PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

Power, Commitment and Satisfaction in
University Dating Relationships

M.H. Victoria Mowat

1994

Presented to the Department of Psychology in
partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the Master of Arts degree

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

**THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN
IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE
LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL
LIBRARY OF CANADA TO
REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR
SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY
ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR
FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS
AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED
PERSONS.**

**L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE
IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE
PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE
NATIONALE DU CANADA DE
REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER
OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA
THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET
SOUS QUEL QUE FORME QUE CE SOIT
POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE
CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES
PERSONNE INTERESSEES.**

**THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP
OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER
THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR
SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT
MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE
REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER
PERMISSION.**

**L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE
DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE
SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES
EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-
CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU
AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON
AUTORISATION.**

ISBN 0-315-98518-6

Canada

Name VICTORIA NOWAT

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

Psychology
SUBJECT TERM

0451
SUBJECT CODE

U·M·I

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology of 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
 General 0289
 Ancient 0290
 Linguistics 0291
 Modern 0291
Literature 0401
 General 0294
 Classical 0295
 Comparative 0297
 Medieval 0298
 Modern 0316
 African 0591
 Asian 0305
 Canadian (English) 0352
 Canadian (French) 0355
 English 0593
 Germanic 0311
 Latin American 0312
 Middle Eastern 0315
 Romance 0313
 Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion 0318
 General 0321
 Biblical Studies 0319
 Clergy 0320
 History of 0322
 Philosophy of 0469
Theology 0323

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology 0324
 Archaeology 0326
 Cultural 0327
 Physical 0310
Business Administration 0272
 General 0272
 Accounting 0770
 Banking 0454
 Management 0338
 Marketing 0385
Canadian Studies 0501
Economics 0503
 General 0505
 Agricultural 0508
 Commerce-Business 0509
 Finance 0510
 History 0511
 Labor 0358
 Theory 0366
Folklore 0351
Geography 0351
Gerontology 0351
History 0578
 General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0333
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science 0615
 General 0616
 International Law and Relations 0617
 Public Administration 0814
Recreation 0452
Social Work 0626
Sociology 0627
 General 0938
 Criminology and Penology 0631
 Demography 0628
 Ethnic and Racial Studies 0629
 Individual and Family Studies 0630
 Industrial and Labor Relations 0700
 Public and Social Welfare 0344
 Social Structure and Development 0709
 Theory and Methods 0999
Transportation 0453
Urban and Regional Planning 0453
Women's Studies 0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture 0473
 General 0285
 Agronomy 0475
 Animal Culture and Nutrition 0476
 Animal Pathology 0359
 Food Science and Technology 0478
 Forestry and Wildlife 0479
 Plant Culture 0480
 Plant Pathology 0817
 Plant Physiology 0777
 Range Management 0746
 Wood Technology 0306
Biology 0287
 General 0308
 Anatomy 0309
 Biostatistics 0379
 Botany 0329
 Cell 0353
 Ecology 0369
 Entomology 0793
 Genetics 0410
 Limnology 0307
 Microbiology 0317
 Molecular 0416
 Neuroscience 0433
 Oceanography 0821
 Physiology 0778
 Radiation 0472
 Veterinary Science 0786
 Zoology 0760
Biophysics 0425
 General 0996
 Medical 0996

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palynology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences 0566
 General 0300
 Audiology 0992
 Chemotherapy 0567
 Dentistry 0350
 Education 0769
 Hospital Management 0758
 Human Development 0982
 Immunology 0564
 Medicine and Surgery 0347
 Mental Health 0569
 Nursing 0570
 Nutrition 0380
 Obstetrics and Gynecology 0354
 Occupational Health and Therapy 0381
 Ophthalmology 0571
 Pathology 0419
 Pharmacology 0572
 Pharmacy 0362
 Physical Therapy 0573
 Public Health 0574
 Radiology 0575
 Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0383
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences 0485
Chemistry 0749
 General 0486
 Analytical 0487
 Biochemistry 0488
 Inorganic 0738
 Nuclear 0490
 Organic 0491
 Pharmaceutical 0494
 Physical 0495
 Polymer 0754
 Radiation 0405
Mathematics 0605
Physics 0986
 General 0606
 Acoustics 0608
 Astronomy and Astrophysics 0748
 Atomic 0607
 Electronics and Electricity 0798
 Elementary Particles and High Energy 0759
 Fluid and Plasma 0609
 Molecular 0610
 Nuclear 0752
 Optics 0756
 Radiation 0611
 Solid State 0463
Statistics 0346
Applied Sciences 0984
 Applied Mechanics 0984
 Computer Science 0984

Engineering 0537
 General 0538
 Aerospace 0539
 Agricultural 0540
 Automotive 0541
 Biomedical 0542
 Chemical 0543
 Civil 0544
 Electronics and Electrical 0348
 Heat and Thermodynamics 0545
 Hydraulic 0546
 Industrial 0547
 Marine 0794
 Materials Science 0548
 Mechanical 0743
 Metallurgy 0551
 Mining 0552
 Nuclear 0549
 Packaging 0765
 Petroleum 0554
 Sanitary and Municipal System Science 0790
Geotechnology 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
and Research acceptance of the thesis

POWER, COMMITMENT AND SATISFACTION IN
UNIVERSITY DATING RELATIONSHIPS

submitted by M.H. Victoria Mowat, B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

Dr. Roger Wells, Thesis Supervisor

Chair, Department of

Carleton University
October 5, 1994

Power, Commitment and Satisfaction in
University Dating Relationships
Victoria Mowat

Abstract

This research studied the relationship between perceived power, commitment and satisfaction in intimate university relationships over a four month period. The investigation was an amalgamation of several studies, however a longitudinal format was adopted. Generally, it has been found that egalitarian relationships result in higher reported levels of commitment and satisfaction, while traditional, male-dominant relationships are less committed and less happy. Sixty university students (30 men and 30 women) ranging in age from 18-25 years began participation in this study. At the end of the four monthly sessions, 13 women and 20 men remained together with their partners. The hypothesis that an overall perceived egalitarian distribution of power and higher levels of commitment would relate to higher levels of satisfaction was statistically confirmed, however, only egalitarian decision-making structures related to higher commitment for women. Women tended to be higher in their levels of commitment than men, while men perceived their partners as having more power in several of the power areas. There were no differences between those who lasted and those who broke up in the area of satisfaction, or between men and women over time.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Roger Wells, who sparked this whole idea in the first place. Thank you to my other committee members, particularly Dr. Kim Matheson for her continuous statistical help and suggestions throughout. Without their patience and support, this would not have been possible.

To my friends Krista and Andrew for always being there; I owe you dessert. And to my subjects; I am grateful to you all for maintaining your commitment to this study over the past five months.

Lastly, this work is dedicated to my family, and especially Leo, whose never ending love and support carried me more times than he'll ever know.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction and Review of the Literature	1
Chapter 2	Method	40
Chapter 3	Results	46
Chapter 4	Discussion	71
Epilogue		87
References		90
Appendix A:	Commitment Inventory	96
Appendix B:	Satisfaction Scale	103
Appendix C:	Power Scale	106
Appendix D:	Background Questionnaire	115
Appendix E:	Follow-Up Questionnaire	118
Appendix F:	Coding of Appendix E	119
Appendix G:	Informed Consent	120
Appendix H:	Written Debriefing	122

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary of Power and Satisfaction Studies	22
Table 2	Summary of Commitment With Power and Satisfaction Studies	36
Table 3	Subject Attrition Over Each Month	46
Table 4	Subject Expectations for Relationship Over Time	49
Table 5	Discussion of Questionnaires Over Months	50
Table 6	Means for Gender-Duration Interaction on Personal Dedication	53
Table 7	Mean for Gender Effect on Personal Dedication	56
Table 8	Means for Time Effect on Satisfaction	57
Table 9	Means for Gender Effect in Decision Making Authority	61
Table 10	Means Over Time for Contribution Variables ..	62
Table 11	Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables (time 4) for Men and Women	63
Table 12	Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard Function for Survival Without Break-up	68
Table 13	Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard Function for Survival Without Break-up	69

Table 14	Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard	
	Function for Survival Without Break-up	70

CHAPTER 1

Power, Commitment and Satisfaction in University Dating Relationships

Introduction and Review of the Literature

With the emergence of the feminist movement, the changing make-up of marital and intimate relationships has been the focus of much research, particularly over the past two decades. In the past, for example, men's and women's roles in relationships were dichotomous, evident in the number of marital and dating dyads following the traditional formula of men taking the initiative and women being dependent on the "significant" man in their lives. The power distribution in most romantic unions has typically been clear, with the male assuming the power position, usually identified as decision making responsibility in the relationship. This power imbalance has been supported by business, religion, the school system and in many instances, the family (Peplau, 1979).

Much of the research in this area has focused on married couples and has examined either power and satisfaction or satisfaction and commitment. For the purposes of this analysis, the following review of the literature is categorised in terms of theories of power, the relation between power and satisfaction, theories of commitment and finally, the findings on the relation between

power, commitment and satisfaction in both marital and dating relationships. Although some results have been inconsistent, generally, a positive relationship between satisfaction, commitment and an egalitarian balance between partners of intimate relationships has been found to exist.

Theories of Power in Intimate Relationships

One of the major impediments to the research in this area now is the lack of standard definition of relationship power. Consequently, few valid and reliable measurement techniques exist. The term "power", as it is mainly used and accepted in the literature and as it will be used in this research on intimate relationships refers to "one person's ability to influence the behaviour of the other" (Peplau & Miller-Campbell, 1989; Gray-Little & Burks, 1983; Peplau, 1979).

Early research on family power was based on the belief that power processes followed a hierarchical structure, directly analogous to the structure of small groups. Men were assumed to have instrumental influence as a result of being the "bread-winner" of the family and women were expected to carry the responsibility of caring and nurturing the family. This clear division of instrumental and expressive roles between men and women was thought to be required for the maintenance of satisfaction and marital functioning (Haley, 1962). Any relationship not following this pattern was sure to fail. More recently, however,

researchers have focused on marital and family power structures as being more complex than what Haley first proposed.

It has been suggested that power is both behavioural and perceptual. In a heterosexual dyad, obviously two power relations exist; his and hers. Each person may experience the relationship differently and have different perceptions of the existing power distribution. These different perceptions influence how each behaves in the union (Sprecher, 1985). Peplau (1979) found that the overwhelming majority of 231 college students (95% of women and 87% of men) were staunch supporters of an equal distribution of power in their dating relationships even though they rarely grew up in an egalitarian family. Students were asked who had more decision making authority in terms of recreational activities, conversation, sex, time spent together and activities with others. Contrary to what students reported they wanted from their relationships, it was found that only 49% of the women and 42% of the men reported actually having an egalitarian relationship with their dating partner. In most instances, the men had more power. The only area where women had more control was in deciding when to have sex. Women reporting that they had not yet had sex in their relationship reported twice as often they felt more overall power than women reporting they were having sex.

Evidently, increasing numbers of women (and many men) are realising that the subordinate position usually occupied

by women is not conducive to a satisfying relationship, although it is evident by Peplau's (1979) and Brehm's (1985) findings that women are still finding themselves in the subordinate positions in relationships. There have been several theories put forth as to why there still remains the power imbalance in dating and marital relationships even when people vigorously claim that they very much want and believe in equality.

The first explanation is based in sex role attitudes (Peplau, 1979) or the socialisation of these attitudes (Gillespie, 1971). Society, it is argued, is still systematically socialising women to accept the role of "second best" and does not encourage women to strive to develop their full capacities. The traditional attitude that women are weaker and better suited to the home has cut the number of resources and opportunities available for women, which then carries on into their relationships. For example, the person with the higher prestige through physical or social attractiveness, income and status may have the power, or have the "right" to decision making power (Gillespie, 1971). In a situation where a woman does stay home while her husband goes to work, it is the man who has the greater income, the greater status and greater prestige, increasing his voice in decision making, and giving him more power. They are equal, but not egalitarian.

The second theory, the *Principle of Least Interest* involves the impact of emotional power in the relationship.

The person who is least involved in the relationship or less in love than the other usually possesses the greater power.

It is also a generally held belief that the "dyadic property of power resides in the dependence of one partner on the other" (Sprecher, 1985:450). Relative dependence, therefore is seen in terms of the amount of emotional and/or material resources provided by and available to each partner. The fewer the resources one person has relative to his or her partner, the greater the dependence of that person on his/her partner. An imbalanced dependence level translates into an imbalanced power ratio. A monopoly of control on resources by one person can also be associated with an increased likelihood of finding alternative and satisfying relationships, in itself, another source of power (Sprecher, 1985).

In studying 50 college couples who had been dating exclusively for six months, Sprecher (1985) asked several questions concerning their own and their perception of their partner's contribution of socio-economic, affective, expressive, intellectual, sexual and service resources to the relationship. Subject's questions included who loved whom more, their perception of access to alternative relationships and finally, who was perceived to have the power in the relationship. Overall, the results indicated men perceived themselves as having more power, although the difference was not significant. When women felt they contributed more in affection, expression, physical

attraction, services and the more they perceived they loved their partner, they also tended to report that they felt less overall power in the relationship. In the instances that men reported they contributed more in affection, these men also tended to report that they felt less power in the relationship. Perceived access to alternative relationships was significantly positively related to power for men, but negatively correlated for women. Peplau (1979) and Peplau & Miller-Campbell (1989) also found that of the couples reporting the men to be less emotionally involved, 70% also said these men had more say in decision making situations. Conversely, of the couples reporting the women to be less emotionally involved, only 49% claimed these women had more say. There was no explanation given for the other 51% of women who were less emotionally involved in their relationship. These findings support the notion that for men, at least, maintaining the emotional and affectional distance contributes to feeling more in control and in possession of the power in intimate dyads.

In a similar study, Hatfield, Traupmann, Sprecher, Utne and Hay (1985) classified 537 college students into one of three groups; over-benefitted, equal and under-benefitted, mainly based on their answer to the question "Considering what you/your partner puts into the relationship compared to what you/your partner gets out of it, how does it stack up?". Subjects answered questions relevant to their dating relationships. Results showed that equitable relationships

were more compatible and stable and also tended to move on to a more intimate relationship than non-equitable relationships. Couples in more equitable relationships were more optimistic about the future of the relationship than the over- and under-benefited groups. After three-and-a-half months, equitable couples were more likely to still be together. The use of the terms "equity" and "equitable" here refer to each person contributing equal proportions to the relationship, and have been used instead of "egalitarian" to maintain the same terminology that Hatfield, et al. (1985) used in their study. However, this is one problem throughout the literature of researchers using the terms equitable and egalitarian interchangeably, when, in fact, they can mean different things.

As more women have entered the work-force, they have taken on roles similar to their male counterparts. With these roles, women have acquired skills, money and other resources, thus making them less dependent on their partners. According to Brehm (1985), men's authority and economic base of power in relationships has eroded with the change of work patterns. In terms of women's career ambitions, Peplau (1979; 1989) found that of women who aspired to acquiring less than a Bachelor's degree, 87% reported their partners had more power. This percentage dropped to 45% among women who wanted a Bachelor's degree, and dropped even further to 30% in women who aspired to graduate school or further education. There was no relation

between men's educational aspirations and the levels of power they perceived they or their partners had.

Additionally, Gillespie (1971) found that middle class husbands exerted more power in their relationships than working class husbands even though it was the middle class men who believed more strongly in equal partnerships.

Gillespie explained that although middle class husbands believe more in equality of their partnerships, they still feel themselves to be eminently more qualified than their partners to make the decisions in their relationships.

To summarise, despite the gains of the feminist movement in the area of empowering women, there is still a preponderance of inequality at the societal and personal level, as evidenced in these studies. That is, women overwhelmingly view and rate their male partners as having the majority of overall power in the relationship. The assertions made by men to include their partners as equals seems to be merely lip service.

One of the objectives of the present study will be to investigate further the power balances in college dating relationships to explore whether this pattern of wanting one thing but doing another is still the norm.

Power and Satisfaction in Intimate Relationships

With the evidence that power imbalanced relationships still appear to be "the norm" despite people wanting egalitarian relationships, the question arises of how this relates to the level of satisfaction each partner feels in

the relationship. Marital quality has traditionally been measured by the norms of stability and satisfaction, as these are regarded as by-products of a "good" marriage (Gray-Little & Burks, 1983). Marital or relationship satisfaction therefore, is defined as a person's subjective satisfaction with the marriage or relationship as a whole and with specific aspects of the relationship. The results in the literature have been inconsistent, with some researchers concluding that egalitarian relationships are happier, while others find no differences in satisfaction between egalitarian and male-dominant couples. Female-dominant tend to always be low in satisfaction.

Peplau (1979) did not find any relation between sex role attitudes and satisfaction with the relationship. In studying college students, traditional couples were as happy and felt as close to their partner as more liberal couples. No significant differences were found between egalitarian couples and male-dominated couples in levels of satisfaction and closeness, although it was noted that both men and women felt more dissatisfaction in female-dominant relationships. Similarly, Corrales (1975) found that of 394 married couples, the relationships in which the husband made the decisions were most satisfactory for both people, followed by joint decision making couples, followed by wife-dominant couples.

One reason Peplau, at least, did not find any relationship between a balance of power and satisfaction is

that she relied solely on subjects' self-label of traditional or liberal. The term "traditional" may very well mean different things to different people, so a couple labelling themselves traditional may be more liberal by another's standards. The term "traditional" also does not necessarily mean non-egalitarian.

Wife-dominant couples have consistently been found to be the least satisfied (Blood & Wolf, 1960; Centers, Raven & Rodrigues, 1971; Corrales, 1974). Gray-Little & Burks (1983) proposed that women in wife-dominant dyads get their power from their husbands' abstention or self-exclusion from the marriage; the women must then adopt the role of decision maker whether they want to or not, perhaps thereby creating an increased level of discontent with the relationship. Conversely, the male's abstention from the relationship alone could be another major cause of dissatisfaction.

Other researchers have shown that relationships reporting a more equal power distribution have higher levels of happiness and satisfaction reported by both partners than relationships reporting an unequal power distribution. For example, Terman (1938) found that married couples reporting less disagreement and more "give and take" in their marriage had higher happiness scores than those reporting more disagreements. Lu (1952) classified couples as wife-dominant, husband-dominant, or egalitarian. It was found that egalitarian couples scored higher for marital adjustment than the spouse-dominant couples, and

wife-dominant dyads scored particularly low in marital adjustment. It must be noted here that these two studies are quite old in their research, and are unclear as to their rating of what constitutes "egalitarian" (the 1950's were characterised as a notoriously male-dominated era for relationship and family), even though they still elude to the fact that an imbalance of power one way or another also relates to more unhappiness in relationships.

Blood & Wolf (1960) measured power by asking 909 women who made the final decision in eight areas of responsibility. These areas included purchasing insurance, choice of husband's job, and so on. Subjects were classified as wife-dominant, husband-dominant or egalitarian. Egalitarian couples were also broken down into two types of equality measures: i) syncretic equality (actual joint decision making) or ii) autonomic equality (wives and husbands simply making an equal number of unilateral decisions).

It was found that wives reporting a more syncretic decision making structure had the highest levels of satisfaction while wife-dominant couples had the least amounts of satisfaction. Autonomic decision making structures and husband-dominant structures were about equal in their levels of satisfaction. It was concluded that it was not the equity in decision-making, "I make one decision and you make one decision" per se, but the action of being included, or having some sense of control in the decision-

making process that contributed most to marital happiness (even though the actual number of decisions per person may be unequal).

Although Blood and Wolf (1960) is was fairly methodologically sound study, it should be remembered that this work is still over 30 years old, and ideas of an egalitarian balance in a marriage might be quite different now, and their conclusions might not be as applicable by today's standards.

Madden (1987) differentiated the idea of control and power in marital relationships. Control was defined as the feeling of being able to regulate one's own outcomes, whereas power was the feeling of controlling the spouse's actions. Madden reported that people who perceive themselves to possess some control cope better with negative events and regard positive events as more satisfying. It was hypothesised then, that power may not be required for acceptable levels of control; one may have considerable influence over a decision even though their choice is not selected. In egalitarian marriages, both people may feel sufficient control in decision making although neither has complete power.

To study this hypothesis, Madden (1987) asked 37 couples to fill out a satisfaction questionnaire in addition to a questionnaire on decision making and task performance. For decision making questions, each person indicated who made the final decision on a number of given tasks and then

rated how much control they felt they had and their spouse had over those decisions. For the task performance questions, subjects again indicated the extent to which the given activities were performed by themselves or their spouses. Subjects also indicated how much control they felt and how much control they perceived their spouse felt in whether to perform these tasks. Results indicated that among men and women, the reported feelings of control over task performance were significantly related to satisfaction. Respondents with equal control over task performance reported being happier while subjects feeling less task control than their spouse reported less satisfaction. It was concluded that people do feel they can control decisions and tasks even if they do not make the final decision and a moderate amount of control over their activities contributes to contentment. There was no relation between control over decision making and satisfaction.

In addition to decision making, other measures of relationship power have been employed. All, however, share the common measurement of inequality or asymmetry in the dependent variable and the results generally imply that high levels of satisfaction are linked with egalitarianism (Whisman & Jacobson, 1990). For example, several types of control techniques have been cited as indicative of a power imbalance in a relationship. Dissatisfied couples can be distinguished from satisfied couples by the higher number of coercive techniques used by both participants. Falbo &

Peplau (1980) introduced the idea of unilateral and indirect power strategies, including laissez-faire, negative affect and withdrawal. An individual's dissatisfaction with his or her relationship is significantly associated with the use of these unilateral and indirect strategies. These are also used more by women, whereas men, and those who perceive themselves to have the power, tend to use more direct and bilateral strategies.

To investigate this, Aida & Falbo (1991) had 42 married couples complete several questionnaires measuring marital satisfaction and interaction. It was found that marital satisfaction was positively associated with a reliance on direct and bilateral strategies, whereas, satisfaction was negatively associated with a reliance on indirect and unilateral strategies. Dissatisfied couples relied much more heavily on complaining, ignoring, and criticising to deal with their conflicts. Egalitarian couples were more satisfied with their marriages and used fewer unilateral and indirect strategies than non-egalitarian couples. Women in egalitarian marriages also used fewer of either of the strategies than women in traditional relationships. Husbands did not differ in their use of these strategies. Gray-Little & Burks (1983) also found that referent power, "you should see eye-to-eye because you are husband and wife", was used more by happy couples and coercion was used more by unhappy couples. They proposed that the use of coercion may partly override the effects of the power structure and knowing

which coercive method is used by the couple may be more important in accounting for satisfaction than whether the couple is egalitarian. One difficulty with this study is there was no differentiation of techniques that were included in both the unilateral and bilateral category, with some techniques overlapping in both categories. In terms of the present study, coercion will not be incorporated into the power questionnaire. The past research on coercive techniques has exclusively focused on married couples, and it is thought that couples who have only begun dating (with the possible exception of date rape) do not really use these methods so early on in their relationships. These strategies are reserved for those couples who know one another better (for longer than three or four months) and know how to get their way with their partner.

Another measurement of power that has been studied is the actual amount of time couples spend talking about marital issues in a 15-minute period (Falbo & Peplau, 1980) and the number of interruptions made by each person during that discussion (Gray-Little, 1982). The amount of time each person spends talking is a measure of reciprocity, whereas the number of interruptions one person makes against his/her partner measures and is negatively related to the level of positive regard that person has for his/her partner; the more one interrupts, the less likely one is to regard one's partner in a positive light. Initially in the study, Gray-Little (1982) found that egalitarian couples scored the

lowest in relationship satisfaction, spent the least amount of time talking and had the highest number of interruptions made by each person. These results implied that egalitarian couples showed lower levels of both reciprocity and positive regard for their spouse than the other groups (husband- and wife-dominant couples). However, as satisfaction was positively correlated with talking time, the finding was misleading, in that egalitarian couples had lower average talking times than the other two groups (equal couples spoke for 10 minutes, and the other groups spoke for 15 minutes). It was found later that egalitarian couples who had the higher talking times were, in fact, just as satisfied as the couples reporting the highest levels of satisfaction (husband-dominant couples).

Jacobson & Holtzworth-Munroe (1986) proposed an interactive model of dominance based on patterns of conversation dominance and support similar to that proposed by Gray-Little (1982). Dominance can be expressed through both talking and through not listening. In conversation, the powerful spouse takes most of the time talking, and when the other speaks, the dominant spouse does not listen, but turns the conversation back around to focus on him or herself. The other spouse does not have the power to keep the focus on him or herself. Because the other does not listen, the less powerful spouse spends a disproportionate amount of time speaking while the other does not listen, or gives short answers with no elaboration. Thirty-one maritally distressed

couples seeking marital therapy and 23 non-distressed couples were observed on video in a communication assessment and administered the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS), a widely used self-report measure of marital adjustment and satisfaction. After 23 sessions of therapy for the distressed group, these subjects were administered the DAS once again. It was found that for the non-distressed couples, there was a significant inverse relationship between satisfaction and inequality. Inequality was based on coded amounts of time talking and remaining quiet. The more one spouse spoke, the more power he or she was assumed to possess, and the less satisfied the couple was. There was no significant relation for distressed couples, however, Jacobson & Holtzworth-Munroe (1986) did conclude that the greater the inequality, the more the couple benefited from treatment. Both this study and the research by Gray-Little (1982) are problematic in that their methods rely heavily on and are open to the subjective interpretations of the researchers. For example, Gray-Little (1982), herself, was initially mistaken in her conclusion that supposedly egalitarian couples were less satisfied in their relationships simply because they spoke less to each other, when, in fact, they were just as happy as male-dominant couples.

Behavioural assessments, such as talking time and number of interruptions as a sole measure of power is not recommended as these methods rely heavily on the subjective

opinion of the researcher, and are thereby open to biased interpretation. Those choosing to utilise such a measure of power should also administer a questionnaire or interview to confirm any behavioural results about the relationship.

Ickes (1985) cited a 1980 article in the Ladies Home Journal which polled 30,000 readers with a 55 item intimacy questionnaire. Over two thousand women were chosen for statistical analysis. A strong theme was found of definite dissatisfaction among traditionally feminine women married to traditionally masculine men. These women were significantly more likely to report symptoms of stress and significantly more likely to report feeling dissatisfied with life as a whole, their love and sex lives and feel less in control of their lives. They also did not expect to be happy in the future. They tended to feel "under-loved" (they loved more than they received) which closely resembles and supports the Principle of Least Interest theory. It was concluded that the traditional couple suffers from a "one-sidedness" of each partner, that is, one partner is more "into" the relationship than the other. In contrast, women in dyads where one or both people were "androgynous" (adopting and sharing both male and female roles) were quite satisfied and showed considerable success in communication and problem-solving. Following the same idea of androgyny, Antill (1983) administered the BEM Sex Role Inventory and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale to 108 married couples. It was again shown that marital satisfaction was relatively high in

dyads where both the husband and wife were androgynous compared to marriages in which the wife was feminine and the husband masculine. Wives had lower satisfaction than husbands in traditional (husband-dominant) couples, however, husbands scored lower in satisfaction in feminine male/masculine female (wife-dominant) couples.

More recently, Fletcher, Fincham, Cramer and Heron (1987) found that couples who reported being more committed, more satisfied and more in love also reported more egalitarian relationships, while couples who perceived their partner as mainly responsible for the relationship maintenance reported lower levels of satisfaction. Grauerholz (1987) also found in a study of 328 college students that those in highly trusting and committed relationships reported a perception of more equity in the relationship. Similarly, Kyonis, Castell, Gergen and Mauch (1976) found that of 76 married subjects, those who reported they had the final say when disagreements arose in the marriage (a source of power) significantly devalued the worth of their spouse and were less happy in their marriages. Those having the final say also believed their spouse's behaviour was not self controlled, but controlled by the power holder. Stuart and Rubin (1974) found that the more the man in the dating relationship was concerned with power, the less satisfied the couple was, the more likely they were to anticipate problems and the more likely they were to have broken up two years later.

Stuart and Rubin (1974) proposed that power motivated men actually seek alliances with weaker and subordinate women who will "follow" them and avoid conflict. These men also tend to have more sexual partners, they are more likely to be physically aggressive towards and express views that show fear and hostility against women. Consequently, they express more difficulties in their interpersonal relationships. Sixty-three exclusively dating couples were asked how satisfied they were with their present relationship and how satisfied they believed their partner to be with the relationship. They were also asked the extent to which they thought a set of given factors would lead to difficulties in the relationship. These factors included internal strains (different attitudes and interests in the other that are difficult to tolerate), independent pressures (desire for independence from the relationship or desire for a relationship with another person) and external pressures (distance separation, parental objections to the relationship, different social backgrounds, etc.). The results indicated that high "hope" power (the amount of power the person desires/expects to have in the relationship) for men was inversely related to their satisfaction with the relationship and the satisfaction their girlfriends felt with the relationship. Women's "hope" power was not related to either their own or their partner's satisfaction. Men's "hope" power was negatively associated with the amount of love and the amount of liking they felt

for their partner. High "hope" power men were also more likely to anticipate problems later on in the relationship, expected to become bored in their relationship, and saw their interest in somebody else as problematic (p. 507). High "hope" power women also tended to expect boredom, conflicting sexual attitudes, parental pressures and their partner's desire for independence to threaten their relationship. After 2 years, the break up rate for high "hope" power men was 50% compared to 15% for low "hope" power men (p.508). There were no results given for the break-up rates for high "hope" power women. Stuart and Rubin (1974) concluded that the power motivation in men is a strong source of relationship dissatisfaction and stress in relationships. With this desire for control coupled with the inability to handle conflict, these men will have difficulties establishing any kind of sound relationship.

The breadth of literature on this topic is quite substantial within the confines of sources of marital power. With the exception of a small number of studies, the research in this area has overwhelmingly shown that a power imbalanced relationship does relate to a more unhappy couple than a power balanced one. Please see Table 1 for a summary.

Table 1

Summary of Power and Satisfaction Studies

Study	Sample	Power Measure	Findings
Peplau, 1979	231 college students	self labelled trad./egal.	no relation
Ickes, 1985	2100 married women	self labelled trad./egal.	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Antill, 1983	108 married couples	self labelled trad./egal.	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Lu, 1952	603 married couples	self labelled trad./egal.	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Terman, 1938	1250 married couples	self labelled trad./egal.	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Corrales, 1974	394 married couples	decision making	no relation
Kyonis, et al., 1976	76 married couples	decision making	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Blood & Wolf, 1960	909 married women	decision making	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Madden, 1987	37 married couples	decision making and control	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Aida & Falbo, 1991	42 married couples	coercion techniques	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Falbo & Peplau, 1980	married couples	talking time	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Jacobson & Holtzworth- Munroe, 1986	31 maritally distressed couples	talking time and not listening	non-egal.=less satisfaction
Gray-Little, 1982	30 married couples	# of interruptions	no relation
Stuart & Rubin, 1974	63 dating college students	amount male expects power	non-egal.=less satisfaction

To date, researchers have failed to investigate how the power distribution within an intimate relationship develops. To do this, one would have to employ a longitudinal method of enquiry, which has not been the method of choice for most experimenters. Although the present investigation is only somewhat longitudinal (four months in length), trends in the development of power will be more evident than querying subjects only once during their relationship. Results have been fairly consistent in the direction that equality in a relationship does, indeed have a positive effect on satisfaction, but the majority of research has focused on marital dyads with surprisingly little done in the area of dating relationships. This field has been explored, but more evidence is required, especially in terms of power balance measures for dating couples.

Theories of Commitment in Intimate Relationships

The whole notion of relationship commitment in the literature is a fairly new area of study, with most of the research beginning in the 1980's. As a result, there are some inconsistencies with respect to definitions of commitment that are used in the literature. Murstein & MacDonald (1983) proposed that "commitment reflects the tendency to place your relationship with your spouse beyond the effect of any given negative act and to feel a sense of permanency about the relationship" (p. 299). This implies that one must be so entrenched in the relationship to accept

whatever negative situation arises in order to be "committed" to the relationship; almost implying a sense of obsession. Others stress that it is the tendency to maintain and feel psychologically attached to the relationship (Rusbalt, 1983).

In their recent work on intimate relationship commitment, Stanley & Markman (1991) presented two related constructs they feel commitment encompasses; personal dedication and constraint commitment. Personal dedication is defined as the "desire of an individual to maintain or improve the quality of his/her relationship for joint benefit of the participants". It also involves the desire to continue, improve and sacrifice for the relationship, invest in it, link personal goals to it and seek out your partner's welfare. Constraint commitment, on the other hand, encompasses the forces that constrain individuals to maintain the relationship regardless of their personal dedication. These constraints arise from external or internal pressures which support a person's commitment to the relationship only because termination of the union would be too costly. Constraints are the major determinants of relationship stability; whether couples make it through the inevitable fluctuations in their relationship, but personal dedication is the key determinant of the future quality of the relationship.

There are several dimensions to each of the two commitment constructs. Under constraint commitment is

included structural investment (increased investment leads to increased commitment), social pressures to maintain the relationship, the difficulty in terminating the relationship, the unattractiveness and availability of alternative partners, and the morality of divorce. Under personal dedication falls relationship agenda (the degree to which one wants the relationship), primacy of the relationship, couple identity (couple as a team), satisfaction with sacrifice, alternative partner monitoring, meta-commitment (level of commitment one has to commitments, in general) and willingness to forgive. Supporting Stanley and Markman (1992), Lund (1985) also found that investment and commitment (constraint commitment) were more predictive of relational stability than love and rewards (personal dedication).

Commitment, Power and Satisfaction in Intimate Relationships

To date, it has been found almost consistently that good things emerge when a couple reaches the plateau of equality. It has been proposed though, that egalitarian relationships grow out of increased commitment rather than commitment resulting from egalitarianism. Trust may contribute to feeling equal in a relationship and as commitment grows, individuals are more comfortable with each other, are less likely to indulge in role prescribed behaviours and trust one another enough to begin exercising equitable power (Grauerholz, 1987). Similarly, Brickman (1987) noted that it is easier to infer one's own trust and

love in situations where one has given power to the other than in situations where one has retained the power. Having power over another and being concerned with it makes it harder for people to see themselves as loving the other and being committed and satisfied with the relationship (p. 74).

To study this, 201 female and 127 male college students who were currently in dating relationships were administered several questionnaires. To measure power, students were asked several questions about dating events, for example, who pays when they go out, whose friends do they go out with, who decides on movies, etc. Each person was classified as being in an egalitarian relationship or in a male/female dominant relationship.

Grauerholz (1987) found that those students in highly committed, highly trusting and highly other-oriented relationships perceived an egalitarian influence more than male or female dominant couples. The more subjects perceived that alternative partners were available to them, the less egalitarian they perceived their relationship to be. Interestingly, an imbalance of love and intelligence was related to an imbalance of perceived power for women (the more they loved their partner, and the more intelligent they perceived their partner to be compared to themselves, the less power they felt they had).

Rusbalt (1983; 1980) presented the Investment Model which distinguished between satisfaction and commitment. The model argued that individuals should be more satisfied with

relationships to the extent that they continue to provide high rewards, low costs and exceed generalised expectations. The greater the satisfaction with the relationship, the more commitment should increase in order to maintain that relationship. Also, people should become more committed if they perceive alternate partners to be of a "lesser quality" than the one they have. The third means of commitment is the level of investment of resources, both intrinsic (emotions and time) and extrinsic (money and friends)- higher levels of investments should produce higher levels of commitment. These three elements of commitment were included in Stanley and Markman's Commitment Inventory.

In studying 34 college students, Rusbalt (1983) administered questionnaires measuring rewards, costs, alternative partners, satisfaction and commitment. Subjects represented relationships that were 0-2 weeks old, 2-4 weeks old, 4-6 weeks old and 6-8 weeks old. The measures were administered every 17 days for several months and subject participation ended if the relationship broke up. At the end of the study, there were 20 subjects left.

It was found that an increase in rewards equalled an increase in satisfaction. Variations in costs did not affect satisfaction except at the 3-7 month involvement. Greater satisfaction and investment and poorer perceived alternatives were related to higher commitment for women, whereas, satisfaction and investment amounts related to commitment for men. Generally, the levels of rewards,

satisfaction and commitment increased over time. Hendrick, Hendrick and Adler (1988) also found that higher levels of commitment and investment related to partner satisfaction. They concluded that commitment in particular, emerged as a strong predictor of relationship endurance.

In addition to supporting this Investment Model of relationships, Sprecher (1988) also presented two more variables related to commitment; equity and social support. Sprecher proposed that relationships are inequitable if an individual perceives that the participants' relative gains or losses are unequal. Individuals perceiving themselves to be treated unequally tend to be less committed to that relationship (Walster, Walster, & Traupmann, 1978; Utne, Hatfield, Traupmann and Greenberger, 1984; Michaels, Acock, & Edwards, 1986). Although Michaels, et al. (1986) found inequity to have a significant zero-order correlation with commitment, when other variables of commitment were controlled for, inequity no longer significantly affected commitment. In contrast, Sabatelli & Cecil-Figo (1985) found that inequity was negatively associated with commitment and actually was the most important predictor of commitment among married couples. Satisfaction, on the other hand, was positively related to commitment and was the second most important predictor. One explanation for the difference between Michaels, et al. and Sabatelli & Cecil-Figo may be the fact that Michaels, et al. studied dating couples rather than married couples. Perhaps when couples are still in the

dating stage (a more precarious state than marriage, in terms of stability) other factors, such as access to alternative partners do play a larger part in the whole spectrum of commitment. Once a couple is married, variables such as finding another partner may not play such an important role; being on equal ground with your partner is really then the most important concern.

The second variable positively related to commitment which Sprecher (1988) presented was social support. As with individual identity formation, couple or dyad identity is affected by the couple's outside network of family and friends. The amount to which family and friends approve or disapprove of the relationship will positively or negatively affect the level of commitment, respectively. To investigate these additional variables, Sprecher (1988) studied 191 couples ranging in age from 17-42. The range of commitment levels varied from casually dating to married. Subjects were questioned on how committed they were to the relationship, how often they thought of ending the relationship, how costly it would be to break up with their partner (in terms of satisfaction, investment, and social approval), and who contributed more to the relationship.

Generally, participants rated their relationship as high in satisfaction, commitment and investment equity and rated alternatives as less attractive. Occasional and regular daters had the lowest commitment, satisfaction, investment, support and rated alternatives the best. Married

couples reported more social support than couples living together and dating exclusively. The two variables that correlated most strongly between partners were satisfaction and commitment. Interestingly, inequity was highly negatively correlated within couples; partners tended to disagree with each other in terms of their perceptions of equity in the relationship. Additionally, men rated the alternatives more positively than women and women reported investing more in the relationship than men.

Supporting Sprecher's (1988) proposed variables related to commitment, Jemmott, Ashby & Lindenfield (1989) suggested that commitment to various relationships is based on three factors; i) the extent to which the individual perceives his/her relationship to be attractive, ii) the extent of his/her investment in the relationship and iii) the extent to which he/she perceives alternatives to the relationship to be attractive. They noted that when sex ratios (the number of men per 100 women in a population) are imbalanced, the whole foundation of romantic relationships is shaken. Men exploit women more and women compete with each other for eligible men. Based on the Commodity Theory (valuing objects more when they are scarce), one might predict that individuals will perceive their relationships to be more attractive if fewer members of the opposite sex are available. Likewise, a person who has fewer opportunities with members of the opposite sex may invest more in the

union and be more motivated to ensure that his/her partner remains satisfied with and interested in the relationship.

Two hundred and fifty-eight undergraduate students (68% of whom were currently in heterosexual relationships; the rest were not in any relationship at that time) were queried about how committed, satisfied and rewarded they felt with their relationship, how great their investment was and how attractive they felt were their options for other relationships. Jemmott, et al. (1989) not surprisingly found that those with longer existing relationships expressed more commitment. The more scarce alternative partners were perceived to be, the more attractive subjects perceived their relationships to be and, the more that was invested, the more subjects reported high levels of commitment. One obvious problem with this study is that it generalised from results using subjects who were not even currently in a relationship.

Stanley and Markman (1991) studied the incidence of commitment over the different stages of couple relationships. Of 279 subjects ranging in age from 17 to 86 years that were recruited from a various church groups, 3% were regular daters, 18% were exclusively dating, 10% were engaged and 69% were married. They administered several questionnaires, including their own Commitment Inventory, as well as measures about termination procedures, unattractiveness of alternatives and marital adjustment. It was hypothesised that the constraint measures would be more

associated with the relationship stage and would increase linearly across stages. Engaged couples would be more constrained than dating couples and married couples with children would be the most constrained (or highest in constraint commitment) of all stages. In terms of personal dedication, it was found that dating couples scored the lowest, while married couples with children scored the highest. Interestingly, there were no differences on this scale for engaged, married and married couples with young children. It was found previously that the dedication subscales correlate more with relationship satisfaction than the constraint subscales (Stanley and Markman, 1991). Satisfaction, as would be expected here, was indeed found to be relatively high for dating couples, but their levels of dedication and constraint commitment were low. Conversely, married couples with children had low satisfaction, but high dedication and constraint commitment. Stanley and Markman (1992) concluded that constraints may be so powerful that the option to stay or leave the relationship may be poor; it is not so dependent on satisfaction, but rather the strength of the constraints holding you in the relationship. They noted, though, that in most relationships, constraints play a more positive role than this, giving couples a sense of being "grounded" and stable. One point to note with the research by Stanley and Markman is that the sample tended to be from a very religious background, thereby, possibly biasing the results.

Stanley and Markman (1992) also measured the effects of alternative monitoring and found that this correlates most highly with relationship satisfaction. This finding has also been supported in past research. For example, Johnson & Rusbalt (1989) found that people reporting the most commitment to their relationships tended to devalue alternate partners, especially if the alternative is highly attractive. Overall, these people also monitored less, and devalued potential threats to the relationship. Stanley and Markman (1992) also cited "score keeping" or monitoring everything one is getting relative to what one is putting in as another manifestation of low commitment. Highly committed people are satisfied in the idea that "everything will even itself out", whereas the more one keeps score, the lower the personal dedication, and hence satisfaction.

Related to this idea of score keeping, Murstein and MacDonald (1983) looked at the relationship among exchange orientation, commitment and satisfaction. Exchange orientation was described as the weighing of a behaviour according to a rule that a behaviour by one should be reciprocated by a behaviour of equal value by the other; input should be proportional to output (p.298). They proposed that couples low in exchange and high in commitment should be more adjusted and couples high in exchange and low in commitment should be least satisfied.

Of 40 couples, 10 were seeing a marital therapist, 10 were seeing a family therapist because of child problems and

20 served as a non-clinical sample. Each couple was administered a commitment scale and exchange-oriented scale.

It was found both husbands and wives showed significant negative correlations between exchange orientation and satisfaction. When men were high in exchange orientation, their wives were significantly less satisfied, but when men were high in commitment, wives were significantly more satisfied. These correlations approximated the same negative and positive correlations women showed for their own exchange orientation, commitment and satisfaction scores. Wives' exchange orientation and commitment scores did not play a strong a part in their husbands satisfaction scores. Additionally, there was a significant positive correlation between commitment and satisfaction for both husbands and wives.

In an effort to make the findings on commitment, power and satisfaction clearer, Table 2 outlines the research in this area. Clearly, there is substantial evidence that increased levels of commitment are positively related to both increased satisfaction with the relationship, and a higher chance of the relationship following a more equal pattern. As with the literature on power, though, the studies have not followed relationships (dating or married) over a period of time to explore the progress of commitment.

The present investigation looked at the relationship between the power distribution of university students' dating relationships and their levels of satisfaction and

commitment in the relationship. The relation between these three variables together has not been studied in depth to date. The power measure used in this study expanded on that used by Sprecher (1985), questioning subjects on resource contribution, access to alternatives, perceived power and relative affect and adding decision making, relative dependence, and perceived control in the decision making process.

Table 2

Summary of Commitment With Power and Satisfaction Studies

Study	Sample	Power Measure	Findings
Grauerholz, 1987	328 college students	rated on dating events	commitment=egalitarian perception
Rusbalt, 1983	34 college students	resource contribution	high equity & satisfaction=high commitment
Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler, 1988	57 married couples	resource contribution	high equity & satisfaction=high commitment
Michaels, Acock & Edwards, 1986	dating couples	perceived equity of gains & losses	no relation
Sabatelli & Cecil-Pigo, 1985	married couples	perceived equity of gains & losses	high inequity=low commitment
Sprecher, 1988	191 couples	investment equity	high commitment=high equity & satisfaction
Jemmott, Ashby & Lindenfield, 1989	258 college students	investment equity	high equity = high commitment
Stanley & Markman, 1991	279 couples	none	Dating: more satisfied & less committed Married: less satisfied & more committed
Murstein & MacDonald, 1983	40 married couples	exchange orientation	high commitment=high satisfaction

The majority of research in this area has traditionally used decision making questions as the sole measure of power in a relationship, but this approach has been criticised as being narrow, restrictive and too simplistic (Gray-Little & Burks, 1983). The studies that have investigated other areas of inequality have looked at only that one realm of imbalance, instead of encompassing the range of situations in which power plays a part. In addition to this, the measures traditionally used have focused on married couples, with few "dating-friendly" questionnaires devised. Obviously, for dating couples, there is a limit to the number of decision making scenarios one would ask about as compared to married couples. For example, one cannot ask about household chore task performance, as many dating people are not living together. However, the power areas on which married couples are questioned can be revised to be applicable to other relationships. To encompass the various sources of power in a dating relationship, the present questionnaire incorporated questions about each of those sources in order to determine some consistency over the different areas.

The vast majority of past research has also relied heavily on self-report measures, with few observational investigations. MacDonald (1980) noted that self reports are problematic, as there is a tendency for couples to remember only what was decided, not who made the decision. In this

sense, one would be measuring perceived authority rather than actual power. In addition to this, many have also only included one partner in the dyad, hence, not only are these studies dealing with the problems of self-reports, they are also dealing with reports of perceptions of the absent partner's behaviour and/or experience. In the present research, for statistical simplicity, subjects will not be studied as couples, but individually. The questionnaires also only measure each person's own feelings and perceptions of the relationship rather than asking for an interpretation of how they think their partner perceives the relationship.

In much of the research on commitment, subjects have represented various stages of relationships, some dating, others engaged, and yet others married. There are obvious methodological problems in trying to compare people at various stages or levels of commitment and stability at one time in the relationship and generalise these results without controlling for other variables affecting commitment. None of these studies mentioned the idea of matching subjects on these other variables, for example, morality of divorce/break up. It would be difficult and misleading to compare two couples, one of which believes that divorce is the very last option and the second which believes that once a relationship is no good for them, they end it. The one study that has mentioned controlling for other variables affecting commitment found no significant relations between commitment and equality (Michaels, et al.,

1986). The current research studied only dating students over a period of four months, so that any changes in commitment, power and satisfaction, may more clearly be attributed to the stage of their relationship and the effect of time.

Finally, this study is one of the first to extend this research to a somewhat longitudinal form. Kelley (1983) suggested that research on commitment be studied over time and under periods of stress, however, only Rusbalt (1983) has attempted a longitudinal format.

Given the results of the majority of research on power in intimate relationships, it was hypothesised that people reporting egalitarian dating relationships would also report being more satisfied and committed to these relationships than people reporting male or female dominant relationships. It was also thought that over the four month period, these relationships levels of reported satisfaction and commitment would increase, and the balance of power would become more egalitarian (as measured by the variables in the power questionnaire). It was hypothesised that men will perceive themselves to be more dominant in their relationships than women perceive themselves.

Chapter 2

Method

Subjects

Sixty subjects volunteered to participate in this study; thirty men and thirty women who ranged from 18 to 25 years of age. Subjects began dating someone near the beginning of the school year (September, October or November, 1993).

This sample was convenient rather than random, as all subjects were taking an Introductory Psychology course. Participation in this research was in partial fulfilment of the students' mandatory participation in four experimental credits for the course.

Materials

Three questionnaires were employed in this research for each of the four testing sessions. The first was the Commitment Inventory, developed by Stanley and Markman (1991) (Appendix A). This measured the levels of commitment a person felt to his/her relationship based on several subscales (social pressure, attractiveness of alternatives, primacy of relationship, etc.). Responses were rated on a 7-point Likert type scale. Although fairly new, there has been strong evidence presented that the commitment Inventory is both reliable and valid (Stanley and Markman, 1992).

A reliabilities test was conducted on the responses of the two scales of the commitment inventory; personal dedication and constraint commitment. The personal

dedication scale was comprised of 6 items related to relationship satisfaction and included relationship agenda, primacy of relationship, couple identity, satisfaction with sacrifice, meta-commitment and alternative monitoring. These six subscales were reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$). The variable labelled "constraint commitment" consisted of 3 items related to relationship stability and included structural investment, social pressure and availability of partners (Cronbach's $\alpha = .63$). Morality of divorce was omitted from this scale as the alpha level without it was much higher than when it was included (Cronbach's $\alpha = .41$). This also made sense for two reasons. First, perceptions on the morality of divorce is not very applicable to the relationships of university students. Secondly, the commitment scale was originally developed using traditionally religious samples. This again, may not make it a particularly "good" fit with a university student sample.

The second questionnaire used was the Dyadic Adjustment Scale to measure the levels of satisfaction. This questionnaire (Appendix B) as developed by Spanier (1976) is the most extensively used measure in the literature on marital adjustment and is widely accepted as the most psychometrically sound of its kind (Hendrick, Hendrick, & Adler, 1988). For the purposes of this study, only the ten items measuring relationship satisfaction (not the components measuring adjustment and trust) were employed. These items included questions about how often the couple

quarrels, regrets about dating the other person and how happy the subject is in the relationship. For each question, subjects rated their response on a 5-point scale.

The third questionnaire measuring power was a structured questionnaire modified from Sprecher's (1985) research (Appendix C). As there seem to be many different views in the literature as to what actually constitutes relationship power, this questionnaire was revised to include questions on subject perceptions of all of those features, for example, contribution of resources, relative involvement (who loves whom more), access to alternatives, decision making power, level of dependence, level of control in the decision making process and direct questions about the perception of who has the power in the relationship. A pre-test of this measure on five subjects did not reveal any problems with the interpretation and understanding of the questions or instructions.

On the power measure, a reliabilities test revealed quite a bit of variation within the power subsections in terms of the lack of reliability between subscales. To combat this and create some level of consistency among the subsections, those questions that increased the alpha level when deleted were excluded. In the end, the contribution of resources scale (Contribution of Resources) consisted of 4 items reflecting emotional contribution to the relationship; perceived contribution of love, affection, concern and companionship, (Cronbach's $\alpha = .63$). Because contributions

of support, physical appearance, sex, social status and intellect did not "scale" together, or with the above contribution variables, they were measured individually. Similarly, the decision making scale (Decision) consisted of decisions concerning how much time to spend together, what to do in that time together and whose friends to go out with, (Cronbach's $\alpha = .56$). Questions on decision making authority on movies (DM Movie), whether to go out for dinner (DM Dinner), what restaurant (DM Restaurant) and bar to go to (DM Bar), when to discuss problems in the relationship (DM Problems), sex (DM Sex) and birth control (DM Birth Control) were measured separately. The dependency scale consisted of 6 variables reflecting perceived level of dependence on one's partner (Dependence) and included dependence on social status, love, affection, support, companionship and sex (Cronbach's $\alpha = .61$). The level of dependence for services was omitted as it was decided that first year university students are not likely to rely on dating partners for services such as cooking and doing laundry. The control scale included the 4 items reflecting perceived level of control in the decisions of what movie to see, what restaurant to go to, when to have sex and what to do in their time together (Control, Cronbach's $\alpha = .65$). The power scale (power) was made up of perceived influence and power, omitting sacrifice (Cronbach's $\alpha = .77$).

In the first testing session, subjects were also administered a background questionnaire (Appendix D). It

asked them to describe the length of and expectations for their relationship, and whether they thought that with time, the relationship would become more or less committed, happy and egalitarian. Subjects were also asked about their dating history and how experienced they felt themselves to be in the field of dating.

For the second, third and last testing sessions, subjects were given a questionnaire about whether or not they had discussed any of the measures with their partners, and if so, how the discussions went (did it result in an argument, agreement, etc.) (questions #1-3 of Appendix E). In the third and last testing session, subjects were queried whether they became more vigilant in their relationship upon completing the questionnaires; that is, did they pay more attention to who made more decisions, who contributed more, etc. (question #4 of Appendix E). The coding scheme for questions # 3 and 4 of Appendix E can be found in Appendix F.

Procedure

Subjects were required to sign their initials and phone number on the sign up sheet provided on the Psychology board. Each subject was contacted by telephone to make an appointment for questionnaire administration.

At the first appointment, subjects were informed of the nature of the research and were reminded that this study was to take place over a period of four months. They were instructed that they would be required to complete these

questionnaires four times (once each in November, January, February and March). They were asked to read the Agreement to Participate and sign the consent (provided in Appendix G).

Upon the completion of the set of questionnaires (approximately 30 minutes) subjects were reminded that they would be called in a month to make another appointment for completing the questionnaires, and that should their relationship not last, their participation in the study would be completed.

Before each subsequent testing session, subjects were called for another appointment. If a subject had broken up with his/her partner, he/she was asked about his/her perceptions of the reasons for the relationship ending. An appointment was then set for the subject to pick up his/her experimental credit slip and written debriefing.

At the end of the four month duration of the study, those subjects still participating were debriefed, which entailed giving each person a previously drafted written debriefing (Appendix H) and any remaining questions answered.

All subjects were informed after each session that should they experience difficulties in their relationship as a result of their participation in this research, help for them and their partners would be arranged if they so wished.

Chapter 3

Results

Subject Attrition

Sixty subjects began participation in this research. As expected, over the course of the four testing sessions, there was some subject mortality, due to the break up of the relationships. Consequently, the focus of much of the analysis will be on examining the differences between subjects who stayed in the study (stayed together) versus those who did not stay in the study (those who broke up). Table 3 below shows the number of men and women who remained in the study from month to month.

Table 3

Subject Attrition Over Each Month

Session	N Male	N Female	% Original Sample Remaining
1	30	30	-
2	26	25	85
3	23	19	70
4	20	13	55

Subject Demographics

The average age of the participants was 19.6 years, while the average age of partners was 19.7 years. There was

a significant gender difference in the mean ages of the participants ($M(\text{male})=20.0$ yrs., $M(\text{females})=19.2$ yrs.; $t(58)=3.28$, $p<.002$). Although the mean ages were significantly different, it was not thought that this difference was large enough to account for any gender differences in the patterns of power, commitment and satisfaction. Gender differences in age were not found to be a function of outliers in one group.

Nature of Dating History

With respect to dating history during the past six months before the current relationship, 40% casually dated several people at once and 22% seriously and exclusively dated people other than their current partner. One subject reported living with someone and one subject was engaged. In the last three years, the average number of casual relationships subjects reported having was 5.6 while the average number of serious relationships was 1.5. Men and women differed in the number of casual relationships they had with men having an average of 7.3 and women having an average of 3.8 casual relationship over the past three years ($t(55)=2.98$, $p<.005$). This variable was correlated with:

Contribution of sex (time 1), $r = .30^*$

Decision making authority for dinner (time 1), $r = -.27^*$

Perceived Power (time 4), $r = -.50^{**}$

Contribution of Services (time 4), $r = .44^*$

* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$

The number of past casual relationships was therefore treated as a covariate variable for perceived power, as it was thought that the proportion of variance accounted for in the other three variables was not large enough to account for any gender differences that might occur in the three main dependent variables of commitment, satisfaction and power.

Men and women did not differ significantly in the number of serious relationships which they had been in over the past three years. Subjects were also asked to rate themselves on a scale of "relationship experience", with 1 indicating "almost no experience" and 7 indicating "very experienced". The average self-rating was 4.1 with 78% of the sample falling in the 3-5 rating with no significant differences between men and women.

Nature of Current Relationship

At the beginning of the study, subjects had been dating their partner for an average of 1.9 months. In terms of the reported seriousness of the relationship at the first session, 32 (53%) rated their relationship as serious and exclusive, 14 (23%) rated it as serious, but not exclusive, 13 (21%) rated it as casually dating and 1 subject was engaged. A chi square test did not reveal any gender differences in relationship seriousness ($\chi^2_{(3)}=6.4$, ns). Subjects were questioned about their expectations for their relationship in terms of whether their feelings, happiness, commitment and equality would increase, decrease or stay the

same as their relationship progressed. The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Subject Expectations for Relationship Over Time

Dimension	Increase	Stay Same	Decrease
Feelings for Partner	58%	20%	22%
Level of Commitment	52%	35%	13%
Happiness	57%	25%	18%
Level of Equality	33%	38%	29%

Generally, the pattern revealed that subjects expected their feelings, commitment and happiness to increase over time, while expecting the level of equality to stay the same as at time one. There were no significant gender differences in the expectations for the relationship. The largest difference between men and women was shown in their expectations for commitment, possibly suggesting a potential trend of women ($M = 2.3$) more than men ($M = 2.7$) expecting to become more committed to their partner.

At the end of the second, third and fourth testing session, subjects were given a follow-up questionnaire about

whether or not they had discussed the study with their partner. Results are found in the table below.

Table 5

Discussion of Questionnaires Over Months

Session	† Discussed			
	Questions	Commitment	Satisfaction	Power
2	63	37	20	47
3	69	40	26	40
4	55	30	27	24

Generally, the majority of subjects from month to month discussed the questionnaires with their partners, with most of them discussing power issues after the first and second testing session. After the third testing session, however, most of the discussions seemed to turn towards the topic of commitment. This is understandable as at this time, decisions of commitment and whether to maintain the relationship over the possible summer separation probably tended to arise more.

Eleven of the 51 subjects in the second month reported a simple discussion about their relationship, whereas 20 reported discussing the actual questionnaires. Of these 20, 15 reported that their partner agreed with their answers, 3 reported a disagreement and 2 reported an argument that was

yet to be resolved. The other 20 subjects did not answer the question. By the third session, discussions mainly revolved around the relationship in general rather than comparing answers. Sixty-seven percent of those reported being more vigilant of the dynamics of their relationship since completing the questionnaires. At the end of the final session, 61% reported being more vigilant since completing the questionnaires. In comparing men and women, there were no significant gender differences the discussion of any of these variables with their partner, or whether they became more vigilant about their relationships.

Analysis of Measures

In analysing the power, commitment and satisfaction questionnaires over the four months, multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were employed to assess the differences between participants who remained in their relationship for the duration of the study and those who broke up¹. Generally, 2x2 MANOVA on the dependent variables from the three main questionnaires were used.

Commitment.

To examine the effects of gender and duration of the relationship (broke up or lasted) on commitment, a 2(gender) x 2(duration; 1-3 months, 4 months) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on personal dedication and constraint

¹Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) for repeated measure designs were planned. However, it was discovered that in comparing subjects from month-to-month comparisons, the sample size for the MANOVA was too small (N=3, 4, etc).

commitment was conducted. There was a significant gender by duration interaction effect (Pillais=.12, $F(2,55)=3.80$, $p<.05$). Follow-up univariate analysis indicated that only personal dedication was significant, ($F(1,56)=6.47$, $p<.05$). Further follow-up Scheffe comparisons revealed that women whose relationship lasted ($M = 5.07$) were significantly higher in their levels of personal dedication in comparison to men who lasted ($M = 4.30$), ($p<.05$). The other comparisons were not significant.

Neither the main effect for gender nor for duration of the relationship were significant, ($Fs<1$). As a reminder to the reader, the commitment scale was a Likert-type scale from 1-7 with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 7 indicating "strongly agree" with the given statements. Higher scores reveal higher levels of commitment. The results are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6

Means for Gender-Duration Interaction on Personal Dedication

Gender	Duration	
	Broke Up	Lasted
Male	4.55 (0.63) n=10	4.30 (0.64) n=20
Female	4.40 (0.75) n=17	5.07 (0.66) n=13

Satisfaction.

To examine the effects of gender and duration of the relationship (broke up or lasted) on satisfaction, a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on one dependent variable, DAS score at session one was conducted. Neither the main effects for gender, duration of the relationship, nor the interaction effects were significant, ($F_s < 1$).

Power.

To examine the effects of gender and relationship duration on perceived power, a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on overall contribution of emotional resources, perceived control and dependence was conducted.

Neither the main effects for gender, duration of the relationship nor the interaction effect of gender and duration were significant, ($F_s < 1$).

To examine the effects of length of duration and gender on the separate contribution variables, a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was performed on contribution of support, physical attractiveness, intellect, sex, social status and services. There was a significant gender effect, (Pillais=.26, $F(6,51)=3.03$, $p<.01$). Follow-up univariate comparisons indicated that only perceived contribution of sex to the relationship was significant, ($F(1,56)=11.43$, $p<.01$), indicating that men ($M = 3.30$) generally perceived they contributed more sexual intimacy to the relationship than their partners, while women ($M = 2.58$) perceived themselves to contribute somewhat less.

Neither the main effects for duration nor the interaction effects of duration with gender were significant, ($Fs<1$).

To examine the effects of gender and relationship duration on perceived power based on decision making authority, a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on overall decision making authority concerning time together, when to discuss problems in the relationship, sex and birth control. There was a significant gender effect (Pillais= .43, $F(5,50)=7.57$, $p<.01$). Follow-up univariate comparisons indicated that only decision making authority in when to discuss problems in the relationship ($F(1,54)=14.88$, $p<.01$) and decisions about birth control ($F(1,54)=17.38$, $p<.01$) were significant. These results indicated that men perceived their partner to make more of

the decisions in both when to discuss problems ($M=2.25$) and about methods of birth control ($M = 2.27$) to use, while women perceived their relationships to be more equal in both of these areas ($M(\text{Problems}) = 1.61$; $M(\text{Birth Control}) = 1.57$). As a reminder to the reader, the 3-point scale for this power variable was recoded as follows: 3="my partner decides; 2="we both decide"; 1="I decide".

Neither the main effect for duration nor the interaction effect between gender and duration was significant, ($F_s < 1$).

To examine the effects of gender and duration of the relationship on the other decision-making power variables, a 2x2 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted on decision making authority in the areas of movies, dinner, restaurant, bar, and overall perceived power. Neither the main effect for gender, duration nor the interaction effect between duration and gender was significant, ($F_s < 1$).

In looking at the trends over time of the scales for the subjects who lasted the duration of the study, 2(gender) x 4(time; 1 month, 2 month, 3 month, 4 month) multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) were once again employed to explore gender differences and patterns from month to month on the dependent variables associated with the three main measures.

Commitment.

To examine the effects of gender and time over the four months on the commitment, a 2x4 multivariate analysis of

variance (MANOVA) on personal dedication and constraint commitment was conducted. There was a significant gender effect (Pillais=.24, $F(2,30)=4.82$, $p<.05$). Follow-up univariate analyses indicated that only personal dedication was significant, ($F(1,31)=8.33$, $p<.01$), indicating that women who lasted were significantly and consistently higher in their personal dedication scores over all four months than the men who lasted.

Neither the main effect of time, nor a sex by time interaction was significant, ($F_s<1$). The results of the gender effect are presented in Table 7.

Table 7

Mean for Gender Effect on Personal Dedication

Variable	Female			Male		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
Personal Dedication						
1	5.07	.66	13	4.30	.64	20
2	5.37	.79	13	4.46	.82	20
3	5.24	.88	13	4.52	.97	20
4	5.29	.96	13	4.59	.89	20

Satisfaction.

To examine the effect of gender and time on the satisfaction measure, a 2x4 multivariate analysis of

variance (MANOVA) on the DAS scores over the four months was conducted. There was a trend toward a significant time effect (Pillais=.23, $F(3,29)=2.81$, $p<.06$). Follow-up univariate analysis indicated that time 2 ($F(1,31)=4.43$, $p<.05$) and time 4 ($F(1,31)=5.09$, $p<.05$) were significant, indicating that satisfaction scores for men and women tended to decrease somewhat over time, only to rise a little at the last testing session (for men only).

Neither the main effect for gender nor the interaction effect of gender by time was significant, ($F<1$). The results are found in Table 8.

Table 8

Means for Time Effect on Satisfaction

Variable	Female			Male		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
1	40.08	4.68	13	38.20	3.37	20
2	39.31	3.86	13	37.30	5.08	20
3	38.85	4.91	13	35.90	5.60	20
4	38.23	6.29	13	36.80	5.46	20

Power.

To examine the effects of gender and time on power, a 2x4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on perceived

dependence, control and overall perceived power was conducted. There were no significant gender, duration or interaction effects for any of these variables, ($F_s < 1$).

To examine the effects of time and gender on the decision making scales, a 2x4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on decision making on movies, dinner and restaurant dependent variables. Neither the main effects for time and gender, nor the interaction effect between time and gender was significant ($F_s < 1$).

A 2x4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effects of time and gender on decision making authority concerning when to discuss problems and overall decision making authority in time together. There was a significant gender effect ($Pillais = .19$, $F(2, 29) = 3.32$, $p < .05$). Follow-up comparisons indicated that only decision making authority in when to discuss problems was significant ($F(1, 30) = 5.85$, $p < .05$), indicating that men consistently perceived their partners to make the decision as to when to discuss the relationship, whereas women perceived a more equal balance concerning these discussions.

Neither the main effect for time nor the interaction effect between gender and time was significant ($F_s < 1$). The results are presented in Table 9.

A 2x4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the effects of gender and time on decision making authority in the areas of sex and birth

control. There was a significant gender effect (Pillais=.35, $F(2,29)=7.75$, $p<.01$). Follow-up comparisons indicated that both decision making authority for sex ($F(1,30)=5.66$, $p<.05$) and birth control ($F(1,30)=13.85$, $p<.01$) were significant. These results indicated that for both variables, men who lasted perceived their partners to make these decisions consistently more, while women who lasted perceived a more equal distribution.

Neither the main effect of time, nor the interaction effect between gender and time was significant, ($Fs<1$). The results are presented in Table 9.

The decision making variable in when to engage in intercourse in the relationship presented a standard deviation of 0 for women who lasted. Although this can be problematic in an analysis such as this, in this case, because the smallest sized group has the smallest standard deviation (0), this shows a more stringent analysis. As another check as to the stability of this test, a Box M test of homogeneity among variance was performed, but did not reveal any significant differences related to the standard deviation.

To examine the effects of time and gender on the contribution of resources scale, a 2x4 multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on overall contribution of resources, contribution of support, physical appearance and intellect and contribution of sex, social status and services. Neither

the main effects for time and gender nor the interaction effect of time and gender were significant ($F_s < 1$).

Although not significant, there was an interesting pattern in the gender effect for the contribution of physical attractiveness and intellect. The means are provided in the Table 10 below. Again, a high score indicates the perception that the subject contributes "much more than my partner" while a low score indicates the perception that the subject contributes "much less than my partner". The pattern revealed that women perceived themselves to contribute more than their partners in the area of physical attractiveness, whereas, they felt they contributed less in the area of intellect.

Table 9

Means for Gender Effect in Decision Making Authority

Variable	Female			Male		
Problems	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
1	1.58	.52	12	2.30	.66	20
2	1.75	.62	12	2.15	.59	20
3	1.67	.65	12	2.20	.62	20
4	2.00	.74	12	2.10	.79	20
Sex						
1	2.00	0	12	2.25	.64	20
2	1.75	.62	12	2.30	.57	20
3	1.83	.58	12	2.25	.64	20
4	1.83	.58	12	2.30	.57	20
Birth Control						
1	1.58	.52	12	2.25	.79	20
2	1.75	.62	12	2.50	.61	20
3	1.67	.49	12	2.25	.55	20
4	1.67	.49	12	2.25	.64	20

Table 10

Means Over Time for Contribution Variables

Variable	Female			Male		
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N
CON Physical Attraction						
1	3.39	.77	13	2.85	.88	20
2	3.15	.56	13	2.85	.75	20
3	3.15	.56	13	2.80	.70	20
4	3.31	.75	13	2.75	.72	20
CON Intellect						
1	2.85	.69	13	3.10	.79	20
2	2.77	.60	13	3.15	.88	20
3	2.92	.64	13	3.40	.94	20
4	2.77	.60	13	3.45	.76	20

Part of the objectives of this research was to study the relationships among the power, commitment and satisfaction variables over the four months. To accomplish this, zero-order correlation's were calculated for men and women who lasted the duration of the study on the dependent variables at time four. The correlation's are presented in Table 11 on the following page.

Table 11

Correlation Matrix of Dependent Variables (time 4) for Men
and Women

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
(1) Personal Dedication	.84** .63**	.54* .25	.43 -.29	.12 .23	.55* .02	.38 -.34	-.69** -.49*	.33 .19
(2) DAS		.45 -.06	.37 -.06**	.19 -.28	.57* -.28	.44 -.24	.51 .06	.08 -.19
(3) Constraint Commitment			.04 .26	.16 .29	.52 .34	-.06 -.49*	.32 .39	.07 .06
(4) Contribution of Resources				.28 .50*	.71** .56**	.47 .20	.27 .23	.57* .49*
(5) Decision Making					.24 .04	.15 .21	.42 .34	.38 .44
(6) Dependence						.57 .40	.32 .24	.53 .27
(7) Control							.14 .44	.27 .19
(8) Contribution of Physical Appearance								.50 .35
(9) Overall Perceived Power								1

women: (n=13)

men: (n=20)

*: $p < .05$

** : $p < .01$

There were several a priori predictions based on past research that were made for these correlations. First, it was expected that commitment would be positively related to

both satisfaction (Murstein & MacDonald (1983); Sprecher (1988)) and equity in relationships (Grauerholz (1987); Sprecher (1988)). Indeed, for both men and women whose relationships lasted, the personal dedication aspect of the commitment scale was positively related to satisfaction (men, $r = .63$; women, $r = .84$, $p < .01$), but not to an overall perceived egalitarian power distribution.

Based on the work of Ickes (1985), Antill (1983), Madden (1987) and Aida & Falbo (1991), it was thought that higher reported levels of satisfaction would relate to higher numbers of reported egalitarian relationships. The matrix shows that neither men nor women demonstrated significant positive associations between overall perceived equal power and satisfaction. Similarly, as contribution of resources is thought to be a form of power in relationships, with unequal contributions of resources relating to unequal power balances, it was thought that any inequality in the case of contribution would affect levels of satisfaction and commitment. For men, those who perceived themselves to contribute more emotionally, also reported being less happy with their relationship ($r = -.66$, $p < .01$). Along these same lines, Sprecher (1985) had proposed that higher emotional contributions made by one person in a relationship would be associated with a feeling of having less power (and more dependence). For both men ($r = .56$) and women ($r = .71$), $p < .01$, the more they felt they contributed emotionally compared to their partner, the more dependent they felt they

were on their partner emotionally and overall, the more egalitarian they perceived their relationship to be, (Men, $r = .49$; Women, $r = .57$, $p < .05$). For men also, the more they felt they contributed emotionally, the more balanced they perceived their decision making authority to be, ($r = .50$, $p < .05$).

From the research of Blood & Wolf (1960), it was found that egalitarian decision making patterns were usually associated with the relationship overall as being reported as egalitarian. In this study, there was no significant relationship between reported decision making equality and overall power equality for either men or women.

There were other significant correlation's that were not necessarily predictable from past research, but are nevertheless interesting. For example, for women, higher reported levels of dependence on their partner related to both higher levels of personal dedication commitment ($r = .55$, $p < .05$) and satisfaction ($r = .57$, $p < .05$). For men, higher levels of perceived control in decision making related to lower levels of constraint commitment ($r = -.49$, $p < .05$). For both men and women, contributions of physical attractiveness to the relationship revealed interesting relations. In terms of physical attractiveness, both men ($r = -.49$, $p < .05$) and women ($r = -.69$, $p < .01$) reported being less committed to their relationship when they reported a perception of themselves contributing more physical attraction than their partners.

Testing for Gender Differences

The magnitude of gender differences in correlation's was tested for significance using Fisher's z transformation. Several of the correlation pairs were significant, indicating that these differences are unlikely to reflect chance fluctuations. The correlation between satisfaction and perceived emotional contribution was significantly different, $z = 2.97$, $p < .01$ as was the correlation between satisfaction and dependence, $z = 2.35$, $p < .05$, indicating in both instances that men were less happy in their relationships when they perceive themselves to contribute more emotionally and to be more dependent on their partner.

Survival Analysis

In an effort to examine which variables or characteristics predicted which couples stayed together compared to those who broke up, a step wise Cox regression with potential predictors was performed on 10 variables from the first testing session. For the small number of subjects in this study, a maximum of about 10 variables are allowed in this type of analysis for it to remain a valid measure of prediction. These variables included personal dedication, constraint commitment, perceived power, satisfaction, expectations for future levels of commitment, feelings and equality, levels of dependence, gender and levels of seriousness of this relationship at time one. These variables were chosen based on their potential for actually

being a predictor of break-up/lasting. For example, decision making authority in what restaurant to go to was not thought to have as much potential of being a predictor variable as something like levels of commitment. Because only a small number of variables could be used in the analysis, the selection process had to be very discriminating.

The survival analysis indicated that overall, the indicated level of seriousness was the best and only significant predictor of a couple lasting from the first testing session. Those subjects who indicated that their relationship was serious and exclusive were more likely to last than those who labelled their relationship casual and non-exclusive. The results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard Function for
Survival Without Break-up

Predictor	Initial Score	Order of Entry	Coeff.	Hazard Function Multipli- cation Factor	Partial Correlation
Now	7.53	1	-.62	.54	-.16
Personal Dedication	.68				
Power	.59				
Feelings	.81				
Equal	.22				
Dependence	.58				
Control	.08				
Commitment	.03				
DAS	.34				
Sex	3.14				

Survival analysis was also used for the second, third, and fourth month to look at the variables predicting who lasted from the preceding months. At testing session two, indicated level of seriousness from the first month was the only significant predictor of who lasted.

Table 13

Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard Function for
Survival Without Break-up

Predictor	Initial Score	Order of Entry	Coeff.	Hazard Function Multipli- cation Factor	Partial Correlation
NOW	7.77	1	-.63	.53	-.17
Personal Dedication	.74				
Power	.63				
Feelings	.77				
Equal	.10				
Dependence	.54				
Control	.14				
Commitment	.05				
DAS	.17				
Sex	3.33				

At time three, significant predictor variables from time two were, again, indicated level of seriousness and satisfaction scores. Therefore, in addition to labelling their relationships as serious and exclusive, those who with higher satisfaction scores were more likely to last.

Table 14

Stepwise Cox Regression Predicting Hazard Function for
Survival Without Break-up

Predictor	Initial Score	Order of Entry	Coeff.	Hazard Function Multipli- cation Factor	Partial Correlation
Now	5.97	1	-.71	.49	-.17
Feelings	1.14				
Equal	.11				
Commitment	.04				
Sex	5.03				
Personal Dedication	2.60				
DAS	4.02	2	-.09	.91	-.13
Control	.20				
Dependence	3.29				
Power	.01				

At time four, no variables from time three were significant in predicting who lasted.

Chapter 4

Discussion

Several researchers have investigated the relationship between commitment, satisfaction and perceived power in intimate relationships. Although most have chosen to focus their research on married couples, some have looked at dating or pre-married couples. Peplau (1979) did not find any relation between power imbalances (based on self labelled traditional or egalitarian college couples) and satisfaction with the relationship, whereas, Stuart & Rubin (1974) found in their sample of college students that an imbalance of power did relate to lower satisfaction for subjects. In their studies of college students, Grauerholz (1987) and Jermott, Ashby & Lindenfield (1989) found that high levels of commitment related to a more egalitarian perception of the relationship. Rusbalt (1983) and Sprecher (1988) both found with their college sample those reporting a more equal relationships also reported more satisfaction and higher levels of commitment than those reporting their relationships to be less equal.

The majority of these studies also relied on one testing session. The one exception was that of Rusbalt (1983) who chose a longitudinal format in her investigation of the Investment model with satisfaction and commitment. She found that higher levels of emotional investment related to higher levels of commitment and satisfaction. She also

found that levels of rewards, commitment and satisfaction increase over time.

The present investigation looked at the pattern in the development of power, commitment and satisfaction in university dating relationship over a 4 month period. In this sense, it is only one of a very small number of studies that has chosen to follow a longitudinal format. In effect, it also combined past research into one by looking at several sources of power (contribution of resources, decision making authority, control, dependence, etc.) and the relation to commitment and satisfaction. Past studies have tended to look at each separately.

Based on the results of Stanley & Markman (1991), Sprecher (1988), Rusbalt (1983) and Hendrick, Hendrick & Adler (1988), it was hypothesised that those reporting a higher level of commitment would also report higher levels of satisfaction with the relationship. Indeed, for both men and women, the personal dedication aspect of the Commitment Inventory and DAS scores were significantly and positively related, with those subjects who scored highly in their levels of commitment also scoring highly in their levels of satisfaction. This was to be expected as Stanley & Markman (1991) suggested that the personal dedication aspect was more related to satisfaction, while the constraint commitment aspect was related more to stability. A lack of significant relation between the DAS and constraint commitment may indicate that first year university

relationships up to a maximum of 6 months old still do not experience the constraints to maintain the relationship that more serious relationships might experience. In terms of the perception of an egalitarian relationship, there have been several methods put forth in measuring power distributions in relationships. Generally, with few exceptions, the patterns revealed that those reporting or demonstrating a non-egalitarian relationships also tended to report less satisfaction and lower levels of commitment in their relationship. It was hypothesised here, then, that the more egalitarian subjects reported their relationships to be in all the areas of power, the happier and more committed they would report themselves to be with their relationships.

Results indicated that perceptions of overall egalitarian relationships did not relate to higher levels of satisfaction for both men and women. This does not support Antill (1983), Lu (1952), Terman (1938) and Ickes (1985), however, those researchers studied only married couples. The one researcher in this area who investigated college couples, Peplau (1979), also did not find any relation in her subjects between their reported level of power and their level of satisfaction. Perhaps the university samples in this and Peplau's study were not as concerned with an egalitarian balance in their dating relationships as they might be in a more serious type relationship such as marriage.

Sprecher (1985) questioned college students about who they perceived contributed more resources, who loved whom more and who had the power in their relationships. She discovered that for both men and women, the more each felt they contributed emotionally to the relationship, the less power they felt they possessed. The correlational results in this study indicated that for both men and women, those that felt they contributed more emotionally to the relationship than their partner also reported that they felt more dependent on their partner and they perceived their partner to possess more overall power in the relationship. In addition to this, the men who reported they perceived themselves to contribute more emotionally to the relationship also reported that they perceived their partner to have more say in the decision making in the relationship. One explanation for this can be that the perception of contributing emotionally to a relationship opens a person up to a certain level of vulnerability, particularly when the perception is that one is contributing *more* than his/her partner. This leads to a higher level of dependence on the other for reciprocal emotional contributions. As dependence has been suggested as another form of power (those less dependent have the power; Sprecher, 1985), this finding can be translated into the fact that for both men and women, the more each felt they contributed to the relationship emotionally, the more dependent, and less power they also reported perceiving, supporting Sprecher's findings.

Grauerholz (1987) found in her study of 328 dating college students that in highly committed and trusting relationships, subjects were also more likely to also perceive their relationship as more egalitarian. Her measure of power included questions on dating events and decision making situations. It was hypothesised here that the more subjects perceived their relationship to be egalitarian (in decision making authority), the more committed they would be. The results indicated this relationship did not exist for either men or women. For men, the importance of whether or not the relationship overall is perceived as egalitarian did not relate to either satisfaction or levels of commitment. Decision making authority in social activities, specifically, had no relation in terms of commitment and satisfaction. Perhaps men are more accepting and even prefer their partner to take more of a stand in decisions in the relationship to the extent that this variable is not a source of dominance for them any longer.

Rusbalt (1983) found in her longitudinal research of college dating couples that those subjects reporting that they invested more emotionally in their relationship, also reported themselves to be happier and more committed. In the present research, the men who perceived themselves to contribute more emotionally to the relationship also reported themselves to be less satisfied with the relationship. The one difference between the two findings is that Rusbalt's "emotional investment" implies a voluntary

giving of one's emotions to the relationship, whereas, an imbalanced contribution of emotions suggests a more negative situation in which the subject is compelled to acknowledge the perception that he/she does give more emotionally to the relationship than his/her partner. In this case, men have traditionally been thought of as having some difficulties revealing their emotions. When they are then in the vulnerable position of perceiving themselves to actually contribute *more* than their partner, this may give them a sense of discomfort. They may perhaps feel that their partner is not as "into" the relationship as they are, thereby also creating some dissatisfaction for them. For women, the fact that the relation between emotional contribution and satisfaction was not significant only confirms the notion that women are still used to being the ones who give more emotionally compared to men, so the perception of contributing more emotionally does not tend to affect their levels of commitment or satisfaction.

There were some interesting findings in the correlation's that were significant, but unexpected. For example, for women, there was a significant relations between dependence and commitment and satisfaction; those reporting themselves to be more dependent on their partner, also reported more commitment and satisfaction with the relationship. One explanations for these findings is that the more committed to and satisfied women are with their relationships, the more emotionally dependent they are on

their partner and relationship to maintain the commitment and happiness.

For men, those reporting higher levels of perceived control in decision making situations also reported lower levels of commitment. It could be that men who feel that they own the control in the relationship are more likely to devalue their partner and relationship overall, thereby, not rating as high in their levels of commitment to the relationship. This supports the findings of Kyonis, et al. (1976) who reported that those men who had the final say when disagreements arose (control) tended to devalue their spouse and were less happy in their marriages.

One of the relations that emerged which was quite unexpected was the relation between contribution of physical attractiveness and commitment. For both men and women, the more they reported they contributed to the relationship in physical attractiveness, the lower their commitment levels tended to be. Although a touch fickle, probably the most obvious explanation for this is that by feeling that they are more attractive to the opposite sex than their partner is to the opposite sex, subjects may feel that they can "have" or "get" another partner any time they want should this relationship not work, resulting in less commitment to the relationship. Perhaps someone who thought they were not very attractive to the opposite sex might feel more difficulty in finding another partner, hence the motivation

to maintain the relationship, making the feelings of commitment to the relationship stronger.

In order to investigate the pattern of power, commitment and satisfaction over time and the differences between those who lasted and those who broke up, multivariate analyses of variances were employed. In terms of commitment, women in general tended to be higher in their levels of personal dedication than men. The only significant comparison was that between men who lasted and women who lasted with women rating themselves to be significantly more committed in terms of personal dedication than men. One explanation is that perhaps women still tend to become more committed to their partners faster and with more vigour than men, particularly at this age (late teens, early twenties). Although men date, they still may not be as interested in a long term, committed relationship as women.

In looking at the patterns of those who lasted over the four months, women, again, consistently rated higher in their personal dedication than men. For both, commitment tended to rise over the four months, supporting Rusbalt's (1983) finding that commitment tends to increase over time. By the fourth testing session, men and women were quite high in their level of commitment, indicating that with time, people do become more dedicated to their relationships.

The analysis of satisfaction was quite interesting. There were no differences between subjects who broke up and subjects who lasted at the first testing session, indicating

that this is not a distinguishing variable as to who will last or not. At the first testing session, all subjects were involved with their partners for about the same length of time, and these results indicate that people tend to be generally as satisfied with their relationship in the early stages whether they end up breaking up or not.

In comparing men and women over time, there were no gender differences, however, the trend was for levels of satisfaction for both to decline over time with a slight increase for males at the last testing session. This is contrary to what Rusbalt (1983) found (satisfaction increases over time). This is difficult to explain, as Rusbalt's sample also consisted of college students dating through the school year. One explanation is that while people are quite satisfied with their relationships at the start (while each person is on their "best behaviour"), with time, disillusionment or unhappiness may begin to set in as the "true" person emerges. The second testing session in January was right after the holidays, and some general unhappiness may have been present at being back at school or from homesickness. Also, at this time, subjects may have been separated from their partner for a couple of weeks, contributing to a possible re-evaluation of the relationship. By February, students were going through the stressful period of mid-terms and assignments. Arguments may have arisen because of this. Also, by this time, subjects had been with their partner for 3 to 4 months, a time when

perhaps some began discussions on commitment and where the relationship was going. These discussions may have caused some dissatisfaction if they resulted in arguments, or realisations that one person had a different idea of where the relationship was going. The slight dip upwards at the last testing session may have been due to a resolution of any uncertainties concerning the relationship as the end of the school year drew nearer, whether it was to end the relationship for the summer, or maintain it. The fact that it was close to the end of school may have also put many people in a better mood overall. Generally, it is difficult to explain why satisfaction with the relationship declined over time without actually asking the subjects each month the reasons they were less happy with their relationship. This could be something to be considered for future research.

In the area of power, there were several interesting findings particularly in the decision making authority domain. Men generally perceived their partner to make more decisions concerning discussing problems in the relationship and birth control while women perceived a more balanced structure of decision making. Perhaps men are more willing to defer the power of these decisions to their partner in an effort to not look like they are trying to "control" their partner. Or, though they may perceive their partner to make these decisions, their partner may perceive the balance as equal. Similarly, the men who broke up perceived their

decision making authority in this area as equal, whereas, their partners may feel the men make more of the decisions. In the area of decision making of when to have intercourse and birth control in the relationship, men who maintained their relationship generally felt that their partners tended to have more authority in deciding, while, again, women perceived more of a balance. This is understandable in an age where the idea of men forcing or coercing women into having intercourse is seriously frowned upon, whether the couple is in a relationship or not. It seems that men are finally considering women's feelings in this area to the point where they are leaving this decision entirely up to women.

Still in the area of sexual relations in the relationship, although men perceived their partner to make the decision about intercourse, men also perceived themselves to contribute more sexual intimacy to the relationship than their partners. Similarly, women perceived themselves to contribute less sexually than their partners. One explanation is that although couples nowadays may have reached a better understanding of the dynamics of sexual relations in terms of women having more say about when in the relationship to engage and are feeling less pressured by their partners, once the couple has decided the time is right, they revert back to the traditional idea that it is generally the man's responsibility to initiate sex. Perhaps women are still carrying the idea that if they are the ones

to initiate intercourse too often, they will come across as sleazy.

Part of the objectives of this research was to identify the commonalties in those who lasted as opposed to those who ended their relationship. It was thought that there would be certain patterns of answers or certain variables that were common to those subjects who made it through the length of the study. The results of the survival analysis revealed that from the first testing session, only one variable, perceived level of seriousness of the relationship, was a significant predictor of who would last until the end. Generally, those who perceived their relationship at time one to be long term and serious tended to last while those who perceived their relationship to be casual and less serious tended to break up. This makes sense, in the sense that those subjects who initially consider their relationship long term and serious are probably expecting to be in that relationship for awhile; they do not tend to take their relationships casually and are more willing to put in the work to maintain the relationship.

Predictor variables were also looked at to investigate any common patterns that predicted break up from month to month. Again, in the second month, only level of perceived seriousness was a significant predictor. In the third month, along with level of seriousness, the higher the satisfaction score from month two, the more likely the subjects were to remain with their partners. This is interesting and can be

explained by the fact that time two occurred right after the Christmas holidays, a time when many would have been separated for the first time. If, after two weeks apart, they were still very happy with their relationship, chances are they were in it more for the long haul and were more dedicated to making it work. In the fourth month, no variables from the third month were significant in predicting who would stay together, probably because the break ups that occurred between the third and the fourth month were due to unexpected, almost drastic things, rather than a measurable underlying differences. For example, one subject who broke up between the third and fourth session reported that everything was fine and would have kept going, but her partner suddenly wanted her to quit school and get married. Another subject had been hit by a bus and was forced to move back home for a year. Although their relationship would have kept going if the accident had not occurred, the distance of the separation for a year was too much for them. The subjects lasting until the third and fourth months were very much the same in every other way.

There are several limitations to this study. First, only university students were used as the subject pool. Consequently, the results can only be generalised to a young, middle class university population.

Second, with a questionnaire measure, one always runs the risk of biases and demand characteristics (particularly in the power scales) affecting subject answers. In this

sense, it would be interesting in future research to add a behavioural component to the measure. For example, in addition to questioning subjects about their decision making patterns or levels of contributions, subjects could also be observed in certain situations with their partners or interviewed together as a verification to their answers on their questionnaires. In investigating couples together, further studies could take the opportunity to compare the answers and discrepancies in perceptions between partners.

One problem with the sole reliance of questionnaires is the fact that there may be a difference in the meanings of certain words or phrases that men and women use. For example, "contribution of sex" could mean many things to different people. It might be necessary in future research to investigate this possible difference by asking subjects to define what the phrases mean to them, or by giving a short vignette about a couple, and asking subjects to rate the power distribution based on some of the phrases to see if men and women rate the vignette the same. A behavioural component of interviewing couples may also counteract any language discrepancies.

There may have been other problems with the questionnaires in terms of people answering based on an isolated incident rather than reflecting on the month as a whole. For example, one subject was disillusioned one session because of an argument he had with his partner over suspected infidelity. This one incident seemed to cloud his

views in terms of satisfaction and commitment with the relationship even though he and his partner may have been perfectly happy the rest of the month.

Another possible limitation based on these questionnaires may be the fact that the researcher was always a female. There was no control of a male researcher administering the measures. This may have affected answers, particularly male subjects in the answers concerning power and commitment. In an effort to appear more "supportive" or even feminist in their thinking, they may have tailored their answers to reflect this effort, rather than to reflect their true feelings. Because their partners did not necessarily participate and couples were not compared, this mild deception on the subjects part would be easy to accomplish.

Lastly, the small number of subjects in this research is problematic for both the analysis and the subject attrition effects. Larger numbers would be better for future research in order to still have a sufficient number of subjects left in the end.

In addition to the suggestions above, further research may wish to replicate this study using a slightly older sample than the one here. It was felt that perhaps this sample was still generally on the immature side in terms of relationship development. To get a more realistic picture of the progress of relationships from a clinical perspective, following older subjects (23-26 years old as opposed to 19-

22 years old) may be more beneficial. It is thought that the whole university environment may affect subject's perceptions; perhaps getting away from that environment and into the "real" world may serve as a better indicator of relationship growth. Ideally, it would be fascinating to follow these same subjects and their relationship through their university career to note the development.

Epilogue

This study attempted to investigate the differences between men and women and between people who broke-up versus those who were able to maintain their relationships over a 5-month span in the area of power, commitment and satisfaction. A main aspect to this study was also to investigate the progression and development of these three variables in a relationship over time.

From reading the Review of the Literature, particularly with respect to the past research on power, it becomes apparent that this area is very diverse with respect to both the definitions of power and the measures of power being used. To date, there has not been one consistent way to measure relationship power, thereby leading to discrepant measures and results. The definitions of power are inconsistent, with some researchers measuring whether the relationship is egalitarian and others measuring whether it is equitable. These two words seem to be used interchangeably, when they can mean quite different things. The present investigation attempted to bring some sense of consistency to this area by combining the various ways that have been used to assess power into one questionnaire. By creating a large power questionnaire, this study was able to question the same subjects using several measures instead of different subjects using different measures. The intent was to investigate the reliability of the different measures of

2 of/de 2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

power and whether, in fact, they measure relationship power in the same way. The present study, therefore, was highly exploratory with respect to the results on power, and should be interpreted as such.

The results that did emerge concerning power suggest that these various methods of assessing power are not, in fact, assessing the same thing. Some subscales did reveal results that supported the literature, while others did not. For example, levels of perceived control, contribution of resources, and much of the decision making authority questions did not reveal any significant results in terms of their relationship to commitment and satisfaction. One would expect that if all these variables were measuring the same construct of power, they would all have revealed the same effects on commitment and satisfaction as past research had reported. Unfortunately, without a single definition of relationship power, it is difficult to assess which of these subscales measure power and which does not. It could also be that in a young dating sample such as the one in the present study, some of these aspects of power are not applicable or appropriate for less serious relationships.

It is therefore suggested that future researchers interested in this area be clear in terms of their own thoughts and definitions of relationship power and design their measures based on that definition. With some measures of power, there is the definite possibility that semantic problems may exist in the terms and phrases used. A

behavioural component is strongly recommended in addition to paper and pencil questionnaires, as this might serve to clarify any language confusion. If studying couples together, interviews would also be an excellent opportunity to counteract any demand characteristics that may arise through the questionnaires. Strictly behavioural exercises, such as talking time and interruption situations to assess power (as in Gray-Little, 1982; Jacobson & Holtzworth-Munro, 1986) are not recommended as they are too reliant on the subjective opinion of the researcher.

REFERENCES

- Aida, Y., & Falbo, T., (1991). Relationships between marital satisfaction, resources and power strategies. Sex Roles, 24(2), 43-56.
- Antill, J.K., (1983). Sex role complementarity versus similarity in married couples. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 145-155.
- Blood, R.O. & Wolf, D.M., (1960). Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Illinois:Free Press.
- Brehm, S.S., (1985). Intimate Relationships. New York:Random House.
- Brickman, P., (1987). Commitment, Conflict and Caring. New Jersey:Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Cromwell, R.E., & Olson, D.H., (1975). Power in Families. New York:Wiley Press.
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L.A., (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 618-628.
- Fletcher, G.J., Fincham, F.D., Cramer, L., & Heron, N., (1987). The role of attributions in the development of dating relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(3), 481-489.
- Gillespie, D.L., (1971). Who has the power? The marital struggle. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, 445-458.

- Gottman, J.M., (1979). Marital Interactions: Experimental Investigations. New York:Academic Press.
- Grauerholz, E., (1987). Balancing the power in dating relationships. Sex Roles, 17(9-10), 563-571.
- Gray-Little, B., (1982). Marital quality and power process among black couples. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 44, 633-646.
- Gray-Little, B., & Burks, N., (1983). Power and satisfaction in marriage: A review and critique. Psychological Bulletin, 49(3), 513-538.
- Haley J., (1962). Family experiments: A new type of experimentation. Family Process, 13, 207-214.
- Hansen, G.L., (1987). Reward level and marital adjustment: The effect of weighting rewards. Journal of Social Psychology, 27(5), 549-551.
- Hatfield, E., Walster, G.W., & Traupmann, J., (1978). Equity and premarital sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 82-92.
- Hendrick, S.S., Hendrick, C., & Adler, N.L., (1988). Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction and staying together. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54(6), 980- 988.
- Ickes, W., (1985). Sex role influences on compatibility in relationship. In Compatible and Incompatible Relationships, W. Ickes (Ed). New York:Springer-Verlag.

- Jacobson, N.S., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A., (1986). Marital therapy: A social learning/cognitive perspective. In N.S. Jacobson, & A.S. Gurman (Eds.). Clinical Handbook of Marital Therapy. New York:Guilford.
- Jemmot, J.B., Ashby, R.L., & Lindenfield, K., (1989). Romantic commitment and the perceived availability of opposite sex persons: On loving the one you're with. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19(4), 1198-1211.
- Johnson, P., (1976). Women and power: Toward a theory of effectiveness. Journal of social Issues, 32(3), 99-109.
- Kelley, H.H., (1983). Love and commitment. In H.H. Kelley (Ed.). Close Relationships. San Francisco:Freeman.
- King, C.E., & Christensen, A., (1983). The relationship events scale: A guttman scaling of progress in courtship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45, 671-678.
- Knox, D.H., & Sporakowski, M.J., (1968). Attitudes of college students toward love. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 638-642.
- Kolb, M. & Strauss, M., (1974). Marital power and marital happiness in relation to problem-solving ability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36, 756-766.
- Kyonis, D., Castell, P.J., Gergen, M., & Mauch, D., (1976). Metamorphic effects of power. Journal of Applied Psychology, 61(2), 127-135.
- Lu, Y.C., (1952). Marital roles and marriage adjustment. Sociology and Social Research, 36, 364-368.

- Lund, M., (1985). The development of investment and commitment scales for predicting continuity of personal relationships. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 3-23.
- Madden, M.E., (1987). Perceived control and power in marriage: A study of marital decision making and task performance. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 13(1), 73-82.
- McDonald, G.W., (1980). Family power: The assessment of a decade of theory and research 1970-79. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, 841-852.
- Michaels, J.W., Acock, A.C., & Edwards, J.N., (1986). Social exchange and equity determinants of relationship commitment. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3, 161-175.
- Murstein, B.I., & Macdonald, M.G., (1983). The relationship of "exchange orientation" and "commitment" scales to marriage adjustment. International Journal of Psychology, 18, 297- 311.
- Peplau, L.A., (1979). Power in Dating Relationships. In Women: A Feminist Perspective, 2nd Edition., J. Freeman (Ed). Palo Alto:Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Peplau, L.A., & Miller-Campbell, S., (1989). The Balance of Power in Dating and Marriage. In Women: A Feminist Perspective, 4th Edition., J. Freeman (Ed.). Mountain View:Mayfield Publishing Company.

- Rusbalt, C., (1980). Commitment and satisfaction in romantic associations: A test of the investment model. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 16, 172-186.
- Rusbalt, C., (1983). Longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45(1), 101-117.
- Sabatelli, R.M., & Cecil-Pigo, E.F., (1985). Relational interdependence and commitment in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 47, 931-937.
- Schlesinger, B., (1983). Lasting and functioning marriages in the 1980's. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 2(2), 45-55.
- Sprecher, S., (1985). Sex differences in bases of power in dating relationships. Sex Roles, 12(3-4), 449-462.
- Sprecher, S., (1988). Investment model, equity and social support determinants of relationship commitment. Social Psychology Quarterly, 51(4), 318-328.
- Sprenkle, D.H. & Olson, D.H., (1978). Circumplex model of marital systems: An empirical study of cliniccal and non-clinical couples. Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 4(2), 59-74.
- Stanley, S.M., & Markman, H.J., (1991). Relationship commitment: The new kid on the cognitive block. Paper presented to the 5th Annual Convention Association for the Advancement of Behaviour Therapy, Colorado.

- Stanley, S.M., & Markman, H.J., (1992). Assessing commitment in personal relationships. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54, 595-608.
- Stewart, A.J., & Rubin, Z., (1974). The power motive in the dating couple. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 34(2), 305-309.
- Terman, L.M., (1938). Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Utne, M.K., Hatfield, E., Traupmann, J., & Greenberger, D., (1984). Equity, marital satisfaction and stability. Journal of Personality and Social and Personal Relationhsips, 1, 323-332.
- Walster, E., Walster, G.W., & Traupmann, J., (1978). Equity and premarital sex. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37, 82-92.
- Whisman, M.A., & Jacobson, N.S., (1990). Power, marital satisfaction and response to marital therapy. Journal of Family Psychology, 4(2), 202-212.

Appendix A

COMMITMENT INVENTORY

Please indicate your sex: Male_____ Female_____

This questionnaire is designed to tell us about you and your feelings about your relationship with your partner (whether that relationship is with a spouse, someone you are dating, a fiance, etc.). Any items about your "relationship" refer to your relationship with your partner. Some items are designed to tell us about your attitudes or beliefs and do not refer to your relationship with your partner.

For each item, you are to respond by indicating how strongly you agree or disagree with the idea expressed. If you strongly agree with the item, you should circle "7". If you strongly disagree with the item, you should circle "1". If you neither agree nor disagree with the item, you should circle "4". You can circle any number from 1 to 7 to indicate various levels of agreement or disagreement with the idea expressed in each item.

We have tried to construct items such that almost everyone in a relationship can answer all items. Please try to circle a response for every item.

- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My friends would not mind if my partner and I broke up (divorced)
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I know people of the same/opposite sex whom I desire more than my partner
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I may decide that I want to end this relationship at some point in the future
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I want to keep the plans for my life somewhat separate from my partner's plans for life
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Except when a spouse dies, marriage should be a once-in-a-lifetime commitment
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 This relationship has cost me very little in terms of physical, tangible resources
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I want this relationship to stay strong no matter what rough times we may encounter
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I don't make commitments unless I believe I will keep them
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 My relationship with my partner comes before my relationship with my friends
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 It can be personally fulfilling to give something up for my partner
- 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 I am willing to have or develop a sense of an identity as a couple with my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have disclosed much of my true self to my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	My career (studies) is more important to me than my relationship with my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	My family would not care either way if this relationship ended
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	People should feel free to end a marriage as long as children are not going to be hurt
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I cannot open up to my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I do not get much fulfillment out of sacrificing for my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	It would be difficult for me to find a new partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I want to grow old with my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	It would be difficult for my friends to accept it if I ended the relationship with my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I tend to think about how things affect "us" as a couple more than how things affect "me" as an individual
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have not spent much money on my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	My friends want to see my relationship with my partner continue
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	When push comes to shove, my relationship with my partner often must take a back seat to other interest of mine

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I get satisfaction out of doing things for my partner, even if it means I miss out on something I want for myself

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I do not feel compelled to keep all of the commitments that I make

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I would lose money, or feel like money had been wasted, if my partner and I broke up (divorced)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am not seriously attracted to people of the same/opposite sex other than my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

My family really wants this relationship to work

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Divorce is wrong

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

When the pressure is really on and I must choose, my partner's happiness is not as important to me as are other things in my life

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I would have trouble finding a suitable partner if this relationship ended

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I have trouble making commitments because I do not want to close off alternatives

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

My relationship with my partner is clearly part of my future life plans

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

My relationship with my partner is more important to me than almost anything else in my life

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If a couple works hard at making their marriage work but find themselves incompatible, divorce is the best thing they can do

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am not seriously attracted to anyone other than my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

If for any reason my relationship ended, I could find another partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I have put alot of time and energy into this relationship

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I try hard to follow through on all of my commitments

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I like to think of my partner and me more in terms of "us" and "we" than "me" and "him/her"

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I am not the kind of person that finds satisfaction in putting aside my interests fir the sake of my relationship with my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I would lose valuable possessions if I left my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Though I would not want to end the relationship with my partner, I would like to have a romantic/sexual relationship with someone other than my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Fairly often I make commitments to people or things that I do not follow through on

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I may not want to be with my partner a few years from now

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I believe there are many people who would be happy with me as their spouse or partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I do not often find myself thinking about what it would be like to be in a relationship with someone else

1 2 3 4 5 6 7	My partner does not really know much about the real me
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have put a number of tangible, valuable resources into this relationship
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Though it might take awhile, I could find another desirable partner if I wanted or needed to
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I am more comfortable thinking in terms of "my" things rather than "our" things
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	It is all right for a couple to get a divorce if their marriage is not working out
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	It makes me feel good to sacrifice for my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have shared little of my real self with my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Following through on commitments is an essential part of who I am
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I do not want to have a strong identity as a couple with my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I think alot about what it would be like to be married to (or dating) someone other than my partner
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	When push comes to shove, my relationship with my partner comes first
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I am not very attractive to the same/opposite sex
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have put very little money into this relationship

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I can easily confide in my partner

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Giving something up for my partner is
frequently not worth the trouble

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

I do not have life-long plans for
this relationship

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

My family would not care if I ended
this relationship

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

A marriage is a sacred bond between
two people which should never be
broken

Appendix B

SATISFACTION SCALE

In the space provided, please check the number that you feel best describes your relationship now in the following situations.

1. How often do you discuss or have you considered, separation or terminating your relationship?

- ___ 0 All the time
- ___ 1 Most of the time
- ___ 2 More often than not
- ___ 3 Occasionally
- ___ 4 Rarely
- ___ 5 Never

2. How often do you or your partner leave after a fight?

- ___ 0 All the time
- ___ 1 Most of the time
- ___ 2 More often than not
- ___ 3 Occasionally
- ___ 4 Rarely
- ___ 5 Never

3. In general, how often do you think that things between you and your partner are going well?

- ___ 0 All the time
- ___ 1 Most of the time
- ___ 2 More often than not
- ___ 3 Occasionally
- ___ 4 Rarely
- ___ 5 Never

4. Do you confide in your partner?

- ___ 0 All the time
- ___ 1 Most of the time
- ___ 2 More often than not
- ___ 3 Occasionally
- ___ 4 Rarely
- ___ 5 Never

5. Do you ever regret that you began dating your partner?

- ☐ 0 All the time
- ☐ 1 Most of the time
- ☐ 2 More often than not
- ☐ 3 Occasionally
- ☐ 4 Rarely
- ☐ 5 Never

6. How often do you and your partner quarrel?

- ☐ 0 All the time
- ☐ 1 Most of the time
- ☐ 2 More often than not
- ☐ 3 Occasionally
- ☐ 4 Rarely
- ☐ 5 Never

7. How often do you and your partner "get on each other's nerves"?

- ☐ 0 All the time
- ☐ 1 Most of the time
- ☐ 2 More often than not
- ☐ 3 Occasionally
- ☐ 4 Rarely
- ☐ 5 Never

8. Do you kiss your partner?

- ☐ 4 Every day
- ☐ 3 Almost every day
- ☐ 2 Occasionally
- ☐ 1 Rarely
- ☐ 0 Never

9. Do you and your partner engage in outside interests together?

- ☐ 4 All of them
- ☐ 3 Most of them
- ☐ 2 Some of them
- ☐ 1 Very few of them
- ☐ 0 None of them

10. All things considered, which describes the degree of happiness of your relationship at this point in time:

- _____ 6 Perfect
- _____ 5 Extremely Happy
- _____ 4 Very Happy
- _____ 3 Happy
- _____ 2 A Little Unhappy
- _____ 1 Fairly Unhappy
- _____ 0 Extremely Unhappy

Appendix C

POWER SCALE

In the space provided, please check the number that you feel best describes your current relationship.

When people begin new relationships, each person brings with them things that they are able to contribute to that relationship. One person alone may be able to give one thing, while both of you may be equally able to give something else, or both can give, but to differing degrees. To answer the following questions, I would like you to look at your relationship as it is now, in terms of your and your partner's contributions.

1. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of love to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

2. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of affection to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

3. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of support to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

4. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of concern to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

5. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of physical appearance is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

6. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my intellectual contribution to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

7. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of companionship to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

8. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my sexual contribution to this relationship is

- ☐ 5 much more than my partner's
- ☐ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- ☐ 3 equal to my partner's
- ☐ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- ☐ 1 much less than my partner's

9. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my socioeconomic contribution to this relationship is

- _____ 5 much more than my partner's
- _____ 4 somewhat more than my partner's
- _____ 3 equal to my partner's
- _____ 2 somewhat less than my partner's
- _____ 1 much less than my partner's

10. Compared to my partner's contribution, I feel that my contribution of services (eg. making dinner for partner, helping study for exam, doing little things for partner, etc.) to this relationship is

- _____ 5 much more than partner's
- _____ 4 somewhat more than partner's
- _____ 3 equal to partner's
- _____ 2 somewhat less than partner's
- _____ 1 much less than partner's

RELATIVE INVOLVEMENT:

11. I feel that I love my partner

- _____ 5 much more than my partner loves me
- _____ 4 somewhat more than my partner loves me
- _____ 3 as much as my partner loves me
- _____ 2 somewhat less than my partner loves me
- _____ 1 much less than my partner loves me

ACCESS TO ALTERNATIVES:

12. If you found yourself unattached and wanted a new partner, how easy would it be to find one, given the number of eligible partners you are aware of?

- _____ 5 very easy
- _____ 4 somewhat easy
- _____ 3 somewhat difficult
- _____ 2 very difficult
- _____ 1 I don't know how easy/difficult it would be

DECISION MAKING:

When you and your partner have a disagreement over the following items, who would you say has the final say in the decision:

13. Deciding what movie to see

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both decide together

14. Deciding whether to go out for dinner or stay home

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both decide together

15. Deciding what restaurant to go to

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both decide together

16. Deciding which bar to go to on Saturday night

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both decide together

17. Deciding when to discuss problems we are having in the relationship

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both decide together

18. Deciding when to have sex (how soon into the relationship)

- ☐ I do/did
- ☐ my partner does/did
- ☐ we both will decide/decided together

19. Deciding on a method of birth control

- _____ I do/did
- _____ my partner does/did
- _____ we both will decide/decided together

20. Deciding on how much time to spend together

- _____ I do
- _____ my partner does
- _____ we both decide together

21. Deciding what you both do in that time together

- _____ I do
- _____ my partner does
- _____ we both decide together

22. Deciding whose friends to go out with when you are together

- _____ I do
- _____ my partner does
- _____ we both decide together

23. When arguments arise, they usually result in

- _____ me giving in
- _____ my partner giving in
- _____ mutual give and take

24. If you want to do something or go somewhere , but your partner wants to do something else or go somewhere else, what usually happens?

- _____ 4 you do what your partner wants
- _____ 3 your partner does what you want
- _____ 2 each of you does what you each wanted to do in the first place
- _____ 1 Some kind of compromise is made between the two of you

LEVEL OF DEPENDENCE:

The first two pages of this questionnaire dealt with your contributions of several variables to the relationship as compared to your partner's. In the following questions, although they may seem similar to the first set, I would like you to focus on the more emotional aspect of *dependence* in your relationship for the same set of variables.

25. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for socioeconomic status (money, societal status, etc), I feel that I am

- ☐ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ☐ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ☐ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

26. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for love, I feel that I am

- ☐ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ☐ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ☐ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

27. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for affection, I feel that I am

- ☐ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ☐ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ☐ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

28. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for support, I feel that I am

- ☐ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ☐ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ☐ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ☐ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

29. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for companionship, I feel that I am

- ___ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ___ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ___ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ___ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

30. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for sex, I feel that I am

- ___ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ___ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ___ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ___ 1 much less dependent than my partner is on me

31. Compared to my partner's dependence on me for other services (making dinner for me, doing my laundry, helping me study, etc), I feel that I am

- ___ 5 much more dependent on my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more dependent on my partner
- ___ 3 we are equally dependent on each other
- ___ 2 somewhat less dependent than my partner is on me
- ___ 1 much less than my partner is on me

LEVEL OF CONTROL:

Please indicate the amount of control you feel you have in the decision making process for the following items (whether or not you make the final decision):

32. Deciding what movie to see

- ___ 5 much more control than my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more control than my partner
- ___ 3 as much control as my partner
- ___ 2 somewhat less control, than my partner
- ___ 1 much less control than my partner

33. Deciding which restaurant to go to

- ___ 5 much more control than my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more control than my partner
- ___ 3 as much control as my partner
- ___ 2 somewhat less control than my partner
- ___ 1 much less control than my partner

34. Deciding what you do in your time together with your partner

- ___ 5 much more control than my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more control than my partner
- ___ 3 as much control as my partner
- ___ 2 somewhat less control than my partner
- ___ 1 much less control than my partner

35. Deciding how soon into the relationship to have sex

- ___ 5 much more control than my partner
- ___ 4 somewhat more control than my partner
- ___ 3 as much control as my partner
- ___ 2 somewhat less control than my partner
- ___ 1 much less control than my partner

INCIDENTALS:

36. All things considered, who has more say in what you do together in your relationship?

- ___ I do
- ___ my partner does
- ___ we both have equal say

37. All things considered, who makes more sacrifices in your relationship?

- ___ I do
- ___ my partner does
- ___ we both make the same number of sacrifices

38. All things considered, who has more power in your relationship?

- ☐ I do
- ☐ my partner does
- ☐ we both have equal power

Appendix D

BACKGROUND QUESTIONNAIRE

TODAY'S DATE:

SEX: ____Male ____Female

My AGE: _____

My Partners Age:

ABOUT YOUR CURRENT RELATIONSHIP

How long have you been in the relationship with your current intimate partner? _____ months

Is your intimate partner of the same or opposite sex as yourself?

_____ Same _____ Opposite

Please check the category which best describes your relationship at the current time (today). Please tick **one** box.

Casually Dating

Serious (but not exclusive) Dating

Serious (exclusive) Dating

Living Together, but **not** engaged/planning to marry each other

Living Together, and engaged/planning to marry each other

Married (civil or other religious ceremony)

Consider the feelings you now have or your current intimate partner. How do you think they will change over time as the relationship continues?

Over time my feelings for my current partner will

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intensify		Stay the same			Fade	

Consider the next level of commitment that you have for your current intimate partner at this time. How do you think your sense of commitment will change over time as the relationship continues?

Over time, my commitment to my current partner will

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intensify		Stay the same			Fade	

Consider the next level of happiness or satisfaction that you experience with your current partner at this time. How do you think your feelings of happiness or satisfaction will change over time as the relationship continues?

Over time, my happiness with my current partner will

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Intensify		Stay the same			Fade	

Consider now the degree to which you would describe your intimate relationship as being balanced or equal in overall terms. As your relationship continues, how do you think the sense of overall equality will change over time?

Over time, the relationship will

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Move toward more equality		stay the same			Move toward less equality	

ABOUT YOUR PREVIOUS ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIPS

People have many different patterns of dating and participating in romantic and intimate relationship. Which of the following best fits your patterns in the **six months before** your current relationship began?

- ☐ Never dated
- ☐ Not dated before but dated in the past
- ☐ casual dating of several people
- ☐ casual dating of one person
- ☐ Serious (but not exclusive) dating
- ☐ Serious (exclusive) dating
- ☐ Living with a partner but not engaged or planning to marry each other
- ☐ Living with a partner and engaged or planning to marry each other

If we consider only casual relationships, how many people have you had a casual relationship with over the past three years?

If we consider only serious relationships, how many people have you had a serious relationship with over the past three years?

In terms of your own ideas about relationships, please indicate how much "relationship experience" you think you have at this point in your life.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Almost no		Some			Very	
Experience		Experience			Experienced	

Appendix E

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Since your last appointment to fill out the questionnaires, did you discuss any of the items with your partner?

yes _____

no _____

2. If yes, which items did you discuss with your partner?

_____ commitment

_____ satisfaction

_____ power (decision making, resource contribution, etc)

3. If you discussed any of these items with your partner, what was the discussion like? (eg. did it result in an argument; did your partner agree/disagree with your perceptions of the relationship, etc.

4. Did you feel that after filling out the questionnaires you became more vigilant about your relationship? That is, did you find yourself noticing or paying more attention to who made more decisions, who contributed more to the relationship, how often you argued, etc.? Please explain below.

Appendix F

CODING SCHEME FOR APPENDIX E

Question #3: How did the discussion go?

"Discussed relationship in general" coded 1

eg. "He told me he would try harder to satisfy my needs and be more understanding of my feelings."

"My partner and I discussed how the equality between us makes our relationship happy and successful."

"Partner agreed with subject's answers" coded 2

eg. "There was no argument and we both agreed with each other's perceptions of our relationship."

"Partner disagreed with subject, but no argument" coded 3

eg. "Commitment-this discussion was primarily initiated by me. It did not result in an argument, however, my partner disagreed with my view point."

"Argument between subject and partner" coded 4

eg. "It turned into an argument, but I told her to listen to what I have to say and give her opinion at the end."

Question #4: Has subject become more vigilant?

"Yes" coded 1

eg. "Yes I did start to pay attention to how we were deciding things and I must say I'm satisfied."

"No" coded 2

eg. "No I did not feel that I paid more attention to anything. I just continue on the way I always have."

All unanswered questions in the study were coded 9.

Appendix G

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE

This project is concerned with commitment in the dating relationships of first year students and is being conducted under the supervision of Dr. Roger Wells.

The purpose of this research is to investigate the satisfaction and commitment to the relationship people feel as the relationship changes. Past research has indicated that there may be differences in happiness and commitment between couples who have been together for a long period as opposed to those just beginning a relationship.

Three questionnaires will be administered to you once a month over a period of four months. Each month, this should take about 45 minutes to complete.

All information will be kept strictly confidential and will be seen only by the researchers involved in this study.

You are free to terminate your participation in the study at any time without any penalty to your experimental credits. Your participation will be automatically terminated should your relationship end before the four month duration of the study is complete.

I agree to participate in the research on first year students' dating relationships, which is being conducted by Vicki Mowat, under the supervision of Dr. Roger Wells, Department of Psychology, Carleton University.

Name (please print)

Signature

Phone Number

Date

Appendix H

WRITTEN DEBRIEFING FOR SUBJECTS

Thank you for participating in this study. In this research (as you may have noticed by my emphasis on the power questionnaire) I am looking at how certain types of dating relationships (egalitarian or traditional as assessed by power distribution) differ in levels of satisfaction and degree of commitment felt by each person. I am also interested in examining whether the length of the relationship affects any of those factors.

Students who date tend to want and expect an egalitarian type relationship, however, a high proportion of these relationships end up following a more traditional pattern, with the majority following a male dominant model. Nonetheless, I have hypothesized that in the beginning of the relationships, male-dominant patterns will be most prominent, but with time, the number of egalitarian relationships and male dominant relationships will be about equal with a small number of female dominant relationships also present. I expect egalitarian relationships to be higher in happiness and commitment and these components will also increase over the four month period of study. In addition, I am curious as to whether both men and women will perceive men to be more dominant in the relationships than their female partners.

The issues in these questionnaires may have raised some difficulties between you and your partner. If this has become a problem, please feel free to contact Dr. Wells who is a registered marital therapist for help in working through these issues. Should you have any other questions or ethical concerns about your participation in this study, you are welcome to discuss them with me or any of the Psychologists listed below.

Vicki Mowat (Principal Investigator, 726-6741)

Dr. Roger Wells (Faculty Advisor, 788-2661)

Dr. Lise Paquet (Chair of Ethics Committee, 788-2692)

Dr. Bill Jones (Chairman of Psychology Department, 788-2648)

END

2 9-05-95

FIN