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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

It has often been said that social and psychological research is one step behind the times, especially now, in the present period of rapid social change (Toffler, 1970). This study hopes to anticipate the impact of the new feminism on the modes of interaction used in a marital relationship during conflict resolution, thus keeping one step ahead of an emerging trend. The new feminism is a process of role redefinition which promises to "overturn the basic premises upon which [male-female] relations are built—stereotyped notions about the family and the roles of men and women [Komisar, 1970, p. 55]." Counselors must anticipate the changes the new feminism is going to cause in their male and female clients' role expectations. It is vitally important that counselors should be able to identify the factors which lead to success or failure in adjusting to rapidly changing social conditions. Social psychological theory, especially, can contribute a framework for research in this area (Goldstein, 1966). Thus, this study applies social psychological theory to a counseling concern in order to
help counselors help their clients with changing role expectations. If changing role expectations are the trend in the future, counselors will need new techniques as well as new theories to help their clients. One new technique is the laboratory simulation of a social trend as was done in this study. It is the aim of this study not only to verify several hypotheses which have useful implications for counselors, but also to introduce counselors to useful tools, based on recent technology, to effect their objectives.

Thus, the value of this study for counselors in in:

1. specifying the conditions for the use of certain modes of interaction during conflict resolution
2. being the first to assess the impact of feminism on marital relationships
3. applying social psychological theory to a counseling concern
4. conducting a laboratory simulation of a social trend and
5. introducing a new criterion for marital adjustment.

Statement of Purpose

This study assesses the effect of the new feminism on the marital relationship. It is hypothesized that the new feminism, presented in mass media, will increase the incongruity in expectations the husband and wife have for the wife's role.
This study also attempts to determine whether incongruity in expectations is a predictor of mode of interaction during conflict resolution in a marital relationship. It is further hypothesized that the higher the incongruity in expectations of a couple, the greater the tendency to exhibit destructive interactions when resolving a conflict. Similarly, the higher the congruity of expectations of a couple, the greater the tendency to exhibit productive interactions when resolving a conflict. Consequently, it is hypothesized that the effect of the new feminism will be to increase destructive interactions during resolutions of conflict if the new feminism increases incongruity in role expectations.

A third purpose of this study is to assess the effects of mass media presentations of the new feminism on attitude change. Mass media presentations examined here are those on television and in magazine articles. Because husbands and wives are increasingly exposed to these media, it is important to identify the conditions under which mass media can change role expectations.

Definition and Operationalization of Terms

The New Feminism: The feminist movement in America has been active since the turn of the century (Hale, 1914), but only during the past few years has there
been a strong revival of feminism, hence the appellation, "new." Essentially, what feminists want is a redefinition of the woman's role so that she is treated as an individual first, and as a woman second (Friedan, 1963). Feminists see woman's role as so stereotyped that it prevents development of her fullest potential (Sem and Bem, 1970; Lewis, 1968). Social institutions most under attack for perpetuating this stereotype are: marriage, industry, and education; the very institutions with which counselors most come into contact. Feminists demand a change in the expectations of these institutions and of society in general. Feminists assert that society expects that all women should be able to obtain fulfillment from the homemaker and mother roles. Feminists want increased opportunities for employment and promotion in industry and an end to the education of women for fulfilling primarily the homemaker and mother roles. The new feminism is further defined by the Feminism Video-Tape script and the feminism magazine articles used in this study (see Appendixes I and II).

Role Expectations: Role expectations (attitudes) have long been studied by social psychologists as motivators of behavior (Secord and Backman, 1964). Mangus (1957) defines role expectations as states of readiness to
participate in interactional situations. However, role expectations are often most precisely defined by the instrument which is used to measure them. Thus, the Expectations Semantic Differential (ESD) used in this study, which measures both cognitive and affective components of an expectation, defines the term, "role expectations" (see Appendix IV). This study is only concerned with role expectations of the wife's role. Additionally, in this study the term, "role expectation," refers to the perception an individual has of an ideal, rather than a stereotyped, person. Stereotype refers to the traits assigned to an individual because of his membership in a class or group (Kretch, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962). On the other hand, ideal self is the person's concept of what he ought to be like; the set of values which he holds for himself (Kretch, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962). The ideal self is significantly influenced by social factors in that an individual develops a conception of what he ought to be from the teachings of his culture as to what are desirable and undesirable traits. But the term, "stereotype," refers only to the class attributes of a person, while ideal refers to the more inclusive concept of an individual's identity. Role expectations, then, refer to the marital partners' respective
conceptions of what a wife should be (Mangus, 1957).

**Incongruity:** Incongruity exists when the husband's expectation of the wife's role is different from the wife's expectation of the wife's role. Incongruity will be manipulated in this study by exposing husband and wife to feminist media. If, as is hypothesized, the wife's expectations change more than or in a different direction than do the husband's expectations, incongruity will be increased. Degree of incongruity is assessed by computing the $D^2$ score on each of 46 ESD items. Couples are then ranked on a continuum of lowest to highest total $D^2$ scores.

**Conflict:** Interpersonal conflict exists when the goals of people are incompatible. Thus, in a conflict situation, the probability of goal attainment for one person decreases as the probability for the other increases. Conflict is induced in this study by the Conflict Video-Tape (see Appendix III). The Conflict Video-Tape presents a negative instance of goal attainment, that of the mutual rejection of responsibility for household tasks.

**Modes of Interaction:** Productive and destructive interactions are the modes of verbal interaction which are exhibited during conflict resolution. The terms, "productive and destructive," originated with Deutsch (1969),
who applied these terms to the satisfaction of participants with the outcomes of conflict. But, in this study, the terms refer to verbal behaviors which foster or impede cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral change by intensifying or reducing tension (anxiety).

An interaction is destructive when it intensifies tension and impedes change, while a productive interaction reduces tension and fosters change. Deutsch's specification of productive and destructive behaviors was combined with Bales' social-emotional categories. Categories 1 and 2 of the "Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis" presented in Appendix V represent productive modes of interaction, while Categories 41 and 42 represent destructive modes of interaction.

Conflict Resolution: Conflict resolution is a process of problem-solving and decision-making which lasts from the time the conflict problem is perceived by the couple until the experimenter stops the process. By this definition it is not the outcomes which determine conflict resolution; it is, instead, the process which fosters or impedes cognitive, attitudinal, and behavioral change.

D²Scores (Incongruity Scores): These scores were used instead of raw scores because they more accurately reflect intrapersonal changes in meaning conceived of as distance and interpersonal conceptual congruence
(Osgood, 1957). $D^2$ scores are obtained by computing the difference between the raw scores for each item, squaring each difference, and then summing the squares. Squaring the D scores erases the sign, thus canceling out the direction of the change in meaning. The incongruity scores reflect change in both directions (toward and away from feminism). $D^2$ scores are used in two ways; to show incongruity within an individual from one time to another, and to show incongruity between two individuals (husband and wife) at a given time.

**Directional Change Scores:** A directional change is predicted by Hypothesis 1b, so $D^2$ scores, which erase the direction of the changes cannot be used for that hypothesis. Directional Change Scores are obtained by subtracting the raw score on each item at Time 1 from the raw score on each item at Time 2 ($T_2-T_1$). Also, Directional Change Scores were computed for $T_3-T_2$. The Directional Change Scores reflect change toward feminism.

**Productive Response Ratio (PRR):** This ratio is a comparison of the number of productive responses (numerator) to the total number of responses (denominator). When this ratio reflects a summation of the husband's and wife's responses, the numerator is summed separately from the denominator.
Destructive Response Ratio (DRR): This ratio is a comparison of the total number of destructive responses (numerator) to the total number of responses (denominator). This ratio may be obtained by subtracting the productive response ratio from 1.

Theoretical Foundations of Hypotheses

**Hypothesis I:** The new feminism (as portrayed by mass media) increases the incongruity in expectations held by the husband and wife for the wife's role.

**Hypothesis Ia:** Congruity of role expectations of the husbands and wives in the experimental group can be manipulated via a video-taped presentation and magazine articles on the new feminism.

**Hypothesis Ib:** The expectations of the wives in the experimental group will change toward the position communicated by the media. The expectations of the husbands in the experimental group will not change more than the husbands in the control group.

**Null Hypothesis Ia:** The experimental and control groups are equal in incongruity at Time 2.

**Null Hypothesis Ib:** The wives of the experimental and control groups are equal in feminism from Time 1 to Time 2. The husbands of the experimental
group will change more in either direction than
the husbands of the control group.
A change theoretically predicted not to occur is that
the husbands and wives of the experimental group will
decrease in their incongruity from Time 1 to Time 2.
Another change predicted not to occur is that the wives
of the experimental group will become less feminist
from Time 1 to Time 2. Also, the incongruity between
husbands and wives of the control group is predicted
not to change from Time 1 to Time 2.

Theoretical Foundations: That perception is influenced
by social processes is a central assumption of many psycholo-
gical theories, including the theories derived from the
fields of social psychology, perceptual psychology, phenom-
enological psychology and existential psychology. Therefore,
the assumption that the new feminism, a social process of
role redefinition, will influence perception (expectations)
is certainly not novel.

It has been documented that mass media can change
attitudes (Bogart, 1958; Hovland, Lunsdaine and Sheffield,
1949). But the type of change which occurs is usually a
reinforcement of the attitudes that the individual already
possesses rather than a conversion of his attitudes (Klapper,
1960). In opposition to the theory that attitude change is
dependent on an individual's persuasibility (Hovland and
Janis, 1959), Katz (1960) theorizes that an individual's motivation (or the functions of an attitude) determines attitude change. By combining the theories of Klapper and Katz, the hypothesis that the wife's expectations will change more than the husband's expectations is formed. The wife's expectations perform a value-expressive function for her. When she is exposed to mass communications which confirm part of her already established expectations, she will change in the direction of the communication. Thus, the communication has a reinforcing effect. However, the husband's expectations of the wife's role provide an ego-defensive function for him. He perceives a communication about equality of the sexes as threatening to his ego. Therefore, he will resist changing his expectations of the wife's role.

Another reason for hypothesizing the directional change in the wife's expectations but not in the husband's is found in the way in which the communication is presented. Communications theory has specified the conditions under which mass media change attitudes. These conditions are: characteristics of the setting of the communication, characteristics of the communication itself, characteristics of the communicator, and characteristics of the receiver (Strong, 1968). Hypothesis 1a is generated as a result of constructing the Feminism Video-Tape to be maximally persuasive under these conditions. The condition of the
characteristics of the receiver generates Hypothesis 1b. Knower (1935 and 1936) found that females are more likely to be persuaded by a male speaker than are males. Therefore, the Feminist Video-Tape will use a male speaker as well as all the other conditions for maximizing persuasibility.

**Hypothesis 2**: Degree of incongruity in expectations the husband and wife have for the wife's role is a predictor of mode of interaction during conflict resolution.

**Hypothesis 2a**: The greater the incongruity, the greater the tendency to exhibit destructive interactions (a positive correlation).

**Hypothesis 2b**: The greater the congruity, the greater the tendency to exhibit productive interactions (a positive correlation).

**Null Hypotheses 2a and 2b**: There is no correlation or a negative correlation between degree of incongruity and mode of interaction.

Effects theoretically predicted not to occur are that the greater the incongruity, the greater the tendency to exhibit productive interactions and that the greater the congruity, the greater the tendency to exhibit destructive interactions.

**Theoretical Foundations**: Hypothesis 2 is partially derived from interpersonal congruity theory. Expectations
are a specific type of attitude, i.e. a person's attitude toward himself or toward others (Secord and Backman, 1964). Thus, expectations have three major components, just as do attitudes. These components are the cognitive, the affective, and the behavioral (Secord and Backman, 1964).

Osgood's semantic differential measures the valence of the cognitive and affective components of an attitude (Kretch, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962). Therefore, a measure of the cognitive and affective components of an expectation should predict the behavioral component. Interpersonal congruity theory predicts that a person will act to maintain a state of congruity between his self-concept, part of which are his role expectations, and others' expectations of him (Secord and Backman, 1964). Since expectations are manipulated from Time 1 to Time 2 in this study, the wife and husband do not have a chance to perceive the change in her expectations until the conflict resolution task. Interpersonal congruity theory would predict that wives and husbands who hold incongruous expectations for the wife's role will exhibit certain modes of interaction during conflict resolution in an attempt to make their expectations congruent, and these modes of interaction are termed stabilizing mechanisms. This study does not measure the stabilizing mechanisms a person uses within himself to reduce the incongruity in expectations. Instead, in keeping
with the interpersonal approach, the focus is not upon individuals, but upon interactions between members of dyads. Interpersonal congruity theory specifies the following destructive mechanisms: 1) selective interaction (aloofness and withdrawal), 2) selective evaluation of the other person (deflating other’s status), 3) altercasting (appeals), and 4) misperception (denial of conflict). Productive stabilizing mechanisms are showing warmth and acceptance (agreeing, rewarding, showing solidarity). The stabilizing mechanisms proposed by interpersonal congruity theory are limited and do not predict the conditions under which one mechanism will tend to be used instead of another. Therefore, reinforcement theory, conflict-resolution theory, and self theory predictions for interactions leading to resolution (or change) are also included in this study (see Conflict Resolution Rating section). Reinforcement theory and conflict resolution theory identify additional productive and destructive interactions. Reinforcement theory views agreeing and rewarding as productive interactions. Conflict resolution theory identifies an environment in which a person does not feel threatened as necessary for productive interactions (Deutsch, 1969). Conversely, when there is a maximal amount of threat or anxiety, destructive interactions tend to be used. Self theory also predicts that tension or anxiety intensifies defensive or destructive
interactions. Rogers (1951) sees a maximal amount of anxiety existing when there is incongruence between a person's awareness of self and his experience. A person's self awareness is termed his role expectations in this study and his experience is the other person's expectations of him/her. From self theory, then, the hypothesis is made that as the incongruity between a wife's and husband's expectations for her role increases, the amount of tension or anxiety increases. The greater the anxiety, the greater the tendency to use destructive interactions. Self theory then states the converse, that a reduction of threat allows an individual to accept more of his previously denied and distorted experiences into his self-organization (Brammer and Shostrom, 1968). The incongruity between two individuals' expectations thus has a chance to be reduced because of the productive interaction of creating a non-threatening atmosphere. Consequently, as the degree of incongruity between a husband and wife's expectations for her role increases, the tendency to use destructive interactions during conflict resolution will increase. Conversely, as the degree of incongruity between a husband and wife's expectations for her role decreases, the tendency to use productive interactions during conflict resolution will increase.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

There are two major areas of research which pertain to this study. During the 1950's there was a proliferation of research on role expectation congruity as a predictor of marital happiness. Later, the concept of marital happiness was given a closer look and research into modes of interaction during decision-making began. The first area of research to be reviewed, then, will be the work of the early researchers on role expectation congruity.

Role Expectation Congruity

Dymond (1954) related congruity of perceptions to happiness in marriage. Dymond, who worked with Carl Rogers, was particularly interested in the concept of empathy, so she focused on a couple's ability to predict each other's personality as a measure of empathy or understanding. Her finding was similar to previous findings, that happily married couples were more alike in their self descriptions than unhappy couples. But Dymond also found that happily married couples were able to predict their spouse's answers with greater accuracy than unhappy couples. Unhappy couples
tended to underestimate differences between themselves and their partners. From these findings, Dymond concluded that happiness in marriage is related to a couple's understanding of one another, as reflected in their ability to accurately predict each other's responses to a series of items on a personality inventory.

Dymond's study is valuable for its definition of the concept of empathy or understanding as predictive ability and the application of this concept to marital relationships. However, Dymond's study has some methodological flaws in its use of friends for its sample, in its criterion of happiness being a self-report, and in its use of the MMPI, because it is a measure of personality pathology.

Corsini (1956b) also measured the correlation between understanding, represented by predictive ability on Q sorts, and marital happiness, represented by Burgess' scale. Corsini, like Dymond, found that happiness in marriage correlated with similarity of self perceptions but he also found that understanding is not correlated with similarity of personality. Corsini's most interesting finding was that happiness is related not only to the congruence between the husband's and wife's perception of his role, but also to a stereotyped conception of the husband. This relationship held for even randomly paired individuals. A congruence of perception for the wife's role was not found
to be a predictor of marital happiness. Thus, Corsini concludes that the husband's role in marriage is the crucial one and the closer the husband's role conforms to a stereotyped conception of his role, the happier the marriage.

Corsini's use of randomly paired individuals as a control group was not only a sorely needed addition to role expectation research, but also the technique which led him to the conclusion about stereotyped role expectations. However, a major methodological flaw exists with Corsini's use of the criterion of self-reported happiness, especially with the newlywed couples who participated in his study. It is not surprising that Corsini's newlyweds perceived the stereotype of the husband's role as most important, since this is the idealistic expectation with which many wives enter marriage.

Lueckey (1960a) used role and phenomenological theory (Mangus, 1957; Snygg and Combs, 1949) to hypothesize that interpersonal behavior and ease of communication is dependent upon congruence between spouses' role perceptions. Lueckey concluded that satisfaction in marriage is related to the congruence of concepts for the husband's role, but that this relation does not hold for the wife's role. However, upon closer inspection of Lueckey's data, several interesting effects are noticed. Lueckey rejected the hypothesis that congruence of perception for the wife's role
differentiated satisfactory from unsatisfactory marriages. Her basis for this rejection was that three out of four scales of the Leary Interpersonal Check List did not show a significant difference. But Scale 1, Managerial-Autocratic versus Modest-Self Effacing, did show a significant difference in congruence of perception for the wife's role. Lukey (1960b) also measured congruence of wives' perceptions for themselves and their perceptions of their mothers. Again, Lukey rejected the hypothesis that a congruence of perceptions of the wife for her self and her mother separates satisfactory from unsatisfactory marriages in favor of the hypothesis that the wife's congruence of perception with her self and her father plus the congruence of the husband's perception of himself and his father was the significant discriminator. Yet, the same Scale 1, Managerial-Autocratic versus Modest-Self Effacing, did show a significant difference on the above variables. The unsatisfactorily married wives felt themselves less managerial and autocratic than their mothers significantly more than did the satisfactorily married wives. It would appear, then, that this is a crucial scale for predicting satisfaction in marriage. Furthermore, the feminist movement could be expected to affect this scale even more than the other scales of the Leary Interpersonal Check List.
Luokey's original hypothesis involved interpersonal behavior, yet she used responses to the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale to determine satisfaction with marriage instead of measuring interpersonal behavior directly. Also, Luokey used a pre-selected dichotomous sample, thus creating an artificial breaking point for satisfactory vs. unsatisfactory marriages. One implication which Luokey derives from her findings which may be interesting to pursue is that, in keeping with Burgess and Locke's findings (1945), it is the wife who makes the greater adjustment in marriage.

Kotlar (1965) also used the Leary Interpersonal Check List to measure congruence of role perceptions. She correlated these measurements with adjustment as shown by responses to the Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale and concluded that adjusted husbands and wives saw themselves and their spouses as higher on the dominant and affective components of the Leary Interpersonal Check List than did unadjusted couples. It is important to note that dominance as assessed by the Leary Interpersonal Check List means responsible, self-confident, competent, and independent role attitudes and thus does not have the hostile connotation which is sometimes applied to "domination." Kotlar also found that the discrepancy between husbands' and wives' perceptions for the husband's role was significantly less among the adjusted couples but that this relation did not
exist for the wife's role. Kotlar interprets her findings as indicating that satisfaction in marriage may be a function not only of congruence of perception, but also of the motivation to perceive the spouse as fulfilling the cultural ideal since the affectionate-dominant sector is the ideal. In this sense, Kotlar has reached the same conclusion as Corsini did, that perceptions of a stereotype or ideal may be the crucial factor. Kotlar implies that congruence of perception is related not so much to marital role empathy as it is to similarity of role conceptualizations of adjusted spouses in that they perceive themselves as having similar role attitudes which are in conformity with cultural ideals. Another aspect of the cultural ideal or stereotype is the differentiation of the wife's role as expressive and the husband's role as instrumental (Parsons and Bales, 1955). Kotlar found that the wives of both groups scored higher on the affectionate dimension than did their husbands. Thus, the cultural stereotype of the wife's role as expressive was supported by Kotlar's research.

Tharp (1963), having reviewed the studies of Dymond (1954), Corsini (1956a, 1956b), and Luckey (1960a, 1960b), reaches the same conclusion that congruence about the husband's stereotyped role is most important for marital happiness. Researchers did not find a congruence of perception of the wife's role to be an important predictor of marital
happiness. Perhaps these findings exist because social norms of the late 1950's required the woman to adjust to the man rather than vice versa. But the current feminist movement would certainly argue for these norms to change. Also, as Tharp's review of the literature notes, many methodological impurities existed in these early studies. This study hopes to both assess role expectations as they exist today, in the 1970's, and to use the technology available today to correct these methodological deficiencies.

Kirkpatrick, in 1939, studied discrepancy in attitudes towards the wife's role as feminist in relation to marital adjustment, yet none of the previously mentioned researchers refer to his study. He found that patriarchal or antifeminist attitudes tended to be associated with marital maladjustment. But his hypothesis that the more extreme feminist attitudes on the part of wives tend to be associated with marital maladjustment was not supported by his data. There was no conclusive proof of his third hypothesis, that a discrepancy between husbands and wives in favorableness of attitude toward feminism is associated with maladjustment. Kirkpatrick's study, which concentrated on feminist attitudes, appears to question the finding that perceptions about the wife's role are not predictors of marital adjustment. Perhaps the crucial issue is not just the wife's role per se or the wife's role as measured by personality
indicators, but the wife's role as feminist. Kirkpatrick devised his own scale for measuring feminist attitudes (1936), a reliable and valid scale which is still applicable today. However, Kirkpatrick's use of a couple's friends' classification of the couple is an unsatisfactory measure of marital adjustment because it introduces the distortion of a third person perception, without providing any criteria for this perception.

Jacobson (1952), from The Ohio State University, also tried to use a role inventory instead of personality ratings as a measure of role attitudes. However, Jacobson's inventory consisted of only 28 items which proported to discriminate between a traditional male-dominant attitude and an emergent feminine-equalitarian attitude. Jacobson also does not separate male from female roles in her brief inventory. By measuring divorced versus married couples' attitudes, Jacobson found that divorced couples exhibit a greater disparity in their attitudes towards the roles of the husband and wife in marriage than do married couples. But divorce is not always a valid indicator of marital maladjustment and many of the divorced couples Jacobson studied had been divorced for two years before responding to the role inventory.

Role expectation research in general has suffered because past studies of marital relationships have used
"marital happiness" or "marital adjustment" as their criteria. These criteria variables are vague and depend on self-reported answers during an interview or on a questionnaire for a criterion instrument. In most studies using the variable of happiness in marriage, the goal is to predict divorce. Happiness, though, is not always a good predictor of divorce. Furthermore, divorce is not always an undesirable outcome. A much more important variable for counselors is the nature of the marital relationship which results from incongruous role expectations. Self-reported happiness is not as effective an indicator of the nature of a marital relationship as is mode of interaction during conflict resolution. If conflicts are resolved with destructive interactions, the marital relationship may still continue and the marital partners may still even respond to a questionnaire as being "happy" or "adjusted" even though this type of marital relationship usually is characterized by defensive behaviors, behaviors damaging to the husband, wife, and children. Therefore, this study hopes to introduce a new and operationally-defined criterion variable to replace the formerly vague criteria of "marital happiness" and "marital adjustment." Counselors have a better variable to assess the marital relationship if they use the mode of interaction during conflict resolution rather than perceived happiness. Moreover, in this study, actual
behaviors of conflict resolution are assessed via a criterion instrument, with criterion scores (operational definitions and ratings of destructive versus productive interactions) (Jensen, et. al., 1955).

This study differs from previous role expectation research in several other ways. A continuous, instead of a dichotomous, sample is used to determine the range of interactions which correlate with degrees of incongruity in role expectations. Many of the previous researchers measured congruity of personality ratings although congruity of role expectations was implied. This study uses the semantic differential to measure role expectations. Furthermore, only expectations for the wife's role are measured since it is hypothesized that the wife's role rather than the husband's role will be the main focus of the feminist movement. Expectations about an ideal role for an individual are assessed rather than a cultural stereotype for a group. An experimental control group is introduced in this study, a precaution which was taken by only one of the previous researchers. Instead of just measuring the role expectations which exist, this study attempts to manipulate the independent variable. Moreover, this study's hypotheses are derived from a synthesis of self theory, which comes from the field of counseling, and interpersonal congruity theory, which is based on social psychological research. And,
finally, this study brings previous research up-to-date with the current state of the feminist movement.

**Modes of Interaction**

Modes of interaction are more effective indicators of a marital relationship than is self-reported happiness or rated adjustment, so marriage researchers turned their attention to marital interaction.

Strodbeck (1951) used frequency of communication as the criterion for mode of interaction and found that the spouse who talked the most won the decision. Winning of decisions was also related to the power distribution for husbands and wives sanctioned by different cultural groups. However, no mention was made of the effect winning an argument had on the marital relationship. Strodbeck notes only that the more talkative spouse tended more frequently to ask questions, carry out opinion and analysis, and make rewarding remarks. The less talkative spouse used more acts of agreement and disagreement and more aggressive acts designed to deflate the other's status, which Strodbeck interprets as representing a basically passive agreeing person who occasionally becomes frustrated and aggresses. But, it might be that for a satisfactory marriage, the culturally sanctioned power distribution or status is not as important as is the productive and destructive interactions specified by the proposed study.
Kenkel (1961) also concentrated on interactions which lead to winning a decision and found that amount of talking predicted who won the decision. But Kenkel used Bales' Interaction Process Analysis to further analyze the interactions and found that the distribution of ideas was less important than the distribution of social-emotional actions. Furthermore, in 72% of the cases, the wives performed more of the social-emotional or expressive actions than did the husbands. Kenkel's study reflects the transfer of emphasis from an analysis of power distributions to an identification of role differentiation along the expressive versus instrumental dimensions in marital interactions.

Parsons and Bales' (1955) model of role differentiation led to many studies of married couples in conflict situations. Many of these studies, such as Quade's 1955 dissertation from The Ohio State University, found that the wives tended to use the expressive mode of interaction, while the husbands used mainly the instrumental mode. But the experimental findings of O'Rourke (1963) and Barry (1968) plus the theoretical discussion of Rossi (1968) raise serious questions as to whether the sex role differentiation postulated by Parsons and Bales actually typifies marital interaction. Also, Parsons and Bales' model is based on occupational data of 1949 when wives accounted for only 22.5% of the total labor force, compared to 36.8% in 1967 (U.S.)
Department of Labor, 1969). When the wife's life was centered more in the home, while the husband found fulfillment from a job outside the home, it was the wife who had a greater investment in maintaining the marriage and thus was the one who tended to make expressive responses to this end. The feminist movement urges the wife to find fulfillment outside the home and, in fact, she is, as is shown by her increasing participation in the labor force. Thus, it is predicted that the feminist movement will change the traditional role differentiation of marital interaction (Zytowski, 1969). There is even some question as to whether the instrumental (or cognitive) component of marital interaction is worthy of inspection. Productive and destructive interactions as they are defined by this study are measured in terms of their ability to foster or impede tension reduction and change. Instrumental (or cognitive) interactions certainly do not fulfill this criterion as well as do expressive (or emotional) interactions.

Another approach to assessing marital interaction is found in game theory. Kimmel and Havens (1966) point out that the fundamental focus in game theory is on the two players' differences. But the normative expectation of a married couple is really one of mutual identification, not mutual opposition. Thus, say Kimmel and Havens, "attempts to evaluate a marriage by treating spouses as
psychologically separate individuals deny this normative orientation [p. 461]." Also, an optimum solution by the criteria of game theory may still leave both spouses dissatisfied, with the basic issue not resolved, and their relationship having lost some of its unity. Therefore, the proposed study uses neither game theory nor an evaluation of the outcomes of interaction. Instead, the process of interaction is examined as it fosters tension reduction and change.

However, one finding from game research furnishes a useful prediction for this study. DeVos (1966) comments that "for those individuals who have some source of continuing insecurity relative to their status as men vis-à-vis women...a sense of threat is countered by...the use of coercion...to reaffirm dominance [p. 78]." Then, as Deutsch, et. al. (1967) have found, coercion produces a counter-coercion and lack of cooperation. Escalation of the conflict is a likely result (Deutsch, 1969), leading to an unhappy marriage or divorce. It could be predicted, then, that when a husband is insecure in his own identity, a possible effect of the feminist movement, he will tend to use more destructive interactions during conflict resolution.

Haush, Goodrich, and Campbell (1963) hypothesized that one of the most significant developmental tasks of
newlyweds is to work out acceptable modes of conflict resolution. To test this hypothesis, Goodrich, Ryder, and Raush (1968) examined the conflict resolution interactions of newlywed couples. They found that there are different adaptations to inner conflict for the husband and wife. The husbands tended to suppress conflict by marrying home-centered wives and becoming immersed in their jobs, while the wives tended to express their conflicts more openly. When faced with a conflict resolution task called The Color Matching Test, the husbands who participated in household tasks and lived with wives who were involved with occupational pursuits, tended to avoid disagreement by making a perceptual error. During the "Improvisations" which were another measure of conflict resolution interaction, the wives who were home-centered and married to husbands who were occupationally oriented tended to use rational, non-affective responses. Thus, there were two different kinds of interactions corresponding to two different kinds of role orientations. A prediction for the proposed study which would follow from these findings is that the husbands who participate in household tasks and whose wives have jobs will try to avoid a conflict situation which is presented to them.

Ort (1950) examined the incongruity between husbands' expectations for the wife's role and the wife's actual
role behaviors. He found that reported happiness in marriage is a function of this incongruity, which he terms unrealized role expectations. Furthermore, those couples who reported being happy also reported that they settled differences through discussion while unhappy couples reported arguing as their main mode of resolving differences. But Ort did not relate these modes of resolving differences to the degree of incongruity of the unrealized role expectations. Nor did he attempt to manipulate the incongruity of unrealized role expectations. Finally, Ort's use of self-reported mode of conflict resolution does not appear to be as valid as would have been a measure of actual conflict resolution behaviors.

Barry (1968) used Bales' Interaction Process Analysis to conduct an intensive examination of the relation between actual modes of interaction among newlyweds in response to a conflict situation, sex differences, and marital adjustment. The sex differences revealed that among all the newlyweds in his sample, the husbands were more supportive and less coercive than their wives, a finding that runs contrary to the instrumental-expressive theory of role differentiation. Barry relates these findings to game theory and the developmental tasks newlyweds face. Like Burgess and Cottrell (1939), Barry predicts that it is the wife who must make the greater adjustment in marriage because of her transition
from a career orientation to a home orientation, while life goes on as usual for the husband. Thus, there is a tendency for the wife to use emotional pressure on her husband. In turn, if the husband is secure enough in his own identity, he is supportive of his wife's effort to find herself in her new role. In such a marriage, conflicts are settled easily, precisely because the husband is willing to be supportive, conciliatory, and trusting. Such behavior is reinforcing; the wife responds positively because her need for sympathy and support is satisfied. Conflict is resolved productively and mutual growth is fostered. Barry also found that in those couples whose marriages were in trouble, the husbands were far more coercive and punitive than the other husbands in the sample. Barry's study is valuable because it was the first to closely examine the relation of modes of conflict resolution to marital adjustment. However, Barry does not relate modes of conflict resolution to incongruity in role expectations.

Tharp (1963), in his review of marriage research, concludes that "the crucial issue now facing marriage-role researchers seems to be the identification of the crucial dimensions of marriage-role expectations and performances [p. 114]." Previous researchers have either studied various aspects of role expectations and personality differences as they relate to happiness in marriage or else have just
examined marital interaction. But there still exists a need to connect the crucial dimensions of role expectations with marital interactions. This study proposes to fulfill this need by relating a crucial dimension of role expectations, incongruity between husbands' and wives' expectations, to affective interactions during conflict resolution.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES

Experimental Sample

The sample consisted of 20 married couples, ages 21-33, married 1½-7 years. In every couple, both the husband and the wife had major time commitments outside the home. The couples were volunteers obtained from counselor education and sociology classes at Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, and medical interns and their spouses at two hospitals in Phoenix, Arizona. At the time volunteers were requested, the volunteers were told only that a psychological-sociological study that required one hour total time was being conducted and that both husbands and wives were needed.

Hillman (1962) has shown that marital interaction is affected by the educational level, the income level, and the occupational level of the spouses. Therefore, an attempt was made to control for these variables by selecting the sample from a graduate student population. It should be noted that using such a sample restricts the applicability of the results. The similarity in
educational levels of husbands and wives was also controlled for because Blood and Wolf (1960) concluded that "it is clear that the more one partner's education exceeds that of the other, the larger his share in marital decision making will be....Comparative education influences marital decision making in all occupational levels [p. 37]." The mean highest level of education attained for the husbands in this study was 17 years and for the wives 16 years, indicating that most of the individuals participating in this study were college graduates.

Other variables which can have an influence on marital interaction are the number of children and religious affiliation. Fourteen of the twenty couples did not have any children, with the mean number of children for all the couples participating in the study being 0.4. The religious affiliation breakdown showed a somewhat higher proportion of Catholics in the sample than exists in the general population, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Stated</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only working couples with major time commitments outside the home were selected because time available for home-centered tasks is equal for the partners of these marriages; it
would not be equal in couples where the wife is only a housewife. A conflict situation over responsibility for household tasks such as the one used in this study would not occur until the wife actually leaves the house for a job. To further substantiate the use of only working wives and wives under age 30, the author conducted a pilot study which indicated a significant difference in role expectations only on the dimension of responsibility for household tasks between the under 30 working wife and housewife samples (see Appendix VI for the t values of the pilot study). An indication of whether an individual has a major time commitment to his profession was obtained through an interview prior to the experiment. In this interview, each individual was asked how many hours a day she/he spends in activities outside the home and the approximate proportion of time spent in career-related activities each day.

Individuals between the ages of 21-33 and married 1½-7 years were selected because of the anticipated applications of the study's results in counseling newlyweds of this age group since "about 40% of all divorces occur in the first 5 years of marriage and the rate shows a fairly steady decline for each 5-year period thereafter [Packard, 1970, p. 258]." Individuals married only 1½-7 years were selected in an attempt to control for the effect that the variable of length of marriage might have on perceived conflict. For a
couple married many years, the conflict video-tape may not present a problem since the couple has already been exposed to and handled many similar conflict situations. All couples were asked before the study began if division of responsibility for household tasks, specifically that of making the dinner, was a conflict-producing situation for them. All couples in this study indicated that it was a conflict-producing situation for them.

There were a number of questions on the ESD which were asked the couples in a further attempt to determine the existence of conflict areas. As can be noted from the graphs in Appendix VIII, the husband and wife groups responded similarly to the questions about areas of conflict. The majority of both husbands and wives approved of the wife working outside the home. In fact, both husbands and wives believed that a wife should combine a career, marriage, and family. Also, both husbands and wives agreed that the husband should help with household tasks if the wife works. However, a conflict arises when the wife's career is weighed in importance with homemaking and the husband's career. While both husbands and wives felt that it was possible for the wife to combine a career and homemaking, they did not put the woman's career above her homemaking responsibilities or the husband's career. Thus, most couples in this study were willing to see the wife work, but only to the extent
that her career did not conflict with her responsibility for household tasks or her husband's career.

It was interesting also to note that the majority of both husbands and wives held an "equalitarian" view rather than a "traditional" view of marriage (Dunn, 1960). In other words, they did not identify certain family-related decisions as solely the husband's or wife's responsibility. Consequently, both spouses in this study were new feminists in the sense that they did not define household roles by assigning different responsibilities to husband and wife. However, they still did identify the wife's major responsibility as home-centered and the husband's major responsibility as career-centered.

The wives appear to have an additional conflict in their dependence on their husband's approval. While the majority of wives said it was necessary for them to have their husband's approval of their decisions, the majority also said they would refuse to give up their job if their husband requested them to do so.

One of the basic conflicts for the couples participating in this study appears to be, then, the wife's combination of a career with her responsibility for household tasks. Both husbands and wives felt that a husband should help with household tasks, but that his professional activities are more important than the wife's and that the
wife's major responsibility is the home.

Bem and Bem (1970) have also pointed out that "it is a mark of how well the woman has been kept in her place that such wives often idolize their husbands for 'permitting' them to squeeze careers into the interstices of their marriages so long as their husbands' careers are not unduly inconvenienced [p. 116]." Thus, the sample in this study conforms closely with Bem and Bem's description of the nonconscious ideology of the average man and woman of today.

Experimental Procedures

The couples were randomly assigned to two groups of 10 couples each—one experimental and one control group. Only two couples were able to be studied during each experimental session. Therefore, of the two couples who appeared at a given session, one was assigned to the experimental group and the other to the control group in order to reduce the effects of intrasession history. The experimental group was exposed to feminism media, in an attempt to experimentally increase the incongruity of their expectations. The control group was not exposed to feminism media. Instead, they were provided with magazines which contained no articles about woman's role, in an attempt to standardize the between testing experiences of the control group. The effects of talking about ESD responses among the couples
were controlled by cautioning the couples not to discuss their responses with each other and then supervising them through a one-way mirror and microphone.

After viewing the Conflict Video-Tape, the couple was asked to discuss their reaction to the conflict situation. In an attempt to stimulate interaction, the experimenter asked the questions: "What did you think of that? Do you feel that situation applies to you? What would you do if you were in that situation? Who do you think was right? How would you get your wife (husband) to understand your point of view?" The couples' answers were audio tape recorded, with their consent. Several precautions were taken in an attempt to reduce the effects of being in an experimental situation (Vidich, 1956). Couples' permission to tape record was obtained at the time they were recruited, which was a month before they appeared for the experiment. Also, during the experiment, the experimenter tried to create a relaxed, accepting and open atmosphere. After the couples had interacted for five minutes with the experimenter in the room, the experimenter left the room for five minutes, ostensibly to turn off video-tape equipment or to check on another couple. However, the real reason the experimenter left the room was to allow the couple to interact in a situation which diminished their reluctance to discuss or act out their real interactions during conflict resolution.
The tape recordings were then rated according to the operational definitions of productive and destructive interactions as delineated in the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis by three judges who were psychiatric interns with one year of psychiatric experience (see Appendix V for a copy of the rating manual). The raters were males with an average age of 26. Two of the raters were married and one was divorced.

**Experimental Design**

This study employs two separate designs to correspond to Hypotheses 1 and 2. Campbell's Pretest-Posttest Control Group Experimental Design was used to validate the unidirectionality and the causal effect of Hypothesis 1 (Campbell, 1957). Campbell's Posttest-Only Control Group Experimental Design was used for Hypothesis 2 in order to prevent the interaction effects of pretesting (Campbell and Stanley, 1963). A random assignment to groups of a very homogenous sample leads to the assumption that the experimental and control groups are equivalent in mode of interaction before the introduction of the independent variable. Also, it is hypothesized that the Conflict Video-Tape will not affect the independent variable, i.e. incongruity of expectations. Substantiation for this hypothesis can be found through a comparison of ESD scores from Time 2 to Time 3.
Descriptively, the experimental designs are represented as follows:

**EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN FOR HYPOTHESIS 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>R ESD (O₁) Feminism Media (X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>R ESD (O₃)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN FOR HYPOTHESIS 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td>R Feminism Media (X)</td>
<td>Mode of ESD Interaction in response to Conflict Video-Tape (O₁)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Group</td>
<td>R Mode of ESD Interaction in response to Conflict Video-Tape (O₂)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction of the independent variable (degree of role expectation incongruity) and the dependent variable (mode of interaction during conflict resolution) leads to eight possible outcomes:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Mode of Interaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Incongruity — High Incongruity</td>
<td>Destructive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Incongruity — High Incongruity</td>
<td>Destructive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Incongruity — Low Incongruity</td>
<td>Productive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Incongruity — Low Incongruity</td>
<td>Productive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Incongruity — High Incongruity</td>
<td>Productive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Incongruity — High Incongruity</td>
<td>Productive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Incongruity — Low Incongruity</td>
<td>Destructive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Incongruity — Low Incongruity</td>
<td>Destructive Interaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Hypotheses 1 and 2 are supported, the experimental group will exhibit Low Incongruity — High Incongruity — Destructive Interaction. It may be possible that some couples in the experimental group exhibit such a high degree of incongruity at Time 1 that exposure to the feminist media does not increase their incongruity (High Incongruity — High Incongruity — Destructive Interaction). In this case, Hypothesis 2 would be supported, but Hypothesis 1 would remain to be supported by couples not in this group. It is further hypothesized that the control group will exhibit either High Incongruity — High Incongruity — Destructive Interaction or Low Incongruity — Low Incongruity — Productive Interaction. There will be some couples in the control group, then, who will be like some of the couples in the experimental group in that they exhibit High Incongruity — High Incongruity — Destructive Interaction. The other outcomes presented above are hypothesized not to occur in either the experimental or control groups.
Variables Controlled and Uncontrolled

Variables Controlled:

1. The effects of history, instrument decay, selection, and mortality are all controlled by the use of the Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Campbell, 1957) and the random assignment of couples to the experimental and control groups.

2. The effect of maturation is controlled by manipulating the incongruity in role expectations during the same hour that the Conflict Video-Tape is administered and the interaction audio tape is obtained.

3. Regression effects are controlled by using a continuous sample rather than a sample which represents only extreme scores.

Variables Uncontrolled:

1. The effect of multiple-treatment interferences and reactive effects of the experimental arrangements, including the Hawthorne Effect and interaction effect of testing, may jeopardize the external validity of the results (Kelley, et al., 1970).

2. The effect of personality variance and the effect of variability in amount of prior information on persuasibility is not controlled (Hovland, et al., 1953).
3. The smallness of the sample size may confound the comparability of the experimental and control groups and the ability to derive statistically significant results. The use of a restricted sample reduces the generalizability of the results. The use of volunteers restricts the representativeness of the sample.

**Instruments**

**Expectations Semantic Differential (ESD):** The degree of incongruity in role expectations is operationally defined as the difference score on the ESD, which was developed by the author to measure expectations of the wife's role (see Appendix IV for a copy of the ESD). The semantic differential form was used to obtain the affective level of incongruous role expectations (Osgood, et. al., 1957). Other inventories which measure role expectations exist, but it was felt that they were either not sensitive enough to changes in role expectations produced by the media, not standardized to the degree required by this study, or not valid measures of role variables affected by the feminist movement. Inventories rejected were Dunn's Marriage Role Expectation Inventory, Hurvitz's Marital Roles Inventory, Kirkpatrick's Feminism-Antifeminism Scale, the Terman-Miles Masculinity-Femininity Test, and the Leary Interpersonal
Check List.

Thirty-two pairs of the descriptive adjectives used to define the concept, "ideal wife," were selected from Osgood's list of bipolar adjectives (Osgood, et. al., 1957). Fourteen pairs of the descriptive adjectives were created by the author. Content validity of these adjectives was determined by a panel of five wives who corresponded on all variables to the wives who participated in this study. The only additional prerequisite was that the wives also indicated that they had seen television programs on and read articles about the feminist movement. The panel was asked to select from a list of 70 pairs of adjectives those they felt most applied to the concept, "the ideal wife," and which adjective of each pair was most like the feminist position as they perceive it from their exposure to the media. The 46 pairs of adjectives which were selected by the panel can be found in Appendix VIII, where the first adjective in each pair was judged to be representative of the feminist position. Pairs of adjectives which were not selected by the panel were retained in the final form of the ESD as distractor items.

Factorial validity of the ESD was established by separate rotated factor analyses for the 32 Osgood items and the 14 Palmer items (see Appendix IX). Factor 3 on the Osgood items accounted for the greatest amount of
variance (18.8%). This factor contained evaluative as well as potency items and described some of the characteristics typically associated with femininity such as fragile, following, inferior, yielding, soft. Factor 1 for the Osgood items contained mostly potency items such as strong-weak and free-constrained. For the Palmer items, Factor 2 accounted for the greatest amount of variance (31.3%). This factor contained the evaluative and potency items of liberated-confined, equal-unequal, expressive-unexpressive, and outgoing-subdued. The five factors of the Palmer items, which contained mostly potency items, accounted for more of the total amount of variance than did the Osgood items (70.8% for the Palmer items versus 53.1% for the Osgood items).

The reliability of the ESD was assessed by comparing the scores of the control group from Time 1 to Time 2. A one-way analysis of variance showed that only .003% of the variance is due to error in test-retest from Time 1 to Time 2. However, the analysis of variance assesses the reliability of the total raw scores of the ESD, not the reliability of individual scales. Within the raw scores there could be large changes that cancel each other out and, hence, would not be detected by an analysis of variance of the raw scores. But, it is difficult to obtain a good reliability measure other than that of the raw scores since there are more items on the ESD (46) than there are
Conflict Resolution Rating: Deutsch (1969) was the first source consulted for the construction of a rating scale which would separate productive from destructive interaction during conflict resolution. Deutsch specified the behaviors which characterize a destructive interaction during resolution of conflict as:

1. An expansion of the scope of conflict,
2. An increasing reliance upon a strategy of power and the use of the tactics of threat, coercion, and deception (included non-verbal gestures),
3. A lack of communication; a refusal to communicate or a process of talking at one another instead of with each other (A non-verbal manifestation of this would be leaving the room.),
4. Misperception and defensiveness; an increased sensitivity to differences and threats, while minimizing the awareness of similarities,
5. A rigidity of behavior; a refusal to change goals (expectations) or actions,
6. Commitment; a need to justify one's actions.

All or some of these behaviors may be involved in a destructive interaction during conflict resolution. It is also interesting to note that an extreme withdrawal response is often termed "divorce" in marital situations. Similarly,
what is commonly termed "marital discord" is often a destructive aggressive response, i.e., a reliance upon a strategy of power.

Deutsch identified the following behaviors as characterizing a productive interaction during resolution of conflict:

1. A constriction of the scope of conflict; sticking to the issue,
2. An increasing reliance upon a strategy of mutual problem-solving and the use of openness and sharing,
3. Open and honest communication; empathizing with each other's needs,
4. A trusting and non-defensive attitude; a non-threatening environment (includes non-verbal behaviors which indicate openness and trust),
5. The motivation to examine alternative expectations and behaviors,
6. The creative ability to think of alternative expectations and behaviors.

The above behaviors are quite similar to Rogers' conditions for learning and counseling relationships; genuineness (openness), a warm unconditional positive regard for the other person (a trusting, non-defensive attitude), and empathy. Thus, Rogers advocates the same environment that
Deutsch characterized as productive for conflict resolution, one in which all threats associated with alternative images are removed. Deutsch's classification of productive and destructive interactions, was not, however, operational enough for the development of a rating scale.

Bales' Interaction Process Analysis (Bales, 1951) was then considered as a method for the classification of productive and destructive interaction during conflict resolution. But Bales' categories had to be modified because the information gained by separating the cognitive (adaptive-instrumental) area into six separate categories was not needed. Also, the number of categories in the emotional (expressive-integrative) area had to be reduced because the raters could not distinguish between the category of showing solidarity and the category of showing agreement, nor between the category of showing antagonism and the category of showing disagreement. An additional category, that of denial or withdrawal from conflict (a lack of communication) was part of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis, but was not used by the raters. The raters said they could not identify any acts of the couples which were in this category. Thus, the original Bales' Interaction Process Analysis categories were reduced from 12 categories to six, although some of the operational descriptions provided by Bales for each of
the categories were retained (see Appendix V).

Bales' method of interaction process analysis was then further modified to include the behaviors Deutsch specified. Deutsch's specification of destructive interactions as including an increasing reliance upon a strategy of power, a rigidity of behavior, and a need to justify one's actions was included in Category 41 of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. Deutsch also identified a lack of communication as a destructive interaction, so this was incorporated into Category 44, a category which was not used by the raters. Misperception and defensiveness, other destructive interactions which Deutsch identified, were included in Category 42.

Deutsch's specification of the productive interactions of an increasing reliance upon a strategy of mutual problem-solving, open and honest communication, and the motivation to examine alternatives all became part of Category 1 of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. Similarly, Deutsch's category of a trusting and non-defensive attitude became part of Category 2.

The final form of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis consisted of seven categories (one of which was not used). The numbers of the categories do not correspond to Bales' original numbers. Rather, they were chosen to facilitate computer analysis, wherein all single
digits represent productive affective interactions (Categories 1 and 2); numbers in the twenties represent cognitive answers; numbers in the thirties represent cognitive questions; and numbers in the forties represent destructive affective interactions (Categories 41 and 42).

Categories 1 and 2 are labeled productive and Categories 41 and 42 are labeled destructive because of Bales' definition of these categories as positive and negative social-emotional interactions. Categories 1 and 2 are productive interactions because they lessen the tension through positive or integrative social-emotional interaction. Categories 41 and 42 are destructive interactions because they increase tension through negative or malintegrative social-emotional interaction. Overt disagreement per se is not included in the list of destructive interactions because Coser (1956) has stressed that overt disagreement can have a stabilizing and integrative function for a relationship. But the covert defensive interactions that often are exhibited during a disagreement are specified under the category of destructive interactions.

The Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis also has some similarities to the six category coding scheme used by Barry (1968). Barry distinguished three major categories; cognitive, affiliative, and coercive. Barry's cognitive category corresponds to the cognitive category
used in this study. Similarly, Barry's coercive category corresponds to Category 41 of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis. However, Barry's affiliative category lumps appeals with acceptance of the other and offering collaboration. Thus use of appeals was theorized by both Deutsch and Bales to be a manipulative act, so it was classified in this study as a destructive interaction (Category 41). Acceptance of the other (empathizing) and offering collaboration (mutual problem-solving strategy) were identified as productive interactions in this study.

In computing the productive and destructive response ratios, the cognitive area of interaction was not used. Previous researchers had relied mainly on the proportion of instrumental (cognitive) to expressive (affective) responses as defined by Bales in their assessment of marital interactions. But Barry (1970) has questioned the use of Bales' division of roles into instrumental and expressive, which is a stereotyped sex role differentiation, because this differentiation may not actually typify interaction within marriage. Also, Kenkel (1961) demonstrated that the social-emotional area was more important than the cognitive area for marital interaction. Therefore, only the social-emotional areas of Bales' categories were used; the cognitive area was not used.
The rating system used in this study does have some limitations. Interaction was audio tape recorded, thus limiting the rating to only verbal communication. Although the use of audio tape recordings allows for tonality in the ratings, it also creates a wider discrepancy in the number of responses rated by each rater than if typed transcripts were used. However, there was a very high degree of inter-rater agreement even though each rater tended to rate a different total number of interactions. Also, interactions between husband and wife were not recorded in a matrix. Instead, interactions were categorized. Thus, there is no record of which response of the husband followed which response of the wife. It was felt, though, that a matrix analysis would provide more information than was needed to test the hypotheses of this study.

Inter-rater reliability was determined from Ebel's formula, which is based on an analysis of variance. The overall reliability coefficient among the three raters is 0.9199. For the ratings of husbands it is 0.9432 and for the ratings of wives it is 0.8955. Thus, overall, of the total amount of variance, 92% is explained by actual differences in the subjects, while only 8% is due to error in the raters' judgment.

Since all the judges were married or divorced and males, a chi-square assessment of their possible prejudice
towards husbands or wives was applied to the ratings. Categories 2 and 20 were the only two categories which showed chi-square differences large enough to reject the null hypothesis that there is a 50-50 distribution of ratings for husbands and wives (see Table 1). The raters favored the wives in rating Category 2 responses, a possible rater prejudice which must be taken into consideration when interpreting the productive interaction ratings. Of course, the difference between husbands and wives on Category 2 could be due to actual differences between the two sexes, but the possibility of rater prejudice must also be considered. The raters favored the husbands on Category 20, but this category, a measure of cognitive responses, is not included in the hypotheses of this study.

**TABLE 1**

**CHI-SQUARES OF RATINGS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1</th>
<th>Category 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rater</strong></td>
<td><strong>Husband</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GS</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
X^2 = 1.102 \\
n.s.
\]

\[
X^2 = 71.693 \\
p < 0.0001
\]
TABLE 1—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 41</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x² = 4.027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 20</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x² = 6.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p &lt; 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 42</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x² = 5.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 30</th>
<th>Rater</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Wife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GS</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x² = 3.327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feminism Video-Tape: The feminism video-tape is a five minute presentation of the new feminism by a male panel member (see Appendix I for a copy of the script). The video-tape was obtained from an actual broadcast by KAET-TV, Arizona State University's educational television station, on July 30, 1970, in an attempt to insure the construct validity of this instrument.

This video-tape was introduced to the subjects by the statement:

You will see a video-taped segment of a program recently presented by Arizona State University's television station. The main speaker is Dr. John Hudson, a sociology
professor at Arizona State University. Dr. Hudson is a very warm and likable person who has been helping married couples like you in Phoenix for the past ten years. During the video-tape, Dr. Hudson will be wearing dark glasses because he is blind.

This statement was used in an attempt to control for many of the variables affecting attitude change. Characteristics of the setting were controlled by announcing that the video-tape was broadcast by Arizona State University. The chief characteristic of the communication which needed to be controlled was its ability to evoke involvement. The issue, the new feminism, involved individuals because it is a very personal and emotional subject. Further, the mention of Dr. Hudson having counseled married couples "like you" in the introduction helped involve individuals. The characteristics of the communicator were controlled for expertness ("a sociology professor at Arizona State University"), attractiveness ("he is blind"), and trustworthiness ("has been helping married couples").

Feminism Magazine Articles: Appendix II presents the magazine articles used in this study. Again, the articles were taken from recent women's magazines in an attempt to insure construct validity.

Conflict Video-Tape: The Conflict Video-Tape presents a three minute interaction between a young husband and wife (see Appendix III for the script). The Conflict Video-Tape
induces the conflict over responsibility for household tasks. The validity of using such a conflict situation was established by asking all couples who participated in this study if the division of responsibility for household tasks was a major conflict-producing situation for them.

Analysis of Data

1. Comparability of the experimental and control groups at Time 1 was established by a t test applied to the raw scores and the D^2 scores.

2. Although the sample used in this study was small (n=40), a t test was used instead of the Mann-Whitney U test for Hypotheses 1a and 1b because an analysis of variance between subjects for the experimental and control groups showed an F of 0.51, df=1/39; not a significant variance between the two groups (Guilford, 1965). A significance level of p ≤ .05 was chosen to reject the null hypotheses, using a one-tailed t test because Hypotheses 1a and 1b are uni-directional predictions. Degree of incongruity is reflected by the D^2 scores; while direction of change is reflected by the Directional Change scores.

3. Spearman's rank-difference correlation was applied to Hypotheses 2a and 2b to identify the relationship between the degree of incongruity and the destructive response ratio. A one-tailed test was used because Hypotheses 2a and 2b are unidirectional predictions.
A significance level of $p \leq .05$ was chosen to reject the null hypotheses. However, a two-tailed test and a significance level of $p \leq .10$ was used in analyzing correlations with Directional Change scores since this study contained no hypotheses about the correlation between these scores and mode of interaction.

4. The reliability of the ESD was assessed by applying an analysis of variance to the test-retest scores of the control group.

5. Factorial validity of the ESD was determined by a rotated factor analysis.

6. Inter-rater reliability was assessed by using Ebel's formula, which is based on an analysis of variance.

7. A chi-square test was used to determine differences between husbands and wives in the use of each category of the Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis, which may reflect rater prejudice or actual differences between the two sexes.
Comparability of Experimental and Control Groups at Time 1

To determine whether the experimental and control groups were comparable at Time 1, a t test of the raw scores and the $D^2$ scores was used. The raw scores of the husbands of the experimental group did not differ significantly from the raw scores of the husbands of the control group at Time 1 ($t = 1.568$). The raw scores of the wives of the experimental group also did not differ significantly from the raw scores of the wives of the control group at Time 1 ($t = 0.501$).

The $D^2$ scores of the experimental group did not differ significantly from the $D^2$ scores of the control group at Time 1 ($t = 0.137$).

**TABLE 2**

**UNPAIRED T TESTS FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS AT TIME 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td>225.2</td>
<td>16.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td>223.2</td>
<td>20.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D^2$ Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands &amp; Wives</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>50.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At Time 1 there was also no significant difference between the raw scores of husbands and wives in the experimental group \( (t=0.783) \) nor was there any significant difference between the raw scores of husbands and wives in the control group \( (t=0.233) \).

**Hypotheses 1a and 1b**

There were two different scores used in the \( t \) tests applied to Hypotheses 1a and 1b. Directional Change scores assess the direction of change from Time 1 to Time 2. \( D^2 \) (incongruity) scores were used in two ways. \( D^2 \) scores were used to measure incongruity; whether within an individual from one time to another or between individuals at the same time. For Hypothesis 1a, \( D^2 \) (incongruity) scores were used. A comparison of the incongruity between husbands and wives at Time 2 shows that there was no significant difference between the experimental and control groups \( (t=0.048) \). It may then be concluded that the effect of the feminist media was not to increase incongruity. Null Hypothesis 1a fails to be rejected.

A comparison of the \( D^2 \) scores of the husbands of the experimental versus the control group from Time 1 to Time 2 also leads to a failure to reject Null Hypothesis 1a \( (t=0.936) \). Similarly, the \( D^2 \) scores of the wives of the experimental versus the control group from Time 1 to Time 2 do not show a significant difference \( (t=0.067) \).
TABLE 3

UNPAIRED T TESTS ON D^2 SCORES FOR EXPERIMENTAL GROUP VERSUS CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Control Group Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between H and W at T_2</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>33.97</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>43.67</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H's Change from T_1 to T_2</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>21.06</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W's Change from T_1 to T_2</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>32.82</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>23.09</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Hypothesis 1b, the Directional Change scores were examined. There was no significant difference between the Directional Change scores (T_2-T_1) for the husbands of the experimental versus the control group (t=1.013). However, there was a significant difference between the Directional Change scores (T_2-T_1) for the wives of the experimental versus the control group (t=1.736, p < .05, one-tailed). The expectations of the wives in the experimental group changed from Time 1 to Time 2 toward the feminist position significantly more than did the expectations of the wives in the control group. Thus, Null Hypothesis 1b is rejected (see Table 4).
TABLE 4
UNPAIRED T TESTS ON DIRECTIONAL CHANGE SCORES FOR
EXPERIMENTAL GROUP VERSUS CONTROL GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_2 - T_1)</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>7.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_2 - T_1)</td>
<td>9.900</td>
<td>18.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*p < .05, one-tailed

TABLE 5
PAIRED T TESTS ON DIRECTIONAL CHANGE SCORES FOR
HUSBANDS VERSUS WIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th>Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_2 - T_1)</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>7.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_2 - T_1)</td>
<td>-3.300</td>
<td>7.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that, for the experimental group, there was not a significant difference between the husbands' and wives' Directional Change scores, although the t approaches significance \((t=-1.470)\). For the control group, there was not a significant difference between the husbands' and wives' Directional Change scores \((t=-0.268)\).

Thus, Hypothesis 1b was supported by the data, while Hypothesis 1a was not. For the experimental group, feminist media produced a change in the wife's, but not the husband's
expectations in the direction of the media; however, it did not increase the incongruity in the husband's and wife's expectations.

Hypotheses 2a and 2b

Raw scores at Time 2, $D^2$ scores, and Directional Change scores were correlated with modes of interaction. A one-tailed and a .05 level of significance was used for correlations with incongruity between husbands and wives because these correlations were predicted by uni-directional hypotheses. However, there were no hypotheses in this study which predicted correlations of modes of interaction with raw scores or Directional Change scores. Therefore, a two-tailed test was used for these correlations. A significance level of .10 was chosen. Although this is a lower alpha level than is normally used, it was felt that the smallness of the sample and the consistency of the results justified its use. Since the control group was expected to contain some husbands and wives who were, at Time 2, as high on feminism as were some husbands and wives in the experimental group at Time 2, it was hypothesized that degree of incongruity rather than group membership would be assessed, so both groups were combined for the Spearman rank-difference correlations.
### SPEARMAN RANK-DIFFERENCE CORRELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</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>
<th>10)</th>
<th>11)</th>
<th>12)</th>
<th>13)</th>
<th>14)</th>
<th>15)</th>
<th>16)</th>
<th>17)</th>
<th>18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband D²</td>
<td>.793</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change T₁-T₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband D²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change T₂-T₃</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>-.237</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife D²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change T₁-T₂</td>
<td>.585</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.519</td>
<td>.243</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.094</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.358</td>
<td>-.415</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife D²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change T₂-T₃</td>
<td>.336</td>
<td>.604</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.405</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>-.280</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total D²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change T₁-T₂</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.567</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.411</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.384</td>
<td>.371</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total D²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity at Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incongruity at Time 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple's DBt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's DBt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's DBt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Dir. Chg. T₂-T₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Dir. Chg. T₁-T₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Dir. Chg. T₂-T₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Dir. Chg. T₁-T₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Raw Score at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's Raw Score at Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .10 two-tailed test
From an inspection of Table 6, it is apparent that seven correlations between scores and modes of interaction are significant at the .10 level (two-tailed). The seven significant correlations are:

1. The wife's raw score at Time 2 correlates significantly with the husband's destructive response ratio ($r_s = .395$) and the couple's destructive response ratio ($r_s = .425$). Thus, the wives who had the highest raw scores (the most feminist scores) at Time 2 tended to have husbands who had the highest destructive response ratios.

2. The $D^2$ scores of the husbands who changed the most from Time 1 to Time 2 correlate significantly in a positive direction with the husband's destructive response ratio ($r_s = .435$) and with the wife's destructive response ratio ($r_s = .424$). However, there is a negative significant correlation between a husband's $D^2$ score change from Time 1 to Time 2 and the couple's destructive response ratio ($r_s = -.406$).

3. The wives whose $D^2$ scores changed the most from Time 2 to Time 3 had the highest couple's destructive response ratios ($r_s = .405$).

4. The husbands whose $D^2$ scores changed the most from Time 2 to Time 3 had the wives with the highest destructive response ratios ($r_s = .381$).
It can be concluded, then, that the most feminist wives had husbands who used more destructive than productive interactions. But there was no significant correlation between the wives who changed the most from Time 1 to Time 2 toward the feminist position and the destructive response ratio of the husbands ($r_s=-.026$). Therefore, change as a result of exposure to the feminist media does not predict the husband's mode of interaction, but a high feminist score for the wives at Time 2 does predict the husband's mode of interaction.

The husbands who changed the most from Time 1 to Time 2 in either direction were the ones who used the most destructive responses and who had the wives who used the most destructive responses. The result that the husband's change from Time 1 to Time 2 correlates negatively with the couple's response ratio can be explained by the fact that the wife's destructive response ratio correlated .919 with the couple's destructive response ratio while the husband's destructive response ratio correlated only .712 with the couple's destructive response ratio. Also, the wife's destructive response ratio correlates only .482 with the husband's destructive response ratio. Thus, for some couples, the husbands tended to use more productive than destructive responses even when their wives used destructive responses. And, in many couples, the wife tended to use productive responses even when the husband used destructive
responses. It is interesting to note that the husband's directional change ($T_2-T_1$) did not correlate significantly with mode of interaction. However, there was almost a significant negative correlation between the husband's directional change ($T_2-T_1$) and the wife's destructive response ratio ($rs=-.334$). So there was some tendency for husbands who became higher on feminism at Time 2 to have wives who used productive responses.

The $D^2$ score changes of the husbands and wives from Time 2 to Time 3 correlated with mode of interaction. Wives who changed the most in either direction from Time 2 to Time 3 had the highest couple destructive response ratios, while husbands who changed the most from Time 2 to Time 3 had the wives with the highest destructive response ratios. Since Time 2 $D^2$ scores were obtained before the modes of interaction were obtained and Time 3 scores were obtained afterward, it may be concluded that the type of interaction affected the Time 3 score. Couples who used the most destructive interactions had wives who changed their $D^2$ scores the most from Time 2 to Time 3. Also, husbands who had wives with the highest destructive response ratios tended to change their $D^2$ scores the most from Time 2 to Time 3.

Degree of incongruence between husband and wife at Time 2 did not correlate with the husband's destructive response ratio ($rs=.061$), nor with the wife's destructive
response ratio \( (r_s = .057) \), nor with the couple's destructive response ratio \( (r_s = .031) \). Destructive response ratios were obtained by subtracting each productive response ratio from 1, so, since the two ratios are mathematically equivalent, the productive response ratios also would show no significant correlations with the incongruity or total D² change scores. Thus, Null Hypotheses 2a and 2b fail to be rejected. But, it must be remembered that the husband's amount of change from Time 1 to Time 2 predicted mode of interaction and that the wife's degree of feminism at Time 2 predicted mode of interaction.

Since the wives of the experimental group did change to a more feminist position as a result of exposure to the media, a t test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the experimental and control groups in use of productive responses.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H's PRR</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W's PRR</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total PRR</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 two-tailed
TABLE 8

PAIRED T TESTS ON PRODUCTIVE RESPONSE RATIOS
FOR HUSBANDS VERSUS WIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Husbands</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Wives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experimen-</strong>&lt;br&gt;tal</td>
<td>0.825</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.137</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>0.586</td>
<td>0.184</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.221</td>
<td>-1.818</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A significant difference between the experimental and control groups on use of productive responses was demonstrated for the husbands \((t=3.103, \ p<.05)\) but not for the wives \((t=1.361)\). The husbands of the experimental group used significantly more productive responses than the husbands of the control group. This difference may be due to the effects of exposure to the feminist media or may be due to initial differences between the groups. Selecting the sample from a limited population and randomizing assignment of couples to the two groups was used to control for initial differences between the experimental and control groups, but a pre-test of mode of interaction was not conducted. Also, the results of the t test, that the husbands of the experimental group used more productive responses than the husbands of the control group are inconsistent with the Spearman rank-difference correlation result that the wives with the highest feminism scores had husbands who used the most destructive responses. (The wives with the highest feminism scores tended to be in the experimental group.)
Therefore, it cannot be definitely concluded that the experimental treatment was the cause of differences between the two groups. Initial differences in husbands' mode of interaction is not ruled out as a possible explanation for the significant t test finding.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

The two most important results of this study are that:

1. The feminist media changed the wives' expectations for their role, and

2. The wives who had the highest feminism scores at Time 2 had husbands who used the most destructive interactions.

The first finding was predicted by a hypothesis of this study, but the second finding was not predicted and, thus, would make an interesting prediction for a future study. The conditions which correlated with the husband's use of destructive interactions were the wife's degree of feminism at Time 2 and the husband's change in expectations both toward and away from feminism. Incongruity between the husband's and wife's expectations for the wife's role did not correlate with mode of interaction. Also, a definite relationship between incongruity as a result of exposure to the feminist media and mode of interaction was not shown. There are several possible explanations for the failure of this study to reject the null hypothesis that there is no correlation between degree of incongruity and mode of interaction. From a statistical viewpoint, the sample used was too small and not sufficiently variable.
to statistically detect differences in incongruity. Also, the experimental group contained some husbands and/or wives who were so feminist at Time 1 that exposure to the feminist media did not create a great change. Perhaps the major explanation for the inconclusive findings is that uni-directionality of the association between the independent and dependent variables was not adequately controlled. Instead of a uni-directional prediction that the feminist media causes use of destructive modes of interaction, it may be that those individuals who characteristically use destructive modes of interaction are also most susceptible to change by the media. In other words, an alternative explanation of the finding that the wife's degree of feminism is associated with the husband's use of destructive interactions may be that the marriages most troubled by destructive interactions are those which are most susceptible to feminism.

There also may have been some intervening variables which were not controlled for and which might affect the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. An intervening variable hypothesized by self theory is degree of anxiety. Anxiety mediates between perception (attitudes) and response (behaviors). In this study, it was assumed that incongruity of expectations would intensify anxiety which would then lead to destructive interactions. However, degree of anxiety was not
assessed. Another intervening variable may be the personality of the individual. Such personality characteristics as self-esteem, dependency, aggression, and authoritarianism may affect mode of interaction even more than does incongruity of expectations. Again, personality was not assessed.

The results of this study modify and expand previous research findings. Previous researchers had identified the husband's role as crucial to successful marital interaction (Corsini, 1956b; Luckey, 1960a; Tharp, 1963; and Barry, 1970). Although congruity of expectations for the husband's role was not assessed in this study, the importance of the wife's expectations for her role was demonstrated. More importantly, the wife's role was examined in view of the changes caused by the feminist movement. Kirkpatrick, in 1939, researched some of the same hypotheses that are used in this study. This study's findings are contrary to Kirkpatrick's findings in that the more extreme feminist attitudes on the part of wives were associated with marital maladjustment. It appears that there have been periods of rise and decline of the feminist movement and that when the movement is on the rise, the wife's role does become crucial to marital interaction.

This study used previous findings to develop a new criterion for marital adjustment. Bales' Interaction
Process Analysis was modified and analyzed using only the affective categories. The Modified Bales' Interaction Process Analysis was, then, the criterion for marital adjustment introduced by this study. As was shown in the Review of the Literature section, an analysis of marital interaction is a more effective measure of marital adjustment than are the standard questionnaires.

Parsons and Bales' model of role differentiation was tested by this study. In one of the expressive categories (Category 2), wives were rated as exhibiting more responses than husbands (see Table 1 in Instruments section). In one of the instrumental categories (Category 20), husbands were rated as exhibiting more responses than wives. These findings would appear to support Parsons and Bales' model of role differentiation. However, the findings might also reflect the prejudice of the male raters. Also, there were four categories used in this study to assess expressive interaction and there were no significant differences between husbands and wives in three of these four categories. Thus, Parsons and Bales' model is only tentatively supported by the findings of this study.

Luokey (1960a) and Barry (1968) both theorized that it is the wife who must make the greater adjustment in marriage. As shown by this study, the changes in women's expectations for their role, as a result of the feminist movement, will
affect the adjustment both husbands and wives must make to marriage. A wife who combines a working wife role with a homemaker role certainly will make more demands on her husband than if she were involved in only the homemaker role. Just as a working wife must adjust to the marital relationship, so must a husband adjust to his working wife. The couples used in this study, in all of which the wife worked, agreed that responsibility for household tasks was a major conflict-producing situation for them. And, during the interaction over the Conflict Video-Tape, the husbands contributed as much to the conflict resolution as did the wives. Thus, both husbands and wives are continually adjusting to their marital relationship. It is hoped that future research will further assess both the husbands' and wives' adjustment mechanisms.
CHAPTER VI

IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELORS

The major implication of this study is for counselors to become agents of social action. Riccio (1968) has identified the emerging role of the counselor as a social actionist, an individual concerned with the self in situation and committed to altering society in terms of the persistent needs of youth. The feminist movement was demonstrated in this study to have an impact on interaction during conflict resolution among young marrieds. One of the principal developmental tasks of young marrieds is to work out acceptable modes of conflict resolution (Raush, Goodrich, and Campbell, 1963). The feminist movement is changing the wife's expectations for her role in such a way as to intensify conflict. Out of this intensified conflict, new patterns of relating within the institution of marriage are emerging. Counselors must become aware of the impact of the feminist movement on their clients. And this awareness should be based on hard research data which will not only assess a trend in society, but also provide mechanisms for the counselor to intervene on behalf of his clients.
The feminist movement creates a change in the wife's expectations from the traditional view of the ideal wife as expressive, confined, and unequal. The immediate result of this change is conflicting expectations between husbands and wives. This is not to say that the end result will necessarily be negative; only that there will be a period of difficulty during conflict resolution before the result will be produced. Many couples, when faced with conflict, break up the relationship instead of trying to deal with the conflict. The high rate of divorce today is all the more disturbing when it is realized that 80% of those who are divorced have a new partner within a year, thus entering a new relationship where the same conflict could arise again before taking time to examine the previous relationship (Packard, 1970). Counselors will increasingly be sought as facilitators of communication during conflict resolution (Blocher, 1968). But, counselors must first examine what they value. Counselors in both private practice and the schools have been accused of preventing woman's development through their stereotyped expectations for women (Chesler, 1971; Friedan, 1963). Blocher (1966) has warned that the counselor "must also recognize that his own values are not timeless and unquestionable and must be willing to let clients work through value questions in ways that are relevant to their needs and their
If counselors value self-determination and maximization of opportunities, which are democratic ideals for all people (including women), then they are committed to helping women develop themselves to the fullest without the shackles of stereotyped expectations. If counselors value successful marital relationships as increasingly vital determinants of optimal development in a society which provides few other opportunities for intimacy and growth, then they are committed to strengthening marital relationships. Counselors, then, become agents of change instead of promoters of the status quo, or, worse yet, promoters of their personal interpretation of the status quo. Instead of telling women who are frustrated by society's inequalities to adjust, counselors must work with society's institutions (educational, legal, etc.) to help bring about change toward equality. Counselors must help each individual develop herself/himself fully and uniquely within the marital relationship as well as strengthen the marital relationship itself. A counseling intervention of guiding interaction and reducing anxiety during conflict resolution can assist in the growth of both individuals and marriages. Thus, the problems in human interactions which result from a social trend like the feminist movement can be helped by a counseling intervention.
Another major implication of this study is in specifying the nature of the counseling intervention which will achieve the goals stated above. The media was used to change attitudes in this study. Counselors could also use the media to make salient the change in expectations that is occurring. Often expectations that change as a result of exposure to the commercial media are not brought out into the open by married couples, yet these changed expectations are the real motivators of much interaction in marriage. Through exposing clients to the feminist media, the counselor is able to make these changed expectations salient to both husband and wife. Another use of the media by counselors is in changing the commercial media. Since this study has demonstrated the ability of the commercial media to change attitudes, counselors who see themselves as social actionists must try to structure the commercial media to serve their clients' goals instead of commercial goals. Much of what is presented by the commercial media is productive for selling ideas or products, but destructive to the feminist movement and to successful marital relationships. Counselors, using data from studies such as this one, could act as consultants to the commercial media. Video-tapes such as the Conflict Video-Tape used in this study can be used by counselors as a stimulus for interaction. The counselor can then more accurately assess the interaction
which occurs between a given husband and wife in their marriage. Also, the counselor can intervene to make the interaction productive of rather than destructive to conflict resolution. Video-tapes also could be used as a therapeutic intervention by allowing clients to view a video-tape of their interaction. This method of self-image confrontation has been recently tested as a therapeutic method (Boyd and Sisney, 1967). Video-tapes have still another application in therapy as providers of behavioral models for clients (Bandura and Walters, 1963). Clients who characteristically use destructive modes of interaction could watch a video-tape of models for productive modes of interaction. Video-tapes are especially valuable therapeutic tools since they can bring the real world into the therapeutic situation. In this way, transfer of learning in therapy is maximized. The client does not just gain insight into his situation, he has an opportunity to view the commercial video-tapes which are actually changing his expectations in the real world and also to view video-tapes of role models for action in the real world.

The methods and findings of this study also have implications for counselors in the schools. If the feminist movement is having such a great impact on marital interactions, the schools must prepare students for a marital relationship which takes into account this social trend. The curriculum
in many high schools does not now contain any preparation for marriage or for successful interactions. Counselors could provide this preparation by advocating a change in the curriculum and by applying counseling theory and techniques to a class in interpersonal relationships. This study has demonstrated the need for a class in interpersonal relationships and has provided the means (through the use of video-tapes) for preparing students for their future roles in a society of constantly changing expectations.

Thus, this study has:

1. provided counselors with an assessment of the impact of feminism on marital relationships,
2. specified the conditions for the use of certain modes of interaction during conflict resolution,
3. shown how video-tapes can be used to bring the social world into a laboratory or therapeutic situation and stimulate interaction, and
4. introduced a new criterion for marital adjustment.

Counselors must begin now to use this data to foster their clients' growth in today's society.
APPENDIX I

FEMINISM VIDEO-TAPE

Hudson: "But the studies do suggest, interestingly enough, the least important member of a family is probably the father, when you get right down to it—the least important member. However, now having said that, let me go on with the other observation I want to make. There have been studies done, done by a number of researchers on the working mother to find out what, in fact, are the effects on children as far as the mother being out of the home. And, again, we come back now to what are the conditions under which the mother leaves the home. If the mother leaves the home and goes into the labor force with the consent and support of her husband, then we do not find that this is a disruptive influence. Where she leaves the home and goes into the labor market and her husband strenuously objects, this increases the rate of tension and struggles. Now one of the arguments that is offered is that it's the time. You need to spend lots of time with your children. Now we have again ample data to point out that it's not how much time you spend with the children, it's the quality of the time that you do spend with them that counts. Now I would cite for you, for example, that most parents in the upper class don't raise their children. They're raised
by governesses. The children are washed, they're polished, and cleaned, and they're brought into the parents and you say 'Say, this is your son, you know, the son, this is your father,' and you say 'Hi, Dad!'...The family life that we are familiar with we believe that it's the thing. But there are many patterns of family life and we have to be very careful that we don't want to suggest dire consequences or that serious things are going to happen—the research doesn't bear that out."

**Moderator:** "We have one question and I guess anyone on the panel who feels he might like to answer, 'A woman's native creative instincts are toward the home and family,' this one viewer says, 'perhaps this could be a reason why women who are homemakers and workers are slow to advance to positions of importance in careers apart from the home because their creativity or motivation is still fixed on the home,' they ask."

**Hudson:** "Well, let me just categorically reject that a woman's native creative abilities are in the home. That's learned! We teach our women to be homemakers; we teach our women to do these things; and as a consequence of teaching them, you know, from the time they're just wee tots till they finally walk down that aisle, we keep saying to little girls, 'Now, someday you'll be a mother and someday you'll be married, you'll be a wife.' So they grow up with that approach."
Woman: "You get to be a mother before you get married!"

Hudson: "Well, as a matter of fact, this is not so facetious, what with little dolls and all the games. But, I just would reject the native part of it. It's not native if by that we mean it's in the genes or instinctual. It is learned behavior and men can learn to carry on what we think of as the mothering activities just as effectively as a woman can."

Hudson: "...Well, I don't think we should just leave it up to unions. I think the state, I think industry has a major responsibility here. I think that in the long run they're doing themselves a gross disservice by not seeing to it that there is equal pay for equal work. And, we have this kind of discrimination operating at every level. Some places it operates very subtly and some places it operates right out in the open. The federal government has put in steps in this direction, but it's going to take a concerted effort on the part of the state and on the part of women themselves because one of the problems that comes up, that the woman who is looking for a part-time job or the woman who is married and whose husband is working, she just wants her own extra money, and she's willing to take that lower wage. And I think it's a very difficult problem as far as how long it's going to take, probably a long time."

Moderator: "...Is there a higher divorce rate among families with working mothers? I believe that question should
be introduced or...”

Hudson: "Well, again, you see, as far as I'm concerned all women who are married work. Now the question is do they get paid in dollars and cents by somebody else? They're working! Now, is there a higher divorce rate among women who work outside the home as compared to those who work inside the home? I would--uh--I don't know. I would suspect you would have to control that for a number of other factors, such as the number of years married, whether you're with or without children. The key factor here would not be the factor of the wife's working. The key factor would be the husband's attitude toward her working. In those situations where the husband was basically opposed to the wife's employment, I think we can safely say that there is a higher rate of disorganization and divorce in those families. But that's not a function of the woman's working. That's a function of the man's attitude. It would depend a great deal on age, on the particular social class; there would be a number of factors that we would have to control for."
APPENDIX II

IT'S STILL A MAN'S WORLD--BUT YOU CAN CHANGE IT

by Letty Cottin Pogrebin

author of "How to Make It in a Man's World" [sic]

It makes no sense:

--An Ohio newspaperwoman who is a graduate of Kent State University asks to be assigned to the campus to interview friends of the slain students. Instead, her editor sends 12 men who have never been there.

--A husband and wife arrange to return from vacation on separate planes as a precaution. En route, the wife misses a connection and is stranded in town. When she tries to get into a hotel for the night she is refused, because a woman alone is not welcome.

--A woman lawyer applies for a position with a Boston law firm and is quizzed on which method of birth control she uses. The justification: not wanting to waste time training a girl who might get pregnant and quit.

Whether at home or on the job, women encounter many special difficulties. From the basic issues of equal pay and equal job opportunities, to tax laws and Social Security, to restrictions in housing and public places, right down to the question of who does what at home--the double standard for men and women remains firmly entrenched.

In its report last April, The President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities described the problem this way: "Social attitudes are slow to change. So widespread and pervasive are discriminatory practices against
women that they have come to be regarded, more often than not, as normal."

In recent years more and more women have awakened to the injustices that surround us. We know that it isn't "normal" for women in America to be the only majority with the status of a minority group. We've begun to question why 102.3 million women are represented in the United States Congress by one female Senator and only ten women members in the House. We're appalled that all the top-level female business executives in the nation would barely fill a board room and that women holding Federal judgeships wouldn't fill a jury box, that women account for only one percent of our engineers, three percent of our lawyers, seven percent of our doctors, and nine percent of our scientists.

And statistics like these are just the top of the iceberg. Under the waterline—less visible but not less bothersome—are centuries of social prejudice and rigid cultural conditioning which have left their mark on all of us.

As of today—50 years after we won the right to vote—a woman can still be turned away from a restaurant unless she's with a man. She can still be written off as "too sensitive" for politics, "too emotional" for big business, "too risky" for job training. A bank can tell her she must have a man cosign her mortgage, a landlord can insist that a man guarantee her lease, and a husband can expect her to jump from office or factory into the kitchen while he sinks into a
chair with a can of beer.

--from Good Housekeeping Magazine
November, 1970

THE NEW FEMINISM

Another way in which women are kept from better jobs is by the perpetuation of a host of myths designed to make us believe in our own inferiority and incompetence. What is the real truth about women who work? Test your own knowledge by taking our "Working Women Quiz." Answer "true" or "false" to the following statements:

1. The children of women who work are often delinquents and do poorly in school.
2. The majority of working women are single.
3. Women have higher rates of absenteeism on the job than men.
4. Women change jobs more often than men.
5. White women earn more than nonwhite men.
6. Women are less capable than men of standing stress.
7. Women are basically more passive than men.
8. Women don't have the drive needed for success.
9. Women aren't as logical as men and can't handle abstract ideas.
10. Women cry when they don't get their way.

If you haven't already guessed, the answer to all of these questions is "false." Most working women are married, their absenteeism is about the same as men's and they change jobs at about the same rate. The median annual wage for a
white man is $7,164. Nonwhite men earn $4,528; white women earn $4,152, and nonwhite women earn $2,949. Women are capable of standing as much stress as men, and possibly more, according to some recent studies. Women are as aggressive or passive as men might be. Logic is sexless, and so is emotion.

A recent popular song was titled "Make Him Your Reason for Living." From the moment a young girl's mind begins to function, and throughout her life, she will be relentlessly assaulted by a barrage of similar psychologically and emotionally damaging suggestions. "He's a man, and a man has to try," the song goes; by implication, a woman does not. But even if she does, she will encounter discrimination and be constantly conditioned to regard herself as a second-rate intellect with second-rate functions in life. To society, woman is consumer, not producer; passive responder, not forceful creator. The seeds of self-denial and impaired potential are planted during her youth and are reinforced again and again during her years of schooling.

Children of opposite sexes are treated differently almost from the day they are born. As many psychological studies have shown, girls are hugged, kissed, coddled, and controlled, while their brothers are pushed, prodded, motivated, and urged to excel. Boys are reared to control and mold their environment; girls are trained to mold themselves to that environment or to expect to be protected from it. Boys play with Erector sets, girls with Barbie dolls. Your
brother is going to grow up to be (choose one): a) President, b) a doctor, c) a lawyer. Perhaps you'd like to become:
a) First Lady, b) a nurse, c) a secretary, d) a mommy. Your brother is doing brilliantly in school, but don't you be too smart, dear, you'll scare the boys away.

Are women really passive, men active? Are women emotional, men stolid? The plain fact is that we don't know. No conclusions about woman's innate nature can be drawn without looking at the cultural expectations of the society. As a Loyola University psychologist, Naomi Weisstein, recently pointed out, "If Bruno Bettelheim says that women want first and foremost to be good wives and mothers, it is extremely likely that that is what Bruno Bettelheim, the psychologist, wants them to be." Nevertheless, the elementary school system goes right along reinforcing unsupported beliefs in sexual differences, shaping a child's self-image along conventional but detrimental lines.

Early in their schooling, children are confronted by the fact that behavior and performance demands upon students of opposite sexes differ. Boys are allowed greater liberties in behavior and are therefore less able to concentrate on the tedious work that characterizes elementary education. Girls are conditioned to be quiet and sit still. The results are not only academic (girls outperform boys in all academic areas until their late teens), they are also social and psychological. Rowdiness, loudness, aggressiveness, and
generally stronger personalities characterize boys in grade school. "Boys will be boys," goes the cliché, and most adults consciously encourage young males to fit this role. A girl with similar behavior patterns, however, is regarded as a tomboy. Terrified of raising homosexuals, American parents make certain that their children grow up fearful of being confused or identified with the opposite sex.

Women must re-educate themselves, their women friends, their husbands, and their men friends. Then, perhaps, in a few generations, we can bring up our daughters and sons in a society with a minimum of sexual prejudice and a maximum of options for life.

--from Ladies Home Journal
August, 1970
APPENDIX III

CONFLICT VIDEO-TAPE

Characters: He and She, both in middle 20's

Time: 1970, 6:05 p.m.

Setting: Living room of an apartment

Opening Scene: He is reading the newspaper. He gets up, looks at clock on wall, then at watch on hand. He paces back and forth for a moment, then sits down and resumes reading newspaper and drinking drink.

He: It's about time...

She: I'm sorry I didn't get home in time to fix your dinner but I got caught in the rush hour traffic. One of the personnel managers kept me after five and I got into a terrible traffic jam.

He: Look, don't complain to me. I've had a hard day, too. I'm hungry!

She: You're hungry! I've been to three different places today to try to get a job and I didn't even have time for lunch. The first thing those damn personnel managers asked me is if I'm married. Then they want to know what my husband does. And one of them even had the nerve to ask me if I was pregnant.

He: Of course they asked you if you were pregnant. If you were pregnant they'd have to let you go.
She: Well, they certainly don't ask men that kind of question!

He: 'Cause men don't get pregnant!

She: But I'm a person, and whether I'm married or what my husband does doesn't make a bit of difference as to how well I can do the job. They treat me like a slave, a thing they're buying!

He: Isn't that what women are for? (smiles) Seriously, though, I think you've had a hard week. Why don't you calm down.

She: Yeah, it's been a hard week, alright! Oh, I don't know. But I have got to get out of this house. I feel so trapped, so cooped up. There's nothing for me to stay home for.

He: You can stay home and cook my dinner!

She: I have got to get out of this house. I'm not cut out for all this crap! I have a degree in psychology. I want to get out and work with people. And all they give me is a secretarial test. I'll bet if one of those personnel managers hired a woman to work as his assistant, she'd turn out to be his secretary. I probably should have taken a secretarial course in high school and not bothered to go to college. College certainly didn't prepare me for a job—at least not the kind of job they're willing to give to a woman!
He: What do you want to do, start out as a personnel manager?

She: That's probably what he was afraid of, that I'd take his job.

He: Listen, I don't give a damn what you do! I wish you'd just get home and cook my dinner. I never know what time you're going to be home anymore!

She: And that's all you care about—whether or not you get fed! Well, why couldn't you have made dinner tonight?

He: That's your job!

She: Oh! No! It's not! My job is going to be as personnel assistant. You think just because I'm a woman I'm cut out for just one job—to be your chief cook and bottle washer! Well, if you can choose your job, then I can choose mine. And what's more, you're going to have to learn to take a share in household responsibilities. I can't do everything myself!

He: Damnit! I'm hungry!
APPENDIX IV

EXPECTATIONS SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

Instructions:

The purpose of this study is to measure the meanings of certain things to various people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you. On each page you will find concepts to be judged and a set of scales for each. You are to rate the concept on each of these scales in order.

Here is how you are to use these scales:

If you feel that the concept is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check as follows:

fair X:____:____:____:____:____ unfair

or

fair ____:____:____:____:____:X unfair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the other end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check as follows:

strong ____:X:____:____:____:____ weak

or

strong ____:____:____:____:____:X ____ weak
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If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

```
active ___:___:X:___:___:___ passive
```

or

```
active ___:___:___:X:___:___ passive
```

The direction toward which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging. If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check in the middle space:

```
safe ___:___:___:X:___:___:___ dangerous
```

**IMPORTANT:**

(1) Place your checks in the middle of spaces, not on the boundaries;

**THIS:**

```
___:___:X:___:___:___
```

**NOT THIS:**

```
___:___:X:___:___:___
```

(2) Be sure you check every scale for every concept—do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check on a single scale. Sometimes you may feel as though you've had the same item before on the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through the items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test.
Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items, that we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

### THE IDEAL WIFE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>submissive</th>
<th>dominant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>casual</td>
<td>intense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timely</td>
<td>untimely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rich</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obstinate</td>
<td>vacillating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful</td>
<td>mature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuing</td>
<td>avoiding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indiscriminate</td>
<td>critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenacious</td>
<td>yielding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>cowardly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud</td>
<td>soft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impulsive</td>
<td>deliberate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep</td>
<td>shallow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confined</td>
<td>liberated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent</td>
<td>not intelligent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tense</td>
<td>relaxed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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complex simple
angelic diabolic
educated not educated
unsociable sociable
conventional unconventional
eager indifferent
hot cold
unusual usual
uninfluential influential
thrifty generous
unexpressive expressive
ornate plain
believing skeptical
approaching receding
successful unsuccessful
traditional nontraditional
noncompetitive competitive
idealistic pragmatic
subdued outgoing
heterogeneous homogeneous
docile aggressive
famous obscure
serious humorous
masculine feminine
perfect imperfect
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moving _____________ still
sensitive _____________ insensitive
predictable _____________ unpredictable
rational _____________ intuitive
lasting _____________ transient
leading _____________ following
superior _____________ inferior
controlled _____________ autonomous
rugged _____________ delicate
active _____________ passive
slow _____________ fast
powerless _____________ powerful
tough _____________ fragile
orthodox _____________ unorthodox
changeable _____________ stable
impelling _____________ resisting
public _____________ private
potent _____________ impotent
constrained _____________ free
sophisticated _____________ naive
subservient _____________ masterful
humble _____________ proud
dependent _____________ independent
ambitious _____________ complacent
works _____________ stays at home
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unequal ___:___:___:___:___ equal
emotional ___:___:___:___:___ unemotional

Please also answer the following questions:

1. How do you feel about women working outside the home?
opposed ___:___:___:___:___ approved

2. In relation to homemaking, how do you regard the wife's
career?
secondary ___:___:___:___:___ more important

3. If the wife works, should the husband help with house-
hold tasks?
   yes ___:___:___:___:___ no

4. What would you advise young women about combining
career, marriage, and family?
   definitely not recommend ___:___:___:___:___ recommend

5. Who should have the final say about how the family
income is spent?
husband ___:___:___:___:___ wife

6. Who should have the final say about how the house is
run?
husband ___:___:___:___:___ wife

7. Who should have the final say about your family's social
and recreational activities?
husband ___:___:___:___:___ wife
8. Who should have responsibility for disciplining your children?
   husband _______ wife

9. Who should be more important in your family?
   husband _______ wife

10. Whose professional activities are more important?
    husband's _______ wife's

11. Whose friends do you interact with socially?
    husband's _______ wife's

12. How frequently should the wife interact with her friends or professional associates without her husband accompanying her?
    rarely _______ frequently

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Name or Number_____________________________ Date________
Address____________________________________
Telephone No._________ Age______ Sex________
Marital Status_________ No. of Years Married_______
No. of Children_______ Religious Affiliation________
Occupation___________________________________
Highest Level of Education Attained______________

SOME ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE WIFE

1. How important is it to you to have your husband's approval of decisions you make?
   necessary _______ unnecessary
2. What would your response be if your husband asked you to give up your job (career)?

    refuse _______ readily agree

3. How do you feel about household tasks?

    enjoyable _______ drudgery
Category 1: Agreeing and Rewarding (Accepting Other)  
Showing Sensitivity to Self and Other’s Behavior  
Solidarity (Empathy), Strategy of Cooperation

Raising or enhancing the other's status; giving approval or encouragement; any statement, question, or comment in which the intent is to sustain, reassure, or bolster the status of the other. Examples: "That's fine," "You've done a good job," "Swell," "You've covered a lot of ground today."

Complimenting, congratulating, showing approval of the other, giving credit to the other, showing enthusiasm for his views, applauding or cheering him. Expressing gratitude or appreciation; showing admiration, esteem, or respect, wonder, awe, or reverence. Giving support, reassurance. Concurrence in a proposed course of action or assent to a suggestion the other has made. Examples, "I second the motion," "Let's do that."

Includes any act in which the actor either verbally or overtly complies with a request or suggestion, obliges the other, conforms with some direction or desire of the other, cooperates with an order, or does as he has been requested. The carrying out of any activity which has been decided by the group or the other is included. Yielding, obeying, following, or desisting from some activity when requested are
included; but passively submitting to an overt aggressive act by the other is classified in Category 41. Includes agreement. Examples: "I think you are right about that," "Yes, that's true," "Precisely." Similarly includes agreement, approval, or endorsement of an expression of value, feeling, or sentiment. Examples: "That's right." Includes such comments as: "That's good," "Yes," "I agree," "O.K.," "M-humn," "You're right." Includes giving specific signs of attention to what the other is saying as he goes along, as a means of encouraging him to say what he wishes, by nodding the head, saying "I see." Includes showing comprehension, understanding, or insight after a period of puzzlement and subsequent explanation by the other. Examples: "Oh, I see," "Sure, now I get it." Includes any indication of a permissive attitude, where the other is led to understand that he is accepted "as he is," so that the incorrectness of his solution to any problem or the quality of his performance does not adversely affect his status, so that he can "make mistakes without blame," and is reassured that he does not need to feel anxious. The use of the tactics of openness and sharing without regard to the permitting of activity on request of the other; includes all acts in which the actor gives the other freedom to do something, consents to a request, condones, countenances, or legalizes some activity of the other; in which he grants a privilege, abrogates or sets aside a custom or requirement for the other, excuses,
forgiven, pardons, or exonerates the other from the blame of some misdeed. Open and honest communication; empathizing with each other's needs.

Any indication that the actor identifies himself with the other, or confides in him, or entrusts the self to him. Any act of adherence where the actor chooses to be a fellow member with the other, any act of making a covenant, or of forming an alliance, any act of adhering to the other or becoming a partisan on his behalf, is included. "I can see how you feel," is an example. The showing of sympathy, compassion. The use of the term, "we." Any act where the actor urges unity or harmony, agreement, cooperation, mutual obligation, or expresses other values of solidarity is included. A reliance upon a strategy of mutual problem-solving in cases of disagreement or antagonism between two or more others; the suggesting of a cooperative strategy. Examples: "I feel the same way you do," "I hope so, too." Includes admitting an error or oversight, admitting that some objection or disapproval of the other is valid, conceding a point to the other. Includes introductory phrases which anticipate disagreement of the other and attempt to forestall it by admitting the point in advance. Examples: "Now I may be wrong about this...." "This is not an important point, perhaps...." When actor admits responsibility for some act which has been inconvenient, unjust, or unfair to another. Includes activity in which the actor attempts, by
inference or reasoning, in a primarily objective way, to understand, diagnose, or interpret his own motivation or the "why" of his own behavior. In a practical problem situation, any assessment or evaluation of the effectiveness or efficiency of one's past action is included, as when the actor reflectively examines a plan he has just tried out, or when he examines his own rehearsal or role-playing of future action. Any statement or indication that the person sees patterns and relationships in his own motivation, conduct, or verbal production is included so long as it indicates to the observer an attempt at a logical and reasoned explanation rather than a self-defensive rationalization of conduct. Examples: "I must have been so mad at him that I didn't see he was trying to help me," "Probably I don't realize how nervous I am in situations like that," "I can see now that I totally misjudged the situation." Statements which involve only simple recall or reporting about one's experience, without inference, are classified in Category 20. Attempts to diagnose or interpret the other. Activity in this category is distinguished from activity in Category 20 in that it involves inference or interpretation rather than a simple report, reflection, or rephrasing. Examples: "I probably would have been just like the husband." This category also includes such statements as: "I felt pretty downhearted about that time," "They all thought I was crazy," "This secretly pleased me."
Category 2: Showing Tension Release
(Creating a Non-threatening Atmosphere)

A friendly comment on the weather or some other matter of common interest to "break the ice" and start a conversation. A trusting and non-defensive attitude; a non-threatening environment. Includes expressions of feeling better after a period of tension, any manifestation of cheerfulness, buoyance, satisfaction, gratification, contentment, enjoyment, relish, zest, enthusiasm, pleasure, delight, joy, happiness. Positive responses to a compliment, appearing to be charmed. Any indication that the actor is thrilled, elated, ecstatic, euphoric. Includes the making of friendly jokes, trying to amuse or entertain; any jovial, jocular, humorous, funny, frivolous, "silly," nonsensical remark, whether spontaneous or in an attempt to smooth over some tense situation. Clowning, bantering, "kidding," the other in a friendly fashion are included. More active "horseplay" or "rough-housing," so long as the element of aggression is not too obviously present, are included. The attempt must indicate some sensitivity to the readiness of others to laugh, otherwise the observer concludes that the actor is excessively ego-involved and places the abortive attempt in Category 42 as an indication of anxiety or in Category 41 as an indication of status seeking, according to his judgment. Positive responses to joking, such as smiling, grinning, giggling, chortling, chuckling, or laughing are included.
Category 20: Giving Suggestion, Direction, Orientation
Implying Autonomy for Other (Directing Other in Present
Situation); Giving Opinion, Evaluation, Analysis
Expressing Feeling, Wishes; Giving Information
Repeating, Clarifying, Confirming, Reflecting

Includes cases where suggestive orientation is given
to the other as to what kind of activity is expected of him
in the immediate future under some given conditions, as
when a client comes into a counseling situation, or in a
situation of instruction or briefing preliminary to coopera-
tive activity, such as the setting up of a hypothetical
example or situation for exploration or demonstration where
the actor proposes or suggests how the situation is to be
defined, the purpose and nature of the roles to be taken,
gives instructions or makes proposals about the task, showing
where, when, how, why, something is to be done. Examples:
"We will have to stop at the end of the hour," "Consider for
a moment what would happen if...." "Suppose we set up the
following situation...." Includes direct attempts to guide
or to counsel the other regarding some immediate activity,
exhort him, urge, enjoin, or inspire him to some action.
Includes the exercise of routine or established and accepted
control, or control which is exercised in such a way that it
is clear that the right of request rests ultimately on the
free consent of the other, and the other retains the residual
right to protest or modify acts in which a recognized leader
requests the other to do things as a part of the routine
mechanics of group management or group determined goals. The
leader's requests may be unsolicited by the other and yet anticipate conformance on the part of the other, on the assumption that the leader is acting as a legitimate agent and instrument of the group. The assignment of tasks. Where leadership is not implied, small emotionally neutral requests of the actor to the other are included, such as "Would you hand me the ash tray, please?"

Includes all indications of thought-in-process leading to an understanding or dawning insight, such as introspection, reasoning, reckoning, calculating, thinking, musing, cogitating, or concentrating. The actual statement of the hypothesis. Further logical elaboration, exploration, or testing of the hypothesis or diagnosis is included, whether by example, analogy, analysis or cause and effect relations, symbolic or categorical labeling, or by any sort of logical, intuitive, or conjectural process. The inferential and evaluative element distinguishes acts in the present category. Includes acts of expressing or enunciating feelings or sentiments in the optative mood. Examples: "I think..." "It's my opinion that..." Includes all statements about the nature of the outer situation facing the group as a whole, which are essentially inferential, hypothetical, a matter of opinion or plausible interpretation, but which are not suggestions for solving the problem.

Calling attention to what one is going to say, or pointing out the relevance of what one is saying or doing;
any reference back to what one has already said; the giving of any routine signal that one is beginning a new phase of activity or a new focus of effort, or signifying the end of a phase. Examples: "There are two points I'd like to make," "In the first place..." "Now with regard to our problem of..." "What I am about to say relates to..." Efforts to prevent or repair breaks in the flow of communication include repeating, clarifying confusion about something said, explaining, enlarging, summarizing, restating, not with the purpose of convincing or carrying the argument further, but simply with the purpose of making communication and orientation to process more adequate. Includes any reflective looking back on past activity of the group, or any preparatory looking forward, as in the reviewing of items on an agenda which have already been decided. Includes activity in which the actor simply reports without inference or tells about some past thought, feeling, action, or experience of his own, either spontaneously, or in response to questions. Only statements about the self which are essentially non-inferential, however, and comparatively neutral in emotional tone are included here. Includes showing an understanding of the other or something the other has said by restating, reporting the essential content of what he has said, reflecting the content or feeling back to him, rephrasing, accepting and clarifying the feeling involved, without, however, resorting to inference or interpretation beyond that given
by the subject himself. It includes putting the ideas, feelings, or affective tone in somewhat clearer or more recognizable form, with the intent of aiding the other in the formulation or reformulation of his problem, but the inference must be minimal. Includes statements of fact about the nature of the outer situation facing the group which are essentially objective, straight-forward, non-inferential, non-emotionally toned, descriptive observations or empirical generalizations which are recognized as generally established or easily confirmed by observation. Includes factual information given gratuitously, as in a lecture or in tutoring, in the process of conveying knowledge where there is the implication that the other wants to know or needs to know something the actor can tell him.

Category 30: Asking for Suggestion, Direction and Orientation; Asking for Opinion, Evaluation Analysis, Expression of Feeling; Asking for Information, Repetition, and Clarification

Includes all questions or requests, explicit or implicit, for suggestions as to how action shall proceed through the utilization of concrete ways and means to goals in the immediate future time perspective. Requests for suggestions as to where to start, what to do next, what to decide. Examples: "I don't know what to do," "Where are we?" "Where do we stand now?"

Includes open-ended, non-directive leads and questions aimed at the exploration or intensification-through-expression
of the other's feelings, values, intentions, and inclinations. Includes any kind of question which attempts to encourage a statement or reaction on the part of the other without limiting the nature of the response except in a very general way, with the implication that the other has freedom to express interest or disinterest, where he is not put under pressure to agree or disagree, or to come to any predetermined answers, type of answer, or attitude. Example: "What do you think (i.e., feel)?" Includes questions, statements, or responses which seek an inferential interpretation, hypothesis, diagnosis, or further analysis of some idea from the other, his definition of the situation, or opinion on some topic in a non-threatening or objective manner. The actor may wish to get the other's interpretation or opinion as an aid where there is no known answer and only conjecture is possible.

Includes acts which indicate or express a lack of knowledge sufficient to support action; confusion or uncertainty about the position of the group with regard to its goals, the course of the discussion to the present point, about what has been said or is going on, about the meaning of a word or phrase, even though the actor has been present and has been paying attention. Includes the appearance of any attitude the observer would describe as puzzled, bewildered, baffled, stumped, fuddled, or obfuscated. Verbal examples: "What?" "What was that?" "I didn't quite understand you," "Would you
repeat that?" "I don't quite get what you mean." Includes
direct or outright questions which require the giving of a
factual rather than an inferential answer; i.e., an answer
which can be judged as true or false on the basis of simple
observation, or which is generally accepted as a matter of
convention. Also includes less focalized, or more indefi-
nite expressions of a lack of knowledge or cognitive clarity
sufficient to support action; i.e., instances in which the
requesting or asking is only implicit. Examples: "I don't
know about this," "It isn't clear to me," "It may be true,
or it may not be." The questions or requests, whether ex-
plicit or only implicit, can be about the outer situation
facing the group, about the group itself, its structure or
organization, or about another person. Example: "Who is in
charge of the arrangements for the next meeting?"

Category 41: Rejecting Statements, Formality, Aloofness
Rigidity; Showing Antagonism, Aggression
Deflating Other's Status, (Rejecting Other
Defending Self), Strategy of Power
Deception, Appeals, Submitting
Passively to Aggression
Surrendering, Giving in
with Attitude of Defeat
Manipulative Acts

Includes any indication of an attitude which the ob-
server considers over-cool, frigid, inexpensive, unsmiling.
Any situation in which an emotional response would be ex-
pected, where the actor refuses to give applause, or is
unappreciative, unacknowledging, ungrateful, unallured, "hard
to please," "hard to get," is included. Includes passive forms of rejection, such as remaining immobile, rigid, restrained, silent, close-mouthed, uncommunicative, inexpressive, impassive, imperturbable, reticent, responseless, in the face of overtures of the other (but this silence must be distinguished from the silence ensuing from a refusal to face up to a problem, which is classified in Category 44). Includes any passive withholding of love or friendship, any indication that the actor is psychologically insulated, detached, isolated, indifferent, disinterested, impersonal, aloof, formal, distant, unsocial, reserved, secluded, unapproachable, exclusive, or forbidding. Refraining from intimacies and confidences where the other appears to be seeking this kind of response is included. Includes any act in which the actor appears to be skeptical, dubious, cautious about accepting the proposal, hesitant, critical, suspicious, or distrustful. Includes any of the defensive forms of disagreement, disbelief, astonishment, amazement, or incredulity regarding reports and observations, inferences or diagnoses or interpretations made by the other. More marked forms of strictly ideational disagreement are also included, as when the actor amends or corrects another's description of the situation, his interpretation or diagnosis, contradicts something the other has said. Does not include disapproval of an expression of value or feeling if very mild and confined to the actual expression or suggestion, and it is made plain by
some means that the disapproval does not extend to the other as a person. Includes failing to pay attention when the other is speaking, failing to give a requested repetition, disregarding the other, ignoring a request of any kind or a complaint, by direct evasion, postponement of answer without expressed reason or consideration for the other, equivocation, delay, noncommittal hedging. More generally, includes any refusal to act which frustrates the other, thwarts, balks, blocks, obstructs, or puts barriers in the way; any behavior which restrains, hinders, limits the ongoing activity of the other, confines, constrains, or stands in his way, or which renders his efforts vain, upsets his plans, forestalls, contravene, foils, or checkmates him. Includes any act of withholding resources, the manifestation of any attitude which the observer interprets as possessive, retentive, retractive, or secretive. Any act in which the other is denied something requested, in which the actor disappoints the other, refuses to let the other participate in some satisfaction or have access to some resource may be included here, if the aggressive tone is comparatively high. If the actor has made a suggestion, and someone else in the meantime has disagreed with him, when the actor returns to defend or restate his original definition of the situation or proposal, his return is marked in this category as disagreement. (In general, only the defensive reaction of disagreement is marked in the present category, when the disagreement is essentially
emotional. The arguments which follow, in the form of statements about the situation, analyses of the facts, alternative suggestions, rhetorical questions, etc., are scored in their respective categories. Example: "I don't think so. It seems to me that there were more than that. In fact, I remember seeing at least five." In the foregoing statement only "I don't think so," would be scored in the present category. The argument which follows in support is broken up and scored in the categories above as usual.) Includes rigidity in the sense of maintaining previous behavior in the face of attempts by the other to change one's behavior. Example: "I said it before and I'll say it again...." Includes any response to an attempt at control in which the actor shows active autonomy, is noncompliant, unwilling, or disobliging, where he resists some effort or imagined effort of a superior other to take some satisfaction from him. Includes any behavior in which the actor defies authority, is negativistic, stubborn, resistant, obstinate, refractory, contrary, sulky, or sullen. Includes shrugging the shoulders, avoiding or quitting activities prescribed by authority, resisting coercion and restriction, trying in any manner to shake off restraint or get free. Includes any behavior which works against or circumvents authority, in which the actor shows independence, nonsubmission, nonconformity, is disobedient, insubordinate, rebellious, irresponsible, willful, obstreperous, unrestrained, disorderly. Any stubborn refusal
to admit guilt, inferiority, or weakness. A rigidity of behavior; a refusal to change goals (expectations) or actions.

Includes attempts to control, regulate, govern, direct, or supervise in a manner in which freedom of choice or consent for the other person is either greatly limited or nonexistent, with the implication that the other has no right to protest or modify the demand but is expected to follow the directive immediately without argument; a command. Includes the arbitrary assignment of a role, the location or relocation of the other, a defining or restricting of the other's powers by fiat, demands or commands such as "Come here!" "Stop that!" "Hurry up!" "Get out!" Any act in which the actor peremptorily beckons, points, pushes, pulls, or otherwise directly controls or attempts to control the activity of the other is included. More extreme acts of dismissal or expulsion, where the actor evicts, discharges, cashiers, banishes the other are included. Includes any act in which the observer interprets the attitude of the actor to be overbearing, dogmatic, assertive, imperious, inconsiderate, or severe. Includes arbitrary attempts to lay down principles of conduct, standards, or laws, arbitrary attempts to judge or settle an argument, to give a decision, to force, compel, coerce, subdue, subject, tame, master, dominate. In other words, an increasing reliance upon a strategy of power and the use of the tactics of threat, coercion, and deception.
Includes acts in which the actor prohibits the other from doing something; represses the other; prescribes some activity, interdicts, taboos; gives warning, threats. Includes aggressive acts such as carping, harping, griping, nagging, badgering, harassing, annoying, perturbing, disturbing, or pesterling the other. (Status deflating acts!) On the milder side includes conspicuous attempts to override the other in conversation, interrupting the other, interfering with his speaking, gratuitously finishing his sentence for him when the other does not want help, insisting on finishing, warding off interruption. With regard to active attacks or deflation of the other's status, any implication of inferiority or incompetence on the part of the other is included, such as appraising the other contemptuously, belittling, depreciating disparaging, ridiculing, minimizing the other, reducing his remarks to absurdity, making fun of him. Includes any acts in which the actor would be described as maliciously sarcastic, satirical, ironical, in which the actor lampoons, caricatures, burlesques the other, or becomes unduly and insultingly familiar. Includes teasing, taunting, heckling, gloating, crowing, jeering, scoffing, mocking, sneering, bedeviling, goading, baiting, or provoking the other to say something indiscreet or damaging. Includes damning the other, finding fault with him, complaining, criticizing him; any act that would be interpreted as abusive, accusatory, acrimonious. Includes making charges against the other,
imputing unworthy motives to him, blaming him, denouncing him, excoriating, berating, prosecuting, ill-treating, or browbeating him. Includes any act of gossip; any libel, slander, smirching of the other's character; branding him with undesirable characteristics; demeaning him; tattling against him; informing against him; exposing him; or undermining his position; maligning, or discrediting him; placing him at a disadvantage or oppugning him. Includes tricking, hoaxing, duping, fleecing, hazing, humiliating the other or rendering him conspicuous. With regard to disapproval, includes acts ranging from mild forms of disapproval, such as reprimanding the other, blaming him, scolding him, admonishing or reminding him of his duty, on to more extreme forms, such as indications that the actor is shocked, indignant, appalled, scandalized at something the other has done, and shows horror or disgust. Includes any indication that the actor is indignant, offended, insulted, affronted. Includes indications of moral indignation, such as a grim appearance, appearing incensed, irate, outraged, infuriated. Includes pontifical, ceremonious, self-opinionated, self-important, self-righteous, self-satisfied, self-complacent, or smug. Includes any act which would be regarded as haughty, proud, vain, arrogant, "uppish," snobbish, self-admiring, self-conceited, presumptuous, condescending, or disdainful. (Status defending acts:) Includes any act in which the actor suppresses, conceals, hides, fails to mention,
or justifies something which is considered discreditable, such as inaptitude, ignorance, a defect, some misdeed, failure, or humiliation. Includes any act of defending or protecting the self, one's sentiments, or theories against assault, criticism, or blame, in an ego-involved way. Commitment: a need to justify one's actions. Includes any act of self-vindication or exculpation, such as explaining, excusing, justifying, offering extenuations for or rationalization of inferiority, guilt, or failure; giving alibis; any act of disavowal; disacknowledging guilt; any disclaiming, denial. (Status seeking acts:) Includes any act in which the actor is self-assertive from a position which has the implication of lower status; in which he tries to impress the other with his importance, tries to be seen or heard; in which he pushes himself forward, dramatizes himself, poses as a unique, mysterious, incalculable person. Includes any behavior which the observer regards as exhibitionistic, spectacular, or conspicuous. Includes attempts to excite, amaze, fascinate, entertain, shock, intrigue, or amuse the other as a means of raising one's own status. Includes any behavior in which the observer regards the subject as "acting," showing off, seeking applause or approbation, playing the clown, especially the making of jokes which fall flat or do not provoke a general laugh. Includes attempts to attract attention by mannerisms, expressive gestures, emphatic or extravagant speech, posturing, posing for effect, displaying the
self, seeking the limelight, bragging, boasting, strutting, blustering. Includes praising the self, glorifying, exalting, applauding, approving, or advertising the self. Includes any act in which the actor tries to outdo the other, shows rivalry. Includes the manifestation of any attitude the observer would interpret as aggressive, combative, belligerent, pugnacious, quarrelsome, or argumentative. Includes any indication of intolerance, malevolence, such as glaring, frowning, cursing, fuming, hissing, jostling, pushing, having a fit of rage, screaming, kicking, scratching. Includes moving or speaking in a threatening manner, challenging, defying, attacking, assailing, assaulting, hitting, striking, beating, fighting the other. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as resentful, vengeful, vindictive, or retaliative. Includes any indication of envy, jealousy, covetousness, cupidity, avarice, acquisitiveness at the expense of the other, or attempts to take something away from the other. Includes allowing the self to be talked down, surrendering, giving in, acknowledging defeat, renouncing a goal or object in favor of the other who demands it, taking a back seat, letting the other push by aggressively and have the best. Includes any act in which the actor submits passively; allows himself to be bullied, dispossessed of objects; where he accepts coercion, domination, injury, blame, criticism, censure, punishment, without retaliation, rebuttal, rebellion, or complaint.
Any acts of atonement in which the actor does something to expiate guilt, or humiliates himself, any action which shows that he is apologetic, contrite, penitent, is included. Passing on to more extreme forms, blaming, belittling, and mutilating the self are included. Any act which could be described as self-dissatisfied, -critical, -depreciating, -accusing, -exposing, -convicting, -condemning, -dispraising, -disparaging, -reproving, -reproachful, -upbraiding, -scornful, -degrading, -humiliating, -contemptuous, or self-destroying is included. Any act which the observer interprets as an attempt to place the responsibility for the solution of one's own problems on the other or on the group is included, such as asking for aid, advice, support, asking for or appealing to the other's good nature, mercy, forbearance. Includes acts in which the actor flatters, cajoles, or attempts to appease the other, where he insincerely abases himself, cowes, curries favor, or is servile with the purpose of obtaining ulterior ends; where he attempts to shame the other into some kind of desired behavior by acting as if injured, hurt, martyred, or put upon, but in the judgment of the observer does not actually feel the emotion which he pretends to display. Includes any act in which the actor petitions, pleads, begs, or beseeches the other for some favor. The telling of misfortunes, hardships, accidents, failures, with the intention of arousing sympathy is included. Bewailing, whining, weeping, attempting to move the
other to pity are included. Attempts to exaggerate an
injury, illness, or symptom of any kind; complaints of being
miserable, depressed, sad, worried, tired, are included.
The manifestation of any attitude which the observer inter-
prets as insecure, helpless, tearful, sniffing, self-pity-
ing, plaintive, suppliant, succorant, or dependent is in-
cluded. Showing any kind of need to be supported, nursed,
sustained, protected.

Category 42: Showing or Creating Tension, Frustration
Over-reaction, Anxiety (Threatening Atmosphere)

Includes all sorts of non-focal manifestations of
impatience, indications that the subject feels strained, on
edge, restless, restive, keyed-up, agitated. The appear-
ance of various "nervous habits"—doodling, self-grooming,
fiddling, biting the nails, playing with some object—are
included but not able to be observed via audio-tape record-
ing. Includes any manifestation or indication to the observ-
er that the actor is startled, disconcerted, alarmed, dis-
mayed, perturbed, concerned, qualmish, or has misgivings
about something he has done or intends to do. Any show of
anxious emotionality, such as hesitation, speechlessness,
any indication of flurry, fluster, trembling, blushing,
flushing, stammering, stuttering, verbal disjunctivity,
sweating, "blocking up," gulping, swallowing, or wetting the
lips persistently is included. Includes any verbal or motor
expression of fear, apprehension, worry, dread, fright,
terror, or panic. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as overcautious, over wary, where the actor is overhesitant about undertaking some action, hangs back, shuns, evades, or shrinks from a perilous situation, or refrains from action because of fear of failure. Any behavior which the observer interprets as overprudent, careful, vigilant, tense, abashed, timid, shy, self-distrustful, self-effacing, or self-conscious is included. Wherever the actor seems to be overanxious, inhibited, fearful of blame, sensitive about, or concerned about the good opinion of others; is overcareful to do nothing that will annoy, antagonize, or alienate the affections of others; these indications are scored in this category. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would interpret as overscrupulous, unobjectionable, conscientious, conventional, dutiful, apparently because of fear of provoking opposition or hostility. Appearing to be embarrassed, fussed, sheepish, chagrined, chapfallen, crestfallen, chastened, at a loss, mortified are included in this category. Moaning or cringing; covering the face with the hands; any act which indicates a consciousness of guilt; or any indication that the subject is furtive, ashamed, morose, depressed, or remorseful is included. Any indication on the part of the actor that his effort has failed; that some problems confronting him in his earlier efforts still remain; expressions of feeling frustrated, thwarted, or deprived are
included in this category; unless they are expressed in some more specifically socially oriented way as formulated in other categories. Whenever the observer interprets that the actor is dissatisfied, discontented, disappointed, displeased; and these feelings are expressed only in a diffuse way, with no special social object; the indications are scored here. Includes expressions of unhappiness; any indication that the actor is discouraged, disheartened, disconsolate. Includes any appearance of brooding. Includes the manifestation of any attitude which the observer would regard as indicating that the actor is "on his guard," has a "chip on his shoulder," such as interpreting a harmless remark as a slur, bristling when criticized, protesting, asserting one's own claims. Includes any manifestation of an emotional reaction to another which the observer would interpret as touchy, irritable; in which the actor appears to be provoked; in which he shows annoyance, irritation, heat, or has a temper tantrum. Includes misperception and defensiveness; an increased sensitivity to differences and threats, while minimizing the awareness of similarities.

Category 44: Withdrawal, Denial of Conflict
(Avoidance of Conflict), Blaming Outside Sources
Not Sticking to Topic

Physically leaving, talking about subjects other than the problem, saying the problem is not relevant for them, saying the problem is caused by society, saying there is
nothing they can do about it—that it's out of their control. Includes any behavior which indicates to the observer that the actor is unattentive, bored, or psychologically withdrawn from the problem at hand; slouching, yawning, closing the eyes, day-dreaming, looking away, letting the eyes wander (but these behaviors are distinguished from behaviors in Category 41 in that the behavior must appear to be a withdrawal rather than an aggression to be classified in Category 44). Includes the manifestation of any attitude the observer would interpret as listless, languid, bemused, absorbed, abstracted, adream, unaware, oblivious to others. More overt withdrawal such as giving notice, leaving, deserting, quitting, retiring are included. More extreme forms of autistic, subjective or socially irrelevant behaviors or responses which indicate a lack of contact with what is going on, such as talking to the self, or mumbling. Any indication of non-responsiveness or reclusiveness may be classified in this category. A lack of communication; a refusal to communicate or a process of talking at one another instead of with each other.

Ground Rules:

1. No double coding.

2. Put a line across page at point where the experimenter leaves the room.
3. Don't rate silences and can't rate non-verbal communications.

4. Rate each statement, phrase, or introjection as separate.

5. View each act as a response to the last act or as an anticipation of the next act. (The immediate, last mentioned, or next anticipated social act of the other takes precedence over the more generalized social context.)

6. Favor the category more distant from the middle. Classify the act in the category nearer the top or the bottom of the list. (Example: If one person says, "It's hot today," and the other smiles and responds "Over ninety," the possible dilemma is between classifying in terms of the function of giving information, or in terms of showing agreement, or in terms of showing still more active solidarity. Resolve these competing demands by favoring the category most distant from the middle, and classify it in Category 1.
APPENDIX VI

T VALUES OF PILOT STUDY
USING DUNN'S MARRIAGE ROLE EXPECTATIONS INVENTORY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Homemaking t Value</th>
<th>Authority t Value</th>
<th>Care of Child t Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working wives vs. Housewives (under 30)</td>
<td>2.934*</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>1.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working wives vs. Housewives (over 40)</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>1.659</td>
<td>.679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working wives (under 30 vs. over 40)</td>
<td>.739</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>2.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01 two-tailed
QUESTIONS ON AREAS OF CONFLICT

1. How do you feel about women working outside the home?

2. In relation to homemaking, how do you regard the wife’s career?

3. If the wife works, should the husband help with household tasks?

4. What would you advise young women about combining career, marriage, and family?
5 Who should have the final say about how the family income is spent?

6 Who should have the final say about how the house is run?

7 Who should have the final say about your family's social and recreational activities?

8 Who should have responsibility for disciplining your children?
9 Who should be more important in your family?

10 Whose professional activities are more important?

11 Whose friends do you interact with socially?

12 How frequently should the wife interact with her friends or professional associates without her husband accompanying her?
SOME ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR THE WIFE

1. How important is it to you to have your husband's approval of decisions you make?

   ![Graph showing a scale from necessary to unnecessary.]

2. What would your response be if your husband asked you to give up your job (career)?

   ![Graph showing a scale from refuse to readily agree.]

3. How do you feel about household tasks?

   ![Graph showing a scale from enjoyable to drudgery.]

APPENDIX VIII

EXPECTATIONS SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluate</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>timely-untimely</td>
<td>deliberate-impulsive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuing-avoiding</td>
<td>complex-simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent-not intelligent</td>
<td>moving-still</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated-not educated</td>
<td>active-passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeptical-believing</td>
<td>fast-slow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful-unsuccessful</td>
<td>unemotional-emotional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superior-inferior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical-indiscriminate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaching-receding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influential-uninfluential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenacious-yielding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave-cowardly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep-shallow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong-weak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough-fragile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potent-impotent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-constrained</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unusual-usual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rational-intuitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unorthodox-orthodox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud-soft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager-indifferent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-docile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading-following</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive-noncompetitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud-humble</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Palmer Items Added to Preceding Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative</th>
<th>Potency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expressive-unexpressive</td>
<td>dominant-submissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works-stays at home</td>
<td>masterful-subservient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal-unequal</td>
<td>outgoing-subdued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>liberated-confined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>autonomous-controlled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ambitious-complacent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>powerful-powerless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rugged-delicate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>independent-dependent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Novelty</th>
<th>Stability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unconventional-conventional</td>
<td>nontraditional-traditional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX IX

### ROTATED FACTOR LOADINGS FOR ESD ITEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Osgood Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong-weak(potency)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deep-shallow(potency)</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-constrained(potency)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving-still(activity)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave-cowardly(potency)</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active-passive(activity)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast-slow(activity)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pursuing-avoiding(eval.)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>influential-uninfluential(eval.)</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive-docile(agg.)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rational-intuitive(stability)</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud-humble(unassigned)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tough-fragile(potency)</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unorthodox-orthodox(stability)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leading-following(agg.)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>superior-inferior(eval.)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenacious-yielding(potency)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unusual-usual(novelty)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>critical-indiscriminate(eval.)</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loud-soft(receptivity)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>-.44</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive-noncompetitive(unass.)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex-simple(activity)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educated-not educated(eval.)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deliberate-impulsive(activity)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaching-receding(eval.)</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eager-indifferent(receptivity)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful-unsuccessful(eval.)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance: 7.0% 8.9% 18.8% 7.4% 11.0%

Total Variance = 53.1%
### APPENDIX IX—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Palmer Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ambitious-complacent (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerful-powerless (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masterful-subservient (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expressive-unexpressive (eval.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outgoing-subdued (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberated-con fined (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal-unequal (eval.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unconventional-conven, (novelty)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nontraditional-trad. (stability)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rugged-delicate (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works-stays at home (eval,)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant-submissive (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent-dependent (potency)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Variance

| Total Variance = 76.8%                        | 9.7%  | 31.3% | 14.3% | 7.4% | 8.1% |
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