to be lower as mutually constructive communication was lower ($r = .40, p < .05$). Also, husband commitment displayed a negative relationship by tending to be lower as demand-withdrawal communication was higher ($r = -.43, p < .01$). Or, looking at these relationships conversely, husband commitment to invest tended to be higher when mutually constructive communication was higher ($r = .40, p < .05$) and demand-withdrawal communication was lower ($r = -.43, p < .01$).

Also as expected, from Table 5, wife commitment to invest displayed a positive relationship by becoming higher as mutually constructive communication was higher ($r = .49, p < .01$). Or, looking at this relationship conversely, wife commitment to invest was lower as mutually constructive communication was lower ($r = .49, p < .01$). As projected, these exploratory correlations give supportive evidence that conflict communication style has ties to commitment to invest for both husbands and wives. These husband and wife findings agreed with past studies linking conflict communication with gender (Heavey et al., 1993; Markman et al., 1993) and decision-making power (Babcock et al., 1993; Noller, 1993), which themselves have been linked with commitment to invest (Rusbult & Buunk, 1993; Unger & Crawford, 1992).

However, contrary to prediction for wives, demand-withdrawal communication did not correlate at a statistically significant level with marital commitment to invest. This prediction was also an exploratory hypothesis that may lend support for the position that wives are willing to invest in their marriage even if demand-withdrawal communication occurs, provided that enough mutually constructive communication takes place to help them through the times when communication breaks down into demand-withdrawal. This general hypothesis has been proposed by Unger and Crawford (1992), as well as Noller (1993).
Furthermore, also contrary to what was expected from previous studies, neither husband nor wife commitment to invest correlated significantly with traditional gender orientation (Acitelli, 1992; Cox, 1993; Larsen & Long, 1988) or decision-making power (Henley & Kramarae, 1991; Noller, 1993; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). A possible reason for this could be that the data from these samples were both skewed from the typical averages of previous samples with these measures, which may have influenced their correlations not being statistically significant (Glass & Hopkins, 1996).

As shown on Table 2, husbands compiled a mean of 59.25, and wives scored a mean of 59.94 on the Who Does What decision-making power scale (Cowan et al., 1978). Both of these averages are close to 60 and represent a near-perfect decision-making power balance between husbands and wives. These totals are skewed from the sample averages of 66 for husbands and 67 for wives on a sample of 110 couples from the original measure (Cowan et al., 1978), possibly as the result of low internal reliability and/or from any number of the unique characteristics of this sample.

Hence, from the original husband and wife averages for this measure, it was projected that a typical distribution would produce higher husband decision-making power scores on average, theoretically because males were known to possess greater decision-making power in marriage. Therefore, either society has changed in general over the last 20 years from greater husband decision-making power towards more balance among couples, and/or the sample of husbands and wives for this study was somewhat more egalitarian than most. Either way, it is possible that this skew may have influenced the decision-making power scores with marital commitment to invest.

Furthermore, both husband and wife scores in this sample were skewed towards more egalitarian-orientations than the original sample in 1988 (Larsen & Long, 1988). As shown on Table 2, husbands averaged 135.64 and wives averaged 143.11 in this study, with over 100
representing more egalitarian attitudes. The original sample yielded less egalitarian averages of 105 and 111 for males and females, respectively (Larsen & Long, 1988). Again, either society has changed in general over the last 10 years towards egalitarianism, and/or the sample of husbands and wives for this study was somewhat more egalitarian than most. Either way, it is possible that this skew may have influenced the traditional gender orientation scores with marital commitment to invest.

A particular influence on the skews of the decision-making power sample may have to do with the low internal reliability alphas produced on the Who Does What data in this study. As shown on Table 3 for internal reliability, the husband alpha for decision-making power was .39 and the wife alpha was .48. These low alphas give evidence that even though there were approximately equal decision-making scores in total for each gender, there were some notable discrepancies in answer consistency across some individual items in the questionnaires (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). These discrepancies may have been highly telling, but were masked by overall totals. Hence, the previously mentioned decision-making skews may have been skewed in total only, but still had an influence on the correlations testing out to be statistically significant.

Finally, perhaps these sample averages were accurate measures, but that this sample may not have been representative of the population at large because of the peculiarity of the region from which these samples were drawn relating to these two variables. In other words, this sample may have been of an egalitarian, equal decision-making nature, much more so than the typical averages of the rest of the country at large.

Or, it also may be possible that the Who Does What and the Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role measures did indeed produce an accurate measure of gender and power and are representative of the country at large. If so, this stands in contrast to previous studies (Acitelli, 1992; Larsen & Long, 1988; Noller, 1993; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993), and gives evidence that traditional gender orientation and decision-making power may not in and of themselves be salient
factors with marital commitment to invest. Instead, they may only be components of other, more salient factors, such as conflict communication style, months knowing each other, and total household income (as demonstrated in this study).

The scatterplots of all statistically significant correlations between husband and wife measure all roughly displayed linear patterns with just a few outliers from the regression line, so the correlation assumption of linearity (Glass & Hopkins, 1996) was assumed to be upheld in this study. With the assumption of similarly shaped distributions between variables, the ratio of means to standard deviations was calculated from Table 2 and compared (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The variables with roughly the same ratio (plus or minus three) were assumed to be from roughly the same shaped distribution.

Hence, as calculated from Table 2, the husband ratios of commitment to invest (7.07 : 1) with demand-withdrawal communication (2.50 : 1) and mutually constructive communication (3.45 : 1) were somewhat distant from each other, so the spreads and shapes of these two distributions are somewhat different. Therefore, conclusions should be made somewhat tentatively in these cases. However, the wife ratio of commitment to invest (6.63 : 1) was roughly similar to mutually constructive communication (4.14 : 1), so the spread of these two distributions is approximately the same, so the correlation assumption of similarly shaped variable distributions was assumed to be upheld in this case.

Regressions

Husbands

On the stepwise regression procedure for husbands (H9), the following variables were retained in the order of their unique contribution of predictive power to the regression (Glass & Hopkins, 1996): step 1, demand-withdrawal communication, and step 2, total number of months knowing one’s spouse (see Table 6). In other words, husbands who engaged in less demand-
withdrawal behaviors and/or have known their wives longer tended to be predictive of higher levels of marital commitment to invest. Conversely, husbands who engaged in more demand-withdrawal behaviors and/or have known their wives for a shorter period of time tended to be predictive of lower marital commitment to invest.

The conflict communication style and demographic variables predictive of divorce were an exploratory part of the study for the husbands. Therefore, it was unknown what if any of the demographic variables and/or if either of the conflict communication variables would likely be predictive in their model. Therefore, these results give evidence for the predictive saliency of some of these variables over others in conjunction with commitment to invest in marriage.

Finally, it is also noteworthy that traditional gender-orientation and decision-making power had no chance to be included in the husband regression model because the husband correlations with commitment to invest were not found to be statistically significant (as reviewed in the correlation section). Again, these findings contradict previous studies with these variables and marital commitment to invest (Acitelli, 1992; Larsen & Long, 1988; Noller, 1993; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993). Additional studies will be needed to support or refute all of these findings.

Wives

In the wives' stepwise regression procedure from Table 7, step 1 was the only step of the regression: mutually constructive communication. In other words, wives engaging in more mutually constructive communication tended to be predictive of higher levels of marital commitment to invest. Conversely, wives who engaged in less mutually constructive communication tend to be predictive of lower levels of marital commitment to invest.

It is noteworthy that traditional gender-orientation and decision-making power had no chance to be included in the wife regression model because wife correlations with commitment to invest were not found to be statistically significant (as reviewed in the correlation section). These
findings contradict previous studies with these variables and marital commitment to invest (Acitelli, 1992; Larsen & Long, 1988; Noller, 1993; Rusbult & Buunk, 1993).

Finally, for both genders, conflict communication style and the demographics variables were exploratory parts of the regression. It was unknown if the demographics and/or either demand-withdrawal communication or mutually constructive communication would be predictive in the model. Therefore, these results give evidence for the predictive saliency of some of these variables over others in conjunction with commitment to invest in marriage.

Couples

As shown on Table 8, the regression model for averaged couple scores consisted of the following: step 1, mutually constructive communication, and step 2, total number of months knowing one’s spouse. In other words, couples who engaged in more mutually constructive communication and/or have known their spouses longer tended to be predictive of higher levels of marital commitment to invest. Conversely, couples who engaged in less mutually constructive communication and/or have known their spouses for a shorter period of time was predictive of lower marital commitment to invest.

Interestingly, the variable stronger on the wife regression (mutually constructive communication) combined to build a model with the only other demographic variable in either other model (months knowing spouse). These couple results point to the importance of positive discussions among couples on difficult issues where partners validate each other’s feelings and some sort of agreement or resolution occurs. In combination, these results suggest the importance of validating communication in a marriage, as well as the strength inherent in the relational bonds developed over time the longer spouses have known each other.
Regression Assumptions for Both Genders

For both the husband and wife variables entered into the model, the regression residuals for all entered variables with willingness to invest were examined to investigate the three assumptions of regression (Glass & Hopkins, 1996). The first assumption of normality was assumed to be upheld if the residual scatterplot displayed a pileup of residuals in the center of the plot at each value of predicted scores, with a normal distribution of residuals trailing off symmetrically from there. This was generally so upon inspection of residual plots for all variables entered into the three regressions. Therefore, the assumption of normality was assumed for couple scores and both genders.

The second assumption of linearity was assumed to be upheld if the overall shape of the residual scatterplot was rectangular in shape. This also was roughly so for all of the regression variables: wife and couple mutually constructive communication, and the husband and couple variable months knowing one’s spouse. Therefore, this assumption of normality was assumed to be upheld.

The third assumption of homoscedasticity was assumed to be upheld if the residual scatterplot showed that the band enclosing the residuals was approximately equal in width at all values of the predicted dependent variable. This was generally so for all five variables across the three regressions (with the exception of a few outliers). Therefore, the assumption of equal variance was assumed to be upheld for couples and both genders. Overall, all three regression assumptions were assumed to be upheld in these studies.

Summary

The main husband findings of this study were as follows: There was a tendency for husband marital commitment to invest to be higher as mutually constructive communication was higher and demand-withdrawal communication was lower. Conversely, there was a tendency for
lower husband marital commitment to invest to be associated with lower mutually constructive communication and higher demand-withdrawal behaviors. Furthermore, with the husband regression, there was the finding that higher husband commitment to invest was predicted by higher amounts of time knowing one’s spouse and lower amounts of demand-withdrawal communication. Conversely, lower husband commitment to invest was predicted by lower amounts of time knowing one’s spouse and higher amounts of demand-withdrawal communication.

The main finding for wives was somewhat more narrow: There was a tendency for wife marital commitment to invest to be higher as mutually constructive communication increased. Conversely, there was a tendency for wife marital commitment to invest to be lower as mutually constructive communication decreased. In a similar manner for the regression, higher commitment to invest was predicted by higher levels of mutually constructive communication, and lower wife commitment to invest was predicted by lower levels of mutually constructive communication.

Finally, the main findings for couples were a blend of the husband and wife regression models: There was a tendency for couple marital commitment to invest to be higher as mutually constructive communication was higher and months knowing one’s spouse was higher. Conversely, there was a tendency for lower couple marital commitment to invest to be associated with lower mutually constructive communication and lower amounts of time knowing one’s spouse.

Limitations

An important internal question of this study centers on the Who Does What decision-making power scale (Cowan et al., 1978), as described in the beginning of this chapter. The low
internal reliability on this measure casts doubt upon the utility of the scores on this measure accurately reflecting decision-making power with this sample.

However, the main limitations of this study revolve around sample scores that deviated notably from the sample averages of the original measures (as noted in the measures section). In comparison to the original sample averages, this study’s sample is different in the following ways: With the Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scale (Long & Beach, 1992), subjects displayed higher averages of commitment to invest with low standard deviations. The scores of the Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role questionnaire (Larsen & Long, 1988) reflected stronger egalitarian notions. The Who Does What (Cowan et al., 1978) reflected decision-making power that was almost even between the spouses, as opposed to stronger husband decision making in the original sample. Finally, the scores on the Communication Patterns Questionnaire (Christensen & Sullaway, 1984) displayed higher mutually constructive communication and lower demand-withdrawal behaviors.

These surprising sample scores may have resulted from a number of reasons that may disturb the generalizability of this study. First of all, the notable similarities of the averages between husbands and wives may have resulted from a degree of collaboration while subjects completed their questionnaires (see Table 2). Second, this possible collaboration may have contributed to a halo effect where respondents answered with a greater degree of social desirability. Third, a halo effect may have further resulted from possible concerns about confidentiality. Even though subjects did not use their names on the measures, they still might have been concerned about confidentiality when the measures were collected. Finally, perhaps this particular sample displayed these surprising averages due to unique cultural factors representative of the area of Utah from which this sample was gathered.

The other main possibility of the surprising scores on the measures is that perhaps this sample is truly representative of spouses in broader society today, but that current spousal
attitudes concerning these variables have possibly shifted since the original measure samples were collected up to 20 years ago. If so, then these findings may be very generalizable. In any event, it is likely that the results of this study reflect some of each of these influences, and as such, are generalizable in a tentative degree that necessitates further research on this subject to offer further clarification.

Conclusion, Implications for Treatment, and Recommendations

In light of the limitations of this study, there are several implications these findings have for marital therapy. A key finding is the way both husbands and wives had a conflict communication style predictive of level of commitment to invest: demand-withdrawal for husbands and mutually constructive communication for wives and couples. Conflict communication was an exploratory part of the study, generated through indirect associations with other variables previously shown to be tied with commitment to invest (gender and power). Also, conflict communication was shown to be the more salient predictor variable by being entered into the couple regression, highlighting the importance of this variable among couples.

A plausible implication from this exploratory finding is that conflict communication style in general tends to be linked to how committed partners are towards giving towards the betterment of their marriage. An idea for marital therapists is to assess for both conflict communication styles when creating a treatment plan, and to perhaps encourage having the couple improve their conflict communication in an effort to balance and increase commitment to invest among the partners when commitment to invest is low and/or discrepant.

Another implication comes from the way that both husband and couples scores were predicted to show greater commitment to invest the longer spouses have known each other. Perhaps this is so because the longer couples know each other, the better they know their interpersonal conflict will usually dissipate over time (Cox, 1993). Marriages where spouses
know each other longer also tend to have stronger marital bonds that (a) better help spouses endure the conflict and differences of a marriage, and (b) better help spouses realize the benefits and value of their marriage (Cox, 1993).

The amount of time the couple has known each other can be gathered by the therapist during the intake information and used as a possible reflector of low or discrepant levels of commitment to invest. In other words, if spouses have not known each other very long, this could be a warning light to the therapist of a potential problem or low and/or discrepant commitment to invest (especially with the husband).

This study also shows that warning signs to assess for low and/or discrepant marital commitment to invest include increased demand-withdrawal behaviors (for husbands), decreased mutually constructive communication (for wives and couples), and lesser amounts of time the spouses have known each other (for husbands and couples).

Finally, this study gives evidence that conflict communication has been shown to be a key area for marital therapists to assess and include in treatment planning to increase marital commitment to invest when necessary for positive marital change. This includes working on ways of breaking down demand-withdrawal interactions (especially for husbands), and developing and increasing mutually constructive communication patterns (especially for women).

In conclusion, with marital therapy, this study gives evidence that husbands will be less likely to actively participate in in-session activities and with between-session homework assignments as demand-withdrawal communication increases and the amount of time knowing one’s spouse decreases. Also, this study gives evidence that wives will be less likely to actively participate in in-session activities and with between-session homework assignments as mutually constructive communication decreases. Finally, this study gives evidence for the overall importance of validating communication among couples, and for the positive effect of the bonds built through the length of time spouses know each other.
REFERENCES


S.K. Steinmetz (Eds), Sourcebook of family theories and methods: A contextual approach (pp. 466-504). New York: Plenum.


Appendix A—IRB Approval
MEMORANDUM

TO: Scot Allgood
    Randy Gilchrist

FROM: True Rubal, Secretary to the IRB

SUBJECT: Factors Predictive of Commitment to Invest in Marriage

The above-referenced proposal has been reviewed by this office and is exempt from further review by the Institutional Review Board. The IRB appreciates researchers who recognize the importance of ethical research conduct. While your research project does not require a signed informed consent, you should consider (a) offering a general introduction to your research goals, and (b) informing, in writing or through oral presentation, each participant as to the rights of the subject to confidentiality, privacy or withdrawal at any time from the research activities.

The research activities listed below are exempt from IRB review based on the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) regulations for the protection of human research subjects, 45 CFR Part 46, as amended to include provisions of the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, June 18, 1991.

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through the identifiers linked to the subjects: and (b) any disclosure of human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

Your research is exempt from further review based on exemption number 2. Please keep the committee advised of any changes, adverse reactions or termination of the study. A yearly review is required of all proposals submitted to the IRB. We request that you advise us when this project is completed, otherwise we will contact you in one year from the date of this letter.
Appendix B—Informed Consent
Informed Consent Form

Dear Study Participant,

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the study for a thesis from Utah State University. The code of ethics for research requires that all participants in a study be informed of the project's purpose and benefits, the research methods that will be used, the potential risks that participants may incur, and the right of the participants to have more information at any point during the study process. You are a voluntary participant, and as such are free to withdraw from the study at any time without consequences. Your signature at the end of this consent form will signify that you voluntarily consent to participate in this study, and that you have confidence that all of your questions have or will be answered by me (Randy Gilchrist). If you have further questions, you may either call me (Randy Gilchrist) at (435) 753-5696 or Dr. Scot Allgood at (435) 753-5895.

This project is a study of variables that may or may not be related and predictive of how willing marital partners are to work towards the betterment of their marriage, even under trying circumstances. This information will be useful for guiding future treatment planning in marital therapy, and will assist therapists in knowing additional variables to address when marital willingness to invest is low and/or discrepant. It should therefore also be a benefit to those who eventually choose to participate in marital therapy at some point in their lives.

In order to maintain confidentiality, for the purpose of the study, no names will be asked for on the demographics sheet, only if you are the "husband" or the "wife". All raw data will be collected by Randy Gilchrist. The original data sheets will be destroyed when the study is complete.

Two copies of this consent form have been provided here for you. Please sign the first one. The second you are able to tear off and retain for your personal records (if desired).

_________________________________________  ____________________________________________
Participant’s Name and Date  Participant’s Signature

_________________________________________  ____________________________________________
Dr. Scot Allgood, Principle Investigator  Randy Gilchrist, Student Researcher
Department of Family and Human  Department of Family and Human
Development  Development
(435) 753-5895  (435) 753-5696
Appendix C—Demographics Sheet
Demographics Sheet

Please answer all questions by filling in the blank. (*Note: “not applicable” = zero)

1) Are you male or female? __________

2) What is your age? __________

3) How many years of formal education have you completed? __________
   (High-school graduate=12)

4) What is your yearly household income (approximately)? __________

5) How many people other than yourself do you pool your finances with? (Your spouse equals one other, if applicable) __________

6) How many months and years have you known your spouse? __________

7) How many divorces have you had prior to your current marriage? __________

8) How many premarital pregnancies have you had (for women) or been involved with (for men) prior to your current marriage? __________

9) How many of your biological children do you have living at your house? __________

10) How many of your stepchildren do you have living at your house? __________
Appendix D—Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scale
Willingness to Invest in Marriage Scale

We are interested in how willing you would be to engage in a number of activities to maintain or improve your marriage *in spite of certain obstacles*. *For each item, please circle “true” (T) if you would act in the manner described by the statement, and “false” (F) if you would not act in the manner described by the statement. Be sure to take the indicated obstacle into account when deciding whether or not to act in the described manner.*

1) T / F  I would be willing to share more of my “wants” and “feelings” with my spouse even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

2) T / F  I would be willing to ask for a specific criticism from my spouse, even if it made me feel extremely embarrassed.

3) T / F  I would be willing to engage in light conversation, even if my spouse had been critical of me recently.

4) T / F  I would be willing to speak more quickly, even if it made me somewhat angry to “have” to do this.

5) T / F  I would be willing to interrupt less often, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

6) T / F  I would be willing to ask for clarification of what my spouse is saying, even when I’m in doubt and if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

7) T / F  I would be willing to give more compliments, even if I was angry at my spouse at the time.
8) T / F I would be willing to reassure my spouse that I care about him/her, even if I was angry at him/her at the time.

9) T / F I would be willing to compromise with my spouse on a difficult issue, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

10) T / F I would be willing to agree as much as I honestly could about my spouse’s position when we disagree about something, even if my spouse had been complaining about something earlier.

11) T / F I would be willing to look for the things my spouse and I both enjoy, even if my spouse had been nagging me about something earlier.

12) T / F I would be willing to try to see my similarities to my spouse, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

13) T / F I would be willing to try to recall nice times my spouse and I have had, even if I had to overcome being angry at him/her to do so.

14) T / F I would be willing to try not to respond immediately with a negative behavior when my spouse did something negative, even if my spouse had been nagging me about something earlier.

15) T / F I would be willing to do more things to show caring to my spouse, even if my spouse had been critical of me recently.

16) T / F I would be willing to admit that I do things to contribute to problems in our relationship, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.
17) T / F  I would be willing to compromise on disagreements about finances, even if it made me feel extremely embarrassed.

18) T / F  I would be willing to share more fun activities with my spouse, even if it made me feel extremely embarrassed.

19) T / F  I would be willing to pleasantly surprise my spouse more often, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

20) T / F  I would be willing to lecture or nag my spouse less often, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

21) T / F  I would be willing to give my spouse more “room” to do things alone when he/she wants, even if it would make me somewhat uncomfortable.

22) T / F  I would be willing to engage in hugging and kissing without expecting intercourse, even if it might be upsetting to me.

23) T / F  I would be willing to plan for our retirement, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

24) T / F  I would be willing to go on more “dates” with my spouse, even if my spouse had been nagging me about something earlier.

25) T / F  I would be willing to go for a walk with my spouse, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.

26) T / F  I would be willing to build on proposals my spouse makes about how to solve a problem more often, rather than just suggesting alternatives, even if my spouse had greatly displeased me earlier.
27) T / F I would be willing to work to accept my spouse’s complaints as valid indications that we need to work together to solve a problem, even if I thought my spouse might still be angry at me anyway.

28) T / F I would be willing to share my positive feelings more freely with my spouse, even if I thought it meant “giving in” to my spouse at the time.

29) T / F I would be willing to spend more time with my spouse, even if it made me angry to “have” to do this.

30) T / F I would be willing to encourage my spouse to tell me what is pleasing and displeasing sexually, even if my spouse had been complaining about something earlier.
Appendix E—Communication Patterns Questionnaire
Communication Patterns Questionnaire

We are interested in how you and your partner typically deal with problems in your relationship. *Please rate each item on a scale of 1 (= very unlikely) to 9 (= very likely).

**A. WHEN SOME PROBLEM IN THE RELATIONSHIP ARISES,**

1) **Mutual Avoidance.** Both members avoid discussing the problem.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

2) **Mutual Discussion.** Both members try to discuss the problem.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

3) **Discussion/Avoidance.** a) Man tries to start a discussion while woman tries to avoid a discussion.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

4) **Discussion/Avoidance.** b) Woman tries to start a discussion while man tries to avoid a discussion.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

**B. DURING A DISCUSSION OF A RELATIONSHIP PROBLEM,**

1) **Mutual Blame.** Both members blame, accuse, and criticize each other.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

2) **Mutual Expression.** Both members express their feelings to each other.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

3) **Mutual Threat.** Both members threaten each other with negative consequences.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

4) **Mutual Negotiation.** Both members suggest possible solutions and compromises.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

5) **Demand/Withdraw.** a) Man nags and demands while woman withdraws, becomes silent, or refuses to discuss the matter further.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
   
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |

6) **Demand/Withdraw.** b) Woman nags and demands while man withdraws, becomes silent, or refuses to discuss the matter further.
   - very unlikely
   - very likely
7) **Criticize/Defend.** a) Man criticizes while woman defends herself.  
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

8) **Criticize/Defend.** b) Woman criticizes while man defends himself. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

9) **Pressure/Resist.** a) Man pressures woman to take some action or stop some action, while woman resists. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

10) **Pressure/Resist.** b) Woman pressures man to take some action or stop some action, while man resists. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

11) **Emotional/Logical.** a) Man expresses feelings while woman offers reasons and solutions. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

12) **Emotional/Logical.** b) Woman expresses feelings while woman offers reasons and solutions. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

13) **Threat/Back Down.** a) Man threatens negative consequences and woman gives in or backs down. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

14) **Threats/Back Down.** b) Woman threatens negative consequences and man gives in or backs down. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

15) **Verbal Aggression.** a) Man calls woman names, swears at her, or attacks her character. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

16) **Verbal Aggression.** b) Woman calls man names, swears at him, or attacks his character. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely

17) **Physical Aggression.** a) Man pushes, shoves, slaps, hits, or kicks woman. 
very unlikely 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
very likely
<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18) <strong>Physical Aggression. b)</strong> Woman pushes, shoves, slaps, hits, or kicks man.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C.</strong></td>
<td><strong>AFTER A DISCUSSION OF A RELATIONSHIP PROBLEM,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) <strong>Mutual Understanding.</strong> Both feel each other has understood his/her position.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) <strong>Mutual Withdrawal.</strong> Both withdraw from each other after the discussion.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) <strong>Mutual Resolution.</strong> Both feel that the problem has been solved.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) <strong>Mutual Withholding.</strong> Neither partner is giving to the other after the discussion.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) <strong>Mutual Reconciliation.</strong> After the discussion, both try to be especially nice to each other.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) <strong>Guilt/Hurt. a)</strong> Man feels guilty for what he said or did while woman feels hurt.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) <strong>Guilt/Hurt. b)</strong> Woman feels guilty for what she said or did while man feels hurt.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) <strong>Reconcile/Withdraw. a)</strong> Man tries to be especially nice, acts as if things are back to normal, while woman acts distant.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) <strong>Reconcile/Withdraw. b)</strong> Woman tries to be especially nice, acts as if things are back to normal, while man acts different.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) <strong>Pressure/Resist. a)</strong> Man pressures woman to apologize or promise to do better, while woman resists.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) <strong>Pressure/Resist. b)</strong> Woman pressures man to apologize or promise to do better, while man resists.</td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12) **Support Seeking. a)** Man seeks support from others (parent, friend, children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) **Support Seeking. b)** Woman seeks support from others (parent, friend, children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very unlikely</td>
<td>very likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F—Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role Questionnaire
Traditional-Egalitarian Sex Role Questionnaire

We are interested in your beliefs about traditional and non-traditional gender roles. *Please rate each item on a scale of 1 (= completely disagree) to 9 (= completely agree).

1) It is just as important to educate daughters as it is to educate sons.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

2) Women should be more concerned with clothing and appearance than men.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

3) Women should have as much sexual freedom as men.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

4) The man should be more responsible for the economic support of the family than the woman.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

5) The belief that women cannot make as good supervisors or executives as men is a myth.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

6) The word "obey" should be removed from wedding vows.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

7) Ultimately a woman should submit to her husband's decision.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

8) Some equality in marriage is good, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

9) Having a job is just as important for a wife as it is for her husband.
   completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   completely agree

10) In groups that have both male and female members, it is more appropriate that leadership positions be held by males.
    completely disagree  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
    completely agree
11) I would not allow my son to play with dolls.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

12) Having a challenging job or career is as important as being a wife and mother.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

13) Men make better leaders.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

14) Almost any woman is better off in her home than in a job or profession.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

15) A woman’s place is in the home.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

16) The role of teaching in the elementary schools belongs to women.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

17) The changing of diapers is the responsibility of both parents.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

18) Men who cry have weak character.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

19) A man who has chosen to stay at home and be a househusband is not less masculine.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9  

20) As head of the household, the father should have the final authority over the children.  
   completely disagree  completely agree  
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Appendix G—Who Does What Questionnaire
Who Does What Questionnaire

We are interested in how much influence you and your partner have in the family decisions listed here. *Please rate each item on a scale of 1 (= she decides it all) to 9 (= he decides it all).

1) Deciding how we spend time at home  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

2) Deciding how we spend time out of the house  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

3) Deciding which friends and family to see, and when  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

4) Deciding about vacations: where, when, expenses  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

5) Deciding about major expenses: house, car, furniture  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
   | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 |

6) Deciding about financial planning: insurance, loans, taxes, plans for saving, etc.  
   | she decides it all | he decides it all |
7) Deciding when and how much time both partners should work outside the home
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

8) Initiating lovemaking
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

9) Determining the frequency of lovemaking
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

10) Deciding about religious practices in our family
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

11) Deciding about involvement in community activities
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9

12) Deciding how people should behave towards one another in our family
she decides it all                he decides it all
1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
We are interested in how you and your partner divide up the following household tasks listed here. *Please rate each item on a scale of 1 (= she does it all) to 9 (= he does it all).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Planning and preparing meals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cleaning up after meals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Repairs around the home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>House cleaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Taking out the garbage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Buying groceries, household needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>she does it all</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he does it all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19) Paying bills
   she does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

20) Laundry: washing, folding, ironing
    she does it all
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

21) Writing letters/making calls to family and friends
    she does it all
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

22) Looking after the car
    she does it all
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

23) Providing income for our family
    she does it all
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

24) Caring for plants, garden, yard
    she does it all
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
We are interested in how you and your partner divide up the following tasks related to taking care of children. *Please rate each item on a scale of 1 (= she does it all) to 9 (= he does it all). Project your scores if you don’t have any children.

25) Deciding about the baby’s feeding schedule
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

26) Feeding the baby
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

27) Changing the baby’s diapers; dressing the baby
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

28) Bathing the baby
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

29) Deciding whether to respond to the baby’s cries
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

30) Responding to the baby’s crying in the middle of the night
   she does it all                               he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
31) Taking the baby out: walking, driving, visiting, etc.
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

32) Choosing toys for the baby
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

33) Playing with the baby
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

34) Doing the baby’s laundry
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

35) Arranging for baby sitters or child care
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

36) Dealing with the doctor regarding the baby’s health
   she does it all
   he does it all
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9