

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again -- beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.
5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-14,621

LOPEZ-GARRIGA, María Milagros, 1950-
STRATEGIES OF SELF-ASSERTION: THE PUERTO
RICAN WOMAN.

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1976
Psychology, social

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

STRATEGIES OF SELF-ASSERTION: THE PUERTO RICAN WOMAN


by


MARIA MILAGROS LOPEZ-GARRIGA

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate
Faculty in Psychology in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
The City University of New York

1976

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Feb. 9, 1976 date 
Dr. Barbara Dohrenwend
Chairman of the Examining Committee

Feb. 9, 1976 date 
Dr. Florence Denmark
Executive Officer

Dr. Irwin Katz

Dr. June Nash

Dr. Wendy McKenna

Dr. Ricardo Campos Orta

The City University of New York

DEDICATORY

A Ricardo B. Zúñiga, amigo y maestro

Acknowledgments

I am deeply indebted to many people for helping me in various stages of this work. I am particularly grateful to Barbara Dohrenwend and Jack O. Cole who gave so generously of their time and dedication. I want to thank Ingrid Garriga, Josefina Hernández and Margarita Ostolaza for their valuable help in the collection of data. Rafael Cintrón, Ricardo Campos, Ricardo Zúñiga and Ramón Jiménez, shared with me their ideas and lent moral support. June Nash and Irwin Katz were kind and patient. María S. Barbosa was a good friend. José E. Garriga was uniquely patient, generous and critical. His cooperation and solidarity were essential at all stages of this work.

Abstract

The present study attempts to understand the use of manipulative strategies in the woman's effort to circumvent patriarchal authority in the family.

A sample of 80 Puerto Rican women from the middle strata and working class were interviewed in three urban areas of Puerto Rico. The sample was further subdivided into women who participate in the labor force and non-working women.

The hypothesis predicted significant differences between middle strata and working women in their reported use of manipulative strategies. The hypothesis was confirmed and, as predicted, middle-strata women reported greater use of manipulative strategies in their dealings with their husbands. A second hypothesis predicted an interaction effect between the variables of class and participation in the labor force. No significant results were obtained.

The results were interpreted in light of economic and ideological determinants of family relationships and the paradox of feminine oppression.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	ix
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Description of Behaviors Under Study .	4
The Study of the Woman in the Context of the Family	11
The Relevance of Class Analysis	20
Some Notes on Class Structure in Puerto Rico	25
The Working-Class	25
Middle-Strata	27
Some Relevant Literature on the Relationship Between Class and Family Power	27
The Concepts of Manipulation and Power and their Measurement	34
Summary	45
Statement of the Problem and Hypotheses	47

	Page
II. METHOD	51
Subjects	51
Procedure	53
Instruments	55
The Interview	55
Scale of Marital Adjustment	56
Sex Role Rigidity Scale	57
The Measures of Manipulativeness	58
The Problem of Social Desirability ..	59
III. RESULTS	61
IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	97
Summary of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results	97
The Cultural Learning Hypothesis and the Model of Class	109
The Concept of Manipulation and the Dilemma of the Oppressed	113
 APPENDICES	
A. The Interview Format	126
B. Sex Role Rigidity Scale (English and Spanish Versions)	150
C. Rubin's Influence Distribution Scale	163
D. Marital Adjustment Scale	166

	Page
E. Coding Book	169
F. The Measure of Social Class. Table 28	197
G. The Measure of Manipulativeness	203
BIBLIOGRAPHY	209

List of Tables

Table	Page
1. Salaried Workers, 1973	26
2. Summary of the Characteristics of the Sample: Income, Age, Educational Status of the Woman and Length of Marriage	62
3. Reported Income	63
4. Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects for Scores on the Personal Manipulation Index: Social Class and Occu- pational Status	64
5. Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on the Personal Manipulation Index	66
6. Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on the General Manipulation Index	68
7. Summary of Scores Obtained for the Sex Role Rigidity Scale, Rubin's Influence Distribu- tion Scale, Marital Adjustment Scale and Personal Manipulation Indices	70
8. Selected Pearson Correlations	71
9. Biserial Correlations: Social Class	73
10. Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects for Scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale: Social Class and Occupa- tional Status	76
11. Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale	77
12. Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects for Scores on the Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale	78

Table	Page
13. Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale	79
14. Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variances for Scores on the Marital Adjustment Scale	80
15. Adjectives Used to Describe the Woman's Personal Opinion About the "way men are": Percentages	82
16. Ss Responses to the Question: What is Your Opinion About How Most Puerto Rican Men Are?	83
17. Adjectives Used to Describe What "Most People Generally Think" About the "way men are": Percentages	84
18. Ss Responses to the Question: How do Most People See the Puerto Rican Man? and Point Biserial Correlations With Personal Manipulation Scores	85
19. Adjectives Used to Describe What Other Women Generally Think About Men: Percentages	86
20. Adjectives Used to Describe the Woman's Personal Opinion About Puerto Rican Women: Percentages	87
21. Ss Responses to the Question: What is Your Opinion About How Most Puerto Rican Women Are?	88
22. Adjectives Used to Describe What People Generally Think About Puerto Rican Women: Percentages	89
23. Ss Responses to the Question: How do Most People See the Puerto Rican Woman? and Point Biserial Correlations With Personal Manipulation Scores	90
24. Responses to Selected Questions on Family Decision Making, Influence and Manipulation: Percentages	92

Table		Page
25.	Wife's Mother Use of Authority	94
26.	Mothers' Advice on Men	95
27.	Ways in Which Women Manipulative Men	96
28.	Distribution of Subjects by Social Class ...	201

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Strategies of self-assertion can be defined as the ways in which individuals attempt to establish themselves as significant human beings. Women may find themselves in search of a wider variety of strategies than men because of their existences in contexts that can be defined as patriarchal.

Our focus will be on the use of the manipulative strategy in the male-female relationship. For this purpose we will examine the Puerto Rican woman and her role as wife, particularly, in relation to her influence and her sense of self-importance in the family.

The study was carried out with a sample of Puerto Rican women, mainly because many of the previous studies dealing with the problems of manipulative strategies have emerged from cultural research in Latin America (see Stevens, 1974; Wolf, 1953) and because the author, being a Puerto Rican woman herself, feels a greater understanding of the phenomena under study.

It is possible that an examination of the woman's perception of her influence in the family and her "power" over, or in relation to, the husband will give us a clue to understand

how women circumvent the structure of patriarchal authority. In trying to understand the use of manipulative strategies as a way to circumvent patriarchal authority, we are guided not by the thesis that they respond to a coherent pattern of cultural traits dictated for the woman but by the way in which women respond in an effort to assert themselves. These responses, in turn, are modified by her objective class conditions and, possibly, by her participation in the labor force. This is not to say that these two variables--class and participation in the labor force--mechanically determine her choice of options, but that her placement in relation to these social conditions affects her aspirations, her understanding of what is desirable and, hence, provides for differences in her interpersonal relationships.

We will argue that when women establish manipulative relationships they express a system of social relations. This manipulative strategy is not necessarily original; most probably, it copies other manipulative strategies from other exploitative social relations within the same social formation. A case in point is the one described by Louise Lamphere in her article "Strategies, Cooperation and Conflict Among Women in Domestic Groups," (1974). She examines the ways in which women view the male power structure and how they operate within it.

She analyzes the strategies women employ to attain their ends, "whether this entails making decisions themselves, exercising influence over those who make the decisions, or circumventing the domestic power structure," (p. 99). Lamphere sees women's strategies as depending on their contribution to household resources and this, in turn, being determined by the relative integration or separation of domestic and political spheres. By this she means that the important decisions in society are not apart and distinct from the domestic realm. It requires that persons at both levels be organically related to the functioning of society. The author concludes that in societies where the political and domestic spheres are separated--as in most industrialized and capitalist nations--power and authority are built around a hierarchy of males. Women's strategies in this case become manipulative and centered around influencing the men who hold the authority.

In the ensuing sections we will elaborate on the following aspects of our problem: description of behavior under study; a discussion on the need to study our problem in the context of the family; a discussion on the relevance of class analysis; and finally, an overview of the relevant literature on power and manipulation. The hypotheses will be presented in an operational form at the end of the chapter.

Description of Behaviors Under Study

For the Puerto Rican woman, the cultural ideal is that of a submissive, delicate, docile, supporting, self-effacing woman. They are generally seen by others as emotional, dependent human beings whose lives revolve around the desires and actions of their men (see Safa, 1974; Wolf, 1953). While many women fulfill this role expectation with greater or lesser success, many others comply outwardly while exerting at the same time a great deal of influence in family matters and decisions by way of manipulative strategies. In this respect, Helen Safa comments in her study of a Puerto Rican community:

Nevertheless, women seldom confront their husbands with their dissatisfaction. Instead of protest, women attempt to manipulate men into doing what they want, and into believing that men are the real boss in the household while they are quietly running things. (cf. Stevens, 1973). Much of the public deference to male authority is based on this premise. This manipulative strategy is very similar to that employed by both men and women to all persons in higher authority..."obedezco, pero no cumplo" (I obey but do not comply) is an old jíbaro (hillbilly) saying.¹ In the attempt to avoid open conflict, manipulation employs a highly individualistic mode of gaining advantage over one's adversary. (p. 22).

¹The saying is a Spanish one, not really a jíbaro one.

While Safa does not look into the factors that may account for, or modify, these behaviors, Kathleen Wolf (1953) in her article "Growing Up and Its Price in Three Puerto Rican Subcultures," speaks of differences in three communities in the island. She discusses a group of small rural farmers, a group of sugar cane workers, and the middle class in a small rural town. She describes the norms of adult behavior, family life, authority and kinship patterns, and finds evidence to support the claim that behavioral patterns and family styles vary according to the location and integration of the individuals and the families in relation to the system of production. She describes the woman in the small rural farmer's community as the most subjugated one, and the one who walks around with a high degree of repressed aggressiveness (which according to Wolf is expressed in a high incidence of psychosomatic complaints). However, she describes the manipulative style--though she herself does not use this term--as being exhibited not by the women in this group but, by the group of women in the town's middle class.

In the middle class of San José, the organization of the family differs markedly from that of either class groupings. Again the man is nominally the head of the family and as such is expected to assert his authority over members of the household... They must show that their wives respect their freedom of decision

and that they can cut themselves free from the ties of job or family at a moment's notice or on a dare... The wife is expected to make a show of compliance with her husband's wishes and to indicate verbally that she expects and condones his 'flights of freedom'. However, the relationships symbolized by such demonstrations of male authority are impossible to maintain... During the last few decades women of this group have increasingly contributed to the family's income by taking jobs outside the home, and this has brought about changes in the traditional relations between men and women undermining the dominant position of men. This change in family relations is reflected in women's conversations among themselves. Although women pay lip service to the man's authority on social occasions when the group is mixed, and thus maintain family prestige before the watchful eyes of the community, when women are alone they express quite different feelings about men. Attitudes will vary from somewhat contemptuous amusement at men's antics to an irritated discussion of how to handle men when they are drunk or enraged. The tone of motherly solicitude in which these conversations are couched betrays the facts that in domestic crises men, in spite of their masculine assertiveness, fall into the role of rebellious but dependent children, while their wives take the role of irritated, yet indulgent, mothers. (p. 260)

Wolf describes the middle class as the one group which is most trapped in the contradictions between the traditional sex role expectations, the wife's increased autonomy, and the man's new relation to the production process in large organizations, or for the government, where bureaucratic control is impersonal and modeled after American standards of work and

production.

Stevens (1973) in her studies of other Latin American societies has noted the use of these strategies. She sees these behaviors as the counterpart of machismo (cult of virility). The strategies are accompanied by a set of ideas about the nature of men and how to deal with them. Women in these societies think that men are essentially violent, sexual, free and childish ("como niños"), and cannot be expected to assume responsibility and control of family matters, and many times of the fate of their own lives. Yet, men must not be blamed for their immature or irresponsible behavior because their nature makes them "this way". Stevens develops the concept of marianismo ("cult of the Virgin Mary"), and defines it as a secular edifice of beliefs and practices related to the position of women in society inspired by the myths about the Virgin Mary. She describes the attitude saying, "men must be humored, for after all, everyone knows they are 'como niños' (like children) whose intemperance, foolishness and obstinacy must be forgiven because they cannot help the way they are" (p. 170). Women see themselves as self-sacrificing martyrs, possessing a sort of superiority. At the practical level, Stevens mentions that, "when her husband indulges in infidelity as the machismo norm expects and requires him to do, the prejudice

in favor of the wife's saintliness guarantees her the support of the community" (p. 171).

A study which casts doubt on the idea that these attitudes and behaviors are a cultural trait of Latin American society is the one carried out by Pearlin (1971). In his study of Turinese families in Italy, he also describes women as expressing the same ideas about the nature of males and females. Males are seen as childlike, egotistic and superficial, while women view themselves as sensitive, having common sense, and being the ones who offer guidance and ultimately control matters. Pearlin says:

The authority of men rather than reflecting strength may betray weakness... Their subjugation and suffering (the women's) then, signify to some women their own nobility. It is one mechanism that perhaps enables them to salvage self-esteem where their husband's esteem for them is lacking. In this way they prevent subordination of role from becoming the inferiority of person, and they make the oppressor morally and characterologically inferior to the oppressed. (p. 210)

The author discusses the fact that while some women accept their subordination, they regard their husbands as "rather dependent fellows who need a woman's clear head and steady hand" (p. 213). Some of them choose to carry out this task by open confrontation and many expressed the notion that the most effective guidance is that which is not recognized. One of his

respondents said: "In front of a husband it is best not to seem a strong woman; but I try to have influence over him without letting him notice it" (p. 214).

The idea expressed by Pearlin of women adopting the manipulative strategy in order to salvage self-esteem and make the oppressor morally and characterologically inferior, brings us an alternative framework to cultural norms as a way of understanding our problem. The work of authors such as Sartre, in his book Anti-Semite and Jew (1965), Memmi in The Colonizer and the Colonized (1965), and Fannon in The Wretched of the Earth (1966), present a notion of the dialectical relationship between the oppressor and the oppressed. They argue that the oppressed's image of themselves and their expectations are mediated by the oppressor's image and expectations of them. They describe how the oppressed, by virtue of their submissiveness and docility, wield power over the oppressor in such a way that the oppressor becomes oppressed by virtue of his own acts. In a similar vein, Warner, Wellman and Wietzman (1971) suggest the existence of the role of the operator, as a role that emerges in response to oppressive circumstances:

The female operator, as part of the under-dog psychopolitical style, has a heightened awareness of her situation and 'knows more' although she disguises her own feelings. In this situation, shuffling, playing up, and

dissembling represent manipulative strategies
of rational actors in oppressive circumstances.
(p. 279)

If we can assume that women as a whole find themselves in a position of subordination in terms of power to decide, we could propose that becoming a manipulator is a reaction to her lack of objective power in the family situation as well as in society. However, this general analytic framework does not allow us to predict qualitative and quantitative differences specific to the behavior of women. The problem necessitates a finer analysis that takes into account the material conditions under which women come to exercise more or less influence and the normative expectations of male dominance under which different women operate.

To restate our hypothesis, let us say that the material conditions of her existence, represented for our purposes by her social class and her participation in the labor force, affect differentially her choice of strategies of influence and the normative expectations of male dominance that orient the use of those strategies. We can advance the direction these differences will take by saying that the middle-strata women, particularly those who work, will show a greater predisposition towards the use of the manipulative strategies.

The remaining sections of this chapter will move towards demonstrating why we believe this is the case.

The Study of the Woman in the Context of the Family

The study of women in the context of the family has been criticized (Silvestrini, 1973) as perpetuating a pattern in which women are studied only as members of the family, neglecting their role as members of society. While this criticism is well taken, and social scientists must begin to study women in the various contexts in which they participate, we suspect that the criticism derives from a traditional dichotomization between the personal and familial realm and the economic and political realm. Zaretsky (1974), points out that "the family is the primary institution within which women participate in society", and the "the means of overcoming this dichotomy is through a conception of the family as a historically-formed part of the mode of production" (p. 85). If the family is seen as a unit integrated in the process of production-- because by fulfilling basic needs and socialization it maintains and reproduces the labor force--then, an understanding of the woman's part of this unit is not necessarily a narrow one.

As a theoretical framework for our study we will use the one provided by Rafael Cintrón (1975), in his monograph on "The Proletarian Family as a Reified Process". Cintrón discusses the historical transformations of the occidental family from a pre-capitalist period onward. He tries to understand the family experience in all of its contradictions--male-female, parent-child--as an expression and reflection of antagonisms and class contradictions in society at large. The family experience is mediated by three levels of determination, namely, the economic, the juridico-political and the ideological. That is, the activities of the family and the relation among the members are a product of the economic, legal and ideological factors which sustain it.

In peasant economies, the managerial and supervisory functions of the father are necessary and integral to the economic activities of the family. His authority is essential if the production process is to be carried out and the reproduction of the family unit is to maintain cohesiveness and stability. In this family, the relations of production are direct social functions and the authority of the father is "transparent to the consciousness of the actors". The wife's and children's dependence on him is equally transparent because of the concrete functions he carries out. By transparency Cintrón under-

stands that "the social consciousness of the actors faithfully reflects their praxis" (p. 16). When this praxis is not shrouded by mystical veils, the relations among the members are direct, without ideological or artificial intermediaries.

These economies provide a specific rank and function for women and children; the division of labor being allocated on the basis of age and sex distinctions. This is not to say that these distinctions were not "alienated" but, rather, that they flow naturally from the organization of the production process and the existence of private property. The private sphere of the family reflects the hierarchical organization of the larger society. It assigns "an inferior position to women and an unnatural, even though transparent, dependence of children on the peasant patriarch" (p. 22).

With the transition to a capitalist economy, individuals meet in a market, labor is separated from its product and becomes a merchandise, and the work and familial realms become disassociated units. The family as a productive unit is dissolved and its functions become exclusively the reproduction of "a class of abstract workers". Cintrón explains that "in peasant economies the internal power relations coincided with the equally internal social relations of production which provided it with its base. In the proletarian case, the internal

power relations of the family are always a function of the prior dependence of the parents on capital and the capitalist" (p. 26). The family's reason to exist disappears because the parties' lack of property, and the incorporation of the woman into the labor force, negate the objective need for monogamy and male supremacy. The monogamous marriage and patriarchal dominance continue to exist theoretically, but not historically or practically.

Engels would say that it no longer responds in structure or performs the functions of the historical forces that gave birth to it. When objective conditions that give concreteness to the relations among the members of the family disappear, opacity invades this realm. The family experience ensues as a reified process that maintains itself by clinging to patterns of behavior that correspond to a previous patriarchal, agricultural stage of society. The authority of the father is no longer necessary; yet, it is maintained and, possibly, transformed into an authoritarianism that reflects his frustration in his public existence as a worker. Cintrón says, "the family becomes the stage for his compensatory acting out the role of master. The wife becomes the special target of his anger". (p. 32).

The antagonisms between male and female are sharpened by his insistence on maintaining domestic authority when the necessity and concreteness of his authority have been eradicated. Cintrón states that "whether or not the wife is a worker, the proletarian family continues to be based on the open or concealed domestic slavery of the wife. The contradiction is bound to be a source of increased anguish for the woman. Objectively, she has left the patriarchal system behind. The door is open to her emancipation. Ideologically, she is expected to orient her life style according to the pre-capitalist standards".

(p. 34)

It is worth noting at this point that, while the author speaks of the proletarian family experience, he agrees that some of these points might also hold true for the middle strata of contemporary societies--white-collar workers and professionals. It will be our contention, however, that the women of the middle strata face the contradictions in family life more sharply than Cintrón appears to indicate. While she is probably more educated and less parochial, she will adhere to the notions of patriarchal domination in a more traditional way because they help in maintaining a position of prestige in the eyes of the community. Her aspirations of vertical mobility make her dependent on the man, particularly, in socie-

ties where discrimination against women is pervasive at many levels. Even if she herself works, this serves to sharpen the contradiction between the patriarchal values she espouses and her new role as economic contributor. She may opt for disguising her new role and the influence and authority that accrue from it, by expressing it in indirect ways through the use of manipulative strategies in order to maintain the facade ("mantener las apariencias") of male authority.

We hypothesize that, in comparison, the relation of the working-class woman to the man is not bound to such a large extent by her subscription to traditional values of male preponderance--partly because his role as provider is often questioned, and because her aspirations of mobility and status are less of a concern when subsistence needs are more pressing. That is, while she, as well as the women from the middle strata, get caught up in the same conflict, the relations among the members of the working-class family will tend to be less pervaded by "social" pretensions and, in a sense, more crudely expressed. This allows a possibility for the woman to express herself more directly and receive whatever sanctions come as a result.

In a related way, Tumin and Feldman (1961), in their study on social class and social change in Puerto Rico, state:

We do not have adequate information on the ideas of marriage and the proper and appropriate grounds for dissolution of marriage. But it seems generally accepted that lower-class women are far more independent and self-reliant in taking care of themselves and their family without the aid of husbands. It appears too, that middle-class women are likely to accept and live with much more marital distress. They expect this distress if one gives credence to the common expectations regarding male behavior. (p. 256)

As Engels pointed out, the incorporation of women into the labor force allows them to potentially become economically independent and change the nature of authority relations in the family. However, we cannot assume that participation in the labor force will have a homogenous effect on all women. We hypothesize that work will have a differential impact on the woman's position in the family, depending on the normative expectations about authority relations that the woman has, and other variables such as the amount of authoritative behavior the husband exhibits. We can assume that participation in the labor force sharpens the contradictions between the expectations of patriarchal authority and the woman's role as economic contributor.

We hypothesize that the contradiction is resolved differently by women depending on their normative expectations and their concern with maintaining the traditional image of the family. Women from the middle strata, in their efforts to maintain the traditional image of the family--because of their adoption of bourgeois values and aspirations of vertical mobility--will resolve the conflict by making use of manipulative strategies, such as allowing the husband to believe that he is in command while providing the conditions to attain her goals. On the other hand, the working-class woman will be more direct in her attempts to establish herself as a powerful

agent in the concerns and decisions of the family. We are not saying that she will not adhere to values of patriarchal domination; as a matter of fact, it is possible that at a verbal level she will do so even more. Nevertheless, her concrete life conditions--struggle for economic subsistence and less concern with prestige and vertical mobility--make it less necessary, or possible, to use manipulative tactics to achieve control.

The idea that women's participation in the labor force has the effect of increasing the wife's authority in the home has received support from a study carried out by Robert Weller (1968) in Puerto Rico. The author carried out a survey to study the relationship between the employment of wives and dominance and fertility indexes. His sample consisted predominantly of lower and middle-income neighborhoods in San Juan. He found empirical support for the following notions: a) Participation in the labor force is associated with increased influence by the wife in the decision making, particularly, in respect to the number of children. b) This increased influence is associated with lower fertility rates among working women, and c) the negative relationship between the labor force status and fertility is stronger among wife-dominant and egalitarian families than among husband-dominated couples. This

last finding suggests that participation in the labor force as an isolated variable can be misleading. The behavior of the husband has to be considered as an important determinant. The amount of authoritative behavior of the husband may modify, in significant ways, the woman's choice of response. We can see the relative autonomy of superstructural belief patterns which are not easily changed, even when objective economic arrangements in the family change. That is, we cannot assume a mechanistic determination of the infrastructure. Belief systems are complex and their relationship to the economic basis is equally complex.

Weller does not report differences in the relation between dominance and authority according to socio-economic groups. While this fact may appear to run counter to our expectations, it is only so in appearance. Our analysis is not based on a concept of class based on income, neighborhood, occupation or education. While these are significant aspects of an individual's placement in relation to society, our hypothesis is based on a conception of classes on the basis of their relationship to the means of production.

The Relevance of Class Analysis

A class society is not one in which there simply exist classes, but one in which class relationships are of primary significance to the explanatory interpretation of large areas of social conduct.

Giddens, 1973

It is necessary at this point to clarify the concept of class as used in this study, and to touch briefly on the class structuration of Puerto Rican society and the pertinent studies on class carried out there.

For a while, the concept of class in American social science followed closely Max Weber's definition, based fundamentally on the individual's status and access to the market in terms of consumption. He emphasized the subjective evaluation that the individual makes of his own position in society, and develops a model of stratification that includes the elements of status, access to the market, relation to the means of production and power, all of which are said to vary independently.

Marx, on the other hand, proposed that the defining criterion in the creation and development of classes is the relation of the individual to the means of production. This leaves

us with those who have capital and those who sell their labor. Status, prestige and power are not seen as independent of the economic relations of individuals, but as very much a consequence of it--exceptions are to be found when we are faced with economic systems that are in the process of transition.

While Weber's model is basically classificatory, Marx's is dynamic. Classes exist in relation to one another, developing and determining each other as history goes along. Marx's model presents problems, though, mainly because he never really wrote extensively on the concept of classes and, because in order to understand classes in a Marxian sense, one must always study them in their historical development rather than "things that are" at any given moment.

The principal classes--the bourgeoisie and the working class--are easy to identify in most societies but, in addition, there are many intermediate strata whose boundaries are difficult to establish and membership in which cannot be determined easily. This poses a particularly difficult problem when carrying out an empirical study where one needs to "classify" individuals in terms of their class position.

Also, some changes have occurred in advanced capitalist societies, not foreseen in Marx's writings, that further complicate the study of classes. Bottomore in his book Classes

in Modern Societies (1966) cites some such changes:

1. The development of political democracy.
2. The more effective power of modern governments aided by advances in military technology, in administration and communication.
3. Changes in working-class aims as well as the relations between the classes.
4. Increase in the productive capacity which leads to rising standards of living and the development of social welfare services.

All of these considerations have led many social scientists to negate Marx's analysis of social classes and to disregard the fact that, while these changes make the relations among the classes somewhat different, they do not alter, in any fundamental way, their objective antagonistic structural position in relation to the means of production.

For us it is a particularly pressing problem to study the composition of the working class and the middle strata. Women in our sample come from either one. The theoretical framework addresses itself to the proletarian family and the families of the middle strata. If we do not consider adequate a classificatory scheme based on income, schooling, area of residence or occupation--because we feel that these criteria obscure, rather than explain, the individual's position in society--how are we to understand and locate individuals in

a class? The problem may be that we should not try to locate individuals in a class, but study classes as historically-formed groups. Still, the problem remains for the empiricist collecting a sample to devise some criteria for the selection and classification of individuals in a particular class.

The class structure of advanced societies has been analyzed by various authors. Giddens (1974) and Bottomore (1966) consider the development of what has come to be known as the "new" middle and working classes. The "old" middle class is composed of the "petit bourgeoisie"--small landowners, small businessmen, craftsmen and, in general, people who own limited means of production usually worked by themselves, their families or a few employees. The old working class can be described as the wage worker in business, industry or agriculture, whose standards of living approach subsistence level. The new middle class can be seen as a phenomenon of modern capitalism, where expansion of management and service areas create occupations for professionals, low executives, clerical workers, office workers, supervisors, and individuals who work in welfare, entertainment and leisure-activity areas. The new working class is a concept that describes a sector of the working class that has access to considerable consumption,

and whose income allows them to manage the status symbols traditionally associated with the middle classes. Later students of Marxism refer to this sector as the "aristocracy of the working class". Structurally, they remain salaried workers who sell their labor force but, in terms of consumption, they come closer to middle class standards. Additionally, they are not much different from the middle classes in their normative orientation in life--though they may not be accepted as equals by individuals in the middle class.

To emphasize a previous point let us say that, while these developments do not present a picture of the miserable, exploited worker, it should not obscure the fundamental reality of the dichotomy between the owners of capital and the workers. The gulf between the classes remains very wide, and the idea of capitalist societies as middle-class societies is highly discrepant from reality. (Giddens, 1974). The concepts of "new" and "old" classes as categories serve an analytic function, but tell us little about the role that these sectors will play in societal transformations and historical developments.

The preceding discussion has, hopefully, clarified our use of the concept of class. This concept guides not only our study, but the use and interpretation we make of the

literature pertinent to our problem. Let us proceed with a brief discussion of some sectors in Puerto Rican society, followed by a discussion of the relevant literature.

Some Notes on Class Structure in Puerto Rico

As it would be extremely involved to deal with the evolution of classes in the island, we will portray the present situation in its overall. Literature on present-day classes in Puerto Rico is very limited, and, therefore, any description made here is, by necessity, full of generalizations and simplifications.

The Working Class

The concept of proletarianism is predicated on the extraction of surplus value in strictly Marxian terms. Sixty-three percent of the Puerto Rican population can be classified as members of the working class (Puerto Rican Socialist Party Political Thesis, 1974). This includes proletarians in industrial, agricultural, commercial, and financial sectors. There are other wage workers who help in the realization of surplus value who are also considered part of the working class, i.e., the clerk who sells the merchandise. They are more properly called non-proletariat, salaried workers.

The following table illustrates the numbers and percentage of salaried workers in the various areas of the economy. The data was obtained from a report of the Labor Department on Employment and Unemployment figures for 1973. It is interesting to note the proportion of female workers in each category.

Table 1
Salaried Workers - 1973

	Quantity	Percentage	Percentage of Women
Agriculture	35,000	5	3
Sugar cane	16,000		
Tobacco			
Coffee	4,000		
Others	14,000		
Manufacturing	156,000	23	49
Construction	79,000	12	1
Commerce	100,000	15	29
Finances	22,000	3	32
Government (Transportation and Communication)	40,000	5	15
Government Bureaucracy	149,000	22	45
Services	100,000	15	51
TOTAL	681,000	100	35

The sectors which employ the greatest number of workers are the manufacturing, construction and commerce and the governmental agencies. Women are concentrated in the manufacturing and government employment.

Middle Strata

Muñoz (1973) tells us that the middle classes in Puerto Rico are constituted mostly of salaried workers in the service areas, and includes a less significant group of the petit bourgeoisie. Their origin is linked to the transition of Puerto Rican society from a pre-capitalist, mostly agricultural mode of production, to a capitalist mode of production. Small farmers, small businessmen, craftsmen and fishermen are included in this group. The largest sector of the petit bourgeoisie is the commercial sectors which is calculated around 52,000 approximately. (Puerto Rican Socialist Party Political Thesis, 1974). He notes that there are differences within this group, not so much in terms of their relationship to the means of production, but in terms of the magnitude of their income. Other social groups that find themselves close to the petit bourgeoisie, but who instead of owning means of production own rather "an instrument of work", include doctors, lawyers, dentists, salaried intellectuals, and low and middle-range executives.

Some Relevant Literature on the Relationship Between Class and Family Power

We have referred previously to the work carried out by

Wolf (1953) on patterns of adult behavior in various communities in Puerto Rico. In a similar vein, Steward (1952) and a group of anthropologists, who later published a book under the name of *The People of Puerto Rico* (1956) studied several communities and described the wide differences in familial organization resulting from the relationship of the family to the system of production. They pointed out the existence of three distinctive subcultures in the island, namely, the subculture of coffee plantations, the subculture of sugar cane plantations, and the subculture of tobacco and small-crops plantations. The authors describe the daily life of the communities and their familial structure ties and kinship patterns.

In the case of the coffee communities, the family structure among the landless and submarginal land owners is considered strongly patrilineal, with the father controlling the family labor. He alone determines the inheritance and disposal of the land, and dictates the social relationships of his wife and children.

In the sugar communities, the picture appears quite different due to the seasonal nature of sugar cane harvesting. The labor of women and children becomes a vital factor for the

survival of the family. This has given the woman a relatively high status and a position of some authority in the family which is not encountered in the mountain communities.

Manners and Steward (1952) and Wolf (1953) stressed the fact that among the landless proletariat the family is bilateral and the wife is most likely to be the stable member. These families are characterized by a greater diffusion of power. The man's primary importance as a wage earner and manager of income is less than that of the father in the coffee plantation.

Regarding the tobacco and small-crops communities, Manners and Steward (1952) claimed that, among the landless and the small farmers, the family is bilateral and emphasizes descent on the side where more property lies. Authority for social relations in the family lies generally--but not always and not as strongly as in the coffee region--with the father.

In a study in Latin America, Carlos and Sellers (1972) analyzed the emergence of a pattern of female domination as the result of, first, a strict authoritarianism of the male and, secondly, the degree of economic cohesion of the extended family unit. The authors explained that as the male becomes more absolute, he withdraws from the warm inner circle of the family and his social and physical detachment from day-to-day

household events make it possible, and virtually necessary, for feminine power to prevail. On the other hand, the greater the reliance on male control of resources, the greater the likelihood of actual or symbolic male dominance over nuclear and extended family affairs. Carlos' and Sellers' own survey revealed that studies which attest to female domination--as opposed to egalitarian or male-dominated families--are confined to certain community types and socio-economic groups such as the mestizo peasant villages and the urban lower class in core slums. They stated that, "it is now well documented by several studies (Valentine, 1968) that the reasons for lower-class matriarchy are (1) economic, the absence of a male provider, and (2) the family being considered as a residential unit, not a biological one". (p. 104)

While our own hypothesis stresses the woman's greater directness in the expression of her power, rather than the amount of power per se, this study confirms our expectations of greater appearance of control in the working classes. The problems of matrifocality and female domination are not our same problems. We must look into these analyses when trying to find out under what socio-structural conditions women come to wield power and influence, and the nature of it--how it is expressed and under what circumstances. However, the

question remains whether behaviors have been classified as matrifocal in our inability to understand the various ways in which women exert influence within the family. In this case, we could work on a reconceptualization of the problem as we have seen it in the literature.

These arguments are somewhat similar to the viewpoint of other anthropologists such as Raymond T. Smith. In his book, The Negro Family in British Guiana. (1965) he explains matrifocality as a direct result of the position of the family in the socio-economic order. While acknowledging the importance of historical determinants--such as slavery--on the family structure, he sees matrifocality associated not with specific historical or cultural circumstances, but with a class position at the lowest rank of society in which vertical mobility is limited. Smith states that, "a man's position of authority in the household will be solely determined by his ability to provide. While in more traditional societies his role included kinship and religious roles which sustained his authority. secularization and modernization have eliminated these roles and left him dependent on his economic function". (p. 215)

In Smith's scheme, matrifocality is the end result of a process in which the role of the wife gains dominance over that

of the husband. The existence of this process is in many ways corroborated by studies of West Indian societies. Lowenthal (1972) studied matrifocality in some of these societies and observes the striking differences in family structure according to class. While the middle strata exhibit a pattern closer to the European types, the folk--which constitutes the overwhelming majority--show a much closer tie between mother and children and can be classified as mother-centered homes.

In the case of the sugar plantation, where there is a need to supplement income with temporary migrant work, laborers leave women in charge of the house most of the time and children are solely raised by women. In this situation, men lack authority even when physically present and the woman carries out the important decision of the house almost independently.

González (1970) suggests that matrifocality might not always be associated with a low position in the structural order. She argues that in many cultures, particularly in modern United States middle class, the male may be physically present in the evenings, but physically absent during the day, and what is more important, "psychologically absent" a great deal more. She contends that in complex societies, where there is an increasing separation of the domestic and jural domains, it becomes more difficult for the male to carry

out his functions in all of the areas and females are increasingly "left in charge" of most domestic concerns.

While it may be true that women come to have more power in the family, with responsibility for more decisions, this does not necessarily entail a change in her subjective evaluation of her role. While the objective reality she experiences facilitates the development of a more egalitarian relationship with the husband, subjectively, she may cling to normative expectations of male dominance pertaining to a previous time when her subordination to the man had a functional value. It has been our argument that it is at this point when she may opt for manipulative strategies. The more "ideologized" she is, the more in conflict she will find herself and the greater the likelihood of using manipulative strategies to resolve the conflict.

It should not be understood that patriarchal values are sustained only because they are seen as more consonant with mobility aspirations. There are other social conditions which reinforce subscription to values of male dominance in addition to its being considered socially desirable. We would have to analyze the functional value that the family serves in the perpetuation of the state and the present mode of production. Since such a discussion is beyond the scope of this work we

would like to refer the readers to the work of Engels (1848) and Althusser (1970) on this topic.

It is appropriate at this point to discuss in more detail the concepts of power and manipulation.

The Concepts of Manipulation and Power and Their Measurement

Manipulation has been defined by Raven (1965) as a social influence wherein the intentions of the agent are hidden from the influence. It is a form of secondary influence. Not many studies have been carried out on the subject of manipulation per se. The work of Christie and Geis (1970) is probably the most extensive one on the topic. They have designed the Machiavelli Scale, which measures the views, tactics and morality of individuals whose defining characteristic is manipulateness.

The manipulators, as the authors conceive them, have (a) a relative lack of affect in interpersonal relationships, (b) a lack of concern with conventional morality, (c) a lack of gross psychopathology, and (d) low ideological commitment. The items of the scale were derived from the writings of various authors such as the Arthasastra of Kautilya, The Book of Lord Shang, and Machiavelli's The Prince and Discourses.

While these series of studies might appear pertinent in studying our sample, we decided not to include the scale as one of our instruments for several reasons. First, those characteristics that define "the Machiavellian" do not describe precisely the behavior of the women we are trying to assess--even when these behaviors are also described as manipulative. In our case, we are not conceptualizing "manipulativeness" as an enduring personality trait which would permeate the woman's total outlook on interpersonal interaction. We are, instead, trying to assess a specific behavior that she displays in relation to males. While there is an accompanying "ideology" it appears to be less inclusive than the one proposed by Christie and Geis. Lack of affect in interpersonal relationships, and lack of concern with conventional morality seem to be unlikely elements of the behavior under study.

Secondly, one of the largest problems in using the various versions of the Machiavelli Scale is the fact that, in spite of the efforts to reduce its social desirability component, this is still an unresolved problem. Various internal and external measures of social desirability hold inverse correlations ranging from $-.35$ to $-.44$ with the Machiavelli Scale.

Thirdly, it is possible that in the process of translating the Scale to Spanish, the language of the sample studied, pro-

blems of validity and reliability may reduce the value of the scale.

By necessity, the concepts of power and manipulation are closely interrelated. We assume that the goal of the manipulative act is to establish the individual in a position of control and power. The manipulator, however, does not necessarily attain power and, generally, can only provide the conditions under which power is likely to accrue. Manipulation, then, appears to have a quality of subjectiveness, while power can be conceptualized as the "objective possibility" to act in certain ways.

In this respect, we had mentioned briefly the concept developed by Warner and his colleagues of "the operator" as a role that emerges in response to oppressive circumstances. In addition, there are other authors who deal with the problem from a more psychological perspective. It can be argued that interpersonal interaction can be conceptualized as a constant interplay of power motives--not merely power over decision-making and the concrete outcome of events, but also what Brooks (1973) has called "the political struggles over definitions of reality in everyday life" (p. 173). He presents the eleven case histories described in Laing's Sanity, Madness and the Family as political struggles between parents and children in

which the ideology is low and the issues relatively undefined, but in which all revolves around questions of independence, autonomy and self-definitions.

Probably, Alfred Adler was the first psychologist to conceptualize power as a major goal of all human activity. According to him, a person learns to control the forces that have power over him and his satisfaction ultimately depends on his ability to influence and control his environment. While he conceived this power motivation as stemming from a basic "inferiority complex", others (Winter, 1967) have conceptualized it as an inner need or disposition to seek power. Birch and Veroff (1966) define the power incentive as the condition of obtaining the means of influencing another person's decisions. This includes, not only direct attempts at having power over another, but also indirect attempts that establish the person in a power position. The power motive probably had its origin in conditions of deprivation. Veroff, Atkinson, Feld and Gurin (1960) have found that higher power motives, obtained through a thematic apperception measure, can be found in socially deprived groups such as Blacks, lower-income groups, and the uneducated. This finding is interpreted as generally supporting the hypothesis.

The research in this area has relied heavily on the use of projective measures. Subjects are usually shown pictures which are vague and ambiguous and are, subsequently, asked to write a story about what they think is happening in the picture. The rationale for using this test is that a measure of power is needed that is independent of the occurrence of particular kinds of power behavior.

The concrete relationship of these studies, and their concept of power with our own study, is not a very strong one. While they generally support the idea that an oppressed person might, as a result of his aggression, develop high power needs, they say little about the styles and strategies a person with such needs will come to use. In this respect, Winter (1974) states:

Most of our research so far has dealt with men. Quite frankly, we have no clear notions of the behavior of women who may be high on power needs, except that we feel they should be studied separately and not generalize from men. There are two possible models for women with the need for power: Joan of Arc, where the action is similar to the male pattern; and the Cleopatra, "power behind the throne", a quite different pattern. (p. 279)

The concepts of power, control, dominance and manipulation have been proliferated in a great variety of contexts. Schopler (1965) argues that in the field of psychology alone,

three distinct theoretical orientations can be identified-- not to mention the use of the concepts outside the discipline. He mentions field theory, represented by Lewin, French and Raven (1959), decision-making, represented by Simon (1957) and the interactive approach represented by Thibaut and Kelly (1959).

For the first group, power is defined as a potential for inducing a resultant force whose direction and magnitude depends on the specific characteristics of the interaction. For the second group, power is an influence relative to a causal interaction in which the exercise of power affects the policies of others. For the interactionists, the conception of power is based on their analysis of the way in which individuals interact. Power is defined by Thibaut and Kelly (1959) as the ability to affect the quality of the partners' outcome. Specifically, the amount of power A has over B is determined by the range of outcomes through which A potentially could move B in the course of their interaction. The larger the range of outcomes that B would experience, the greater A's power.

Other approaches to the study of power have been presented. Olsen (1971) points to the existence of two theories of social power; the dependency theory and the trust theory.

Both begin with the assumption that power is always a property of social relations among actors. In the first one, the power of A over B is equal to, and based upon, the dependence of B upon A. In the second, interdependence is seen as the basis of power. A person, or an organization, is powerful if they are invested with trust.

For us, the interactive approach is the most amenable for analyzing strategies, moves and countermoves. Methodologically, though, it almost imposes an experimental paradigm that proves to be highly constrictive.

There is a large area of studies, carried out mostly by sociologists of the family, which deals with power relations and power structure assessed through concrete decision outcomes. The work of Blood and Wolfe, Husbands and Wives (1960) introduced the the germinal ideas that have served as a model and frame of reference to the many studies that followed. The instrument used in their study--as well as those of Wilkening and his colleagues (1963 and Kenkel (1961)--consisted of eight questions aimed at uncovering who in the family was responsible for decisions reached on several dimensions that were considered important to the family. The answers to these questions were supposed to reflect the family's power structure. In the majority of the studies the questions were asked to the wife and critics have

claimed that these studies have left us with a "wives' family sociology".

Other criticisms of this method have been the fact that the questions do not sample fairly, and with enough specificity, all the dimensions of decision-making so that there is a built-in bias for questions that are more relevant to the males. Some of the questions have been: Who has the last say about how available money will be used? Who decides on the purchase of furniture? Who decides when and where to move? (Safilios-Rothschild, 1970).

Furthermore, the calculation and use of an over-all decision-making score also appears to be methodologically questionable since it assumes that all decisions are given equal weight by the family members. Not only is such an assumption unfounded, but common sense indicates that some family decisions are more important than others. Moreover, different kinds of decisions are made with varying frequencies and many times there are tacit arrangements between couples as to whom will deal with specific areas, usually with the approval of the husband. Safilios-Rothschild mentions two other criticisms. She claims that many of these studies--by using the terms "wins" and "losses"--not only distort the process of decision-making, but focus only on its outcome. In addition, the variable of how

much "love" the partners feel for each other is never taken into account. This might be important in light of Rubin's claims that the less involved partner wields more power (1973). We can add that most studies ask the couple to define their relationship in terms of power--something that they might not have considered previously and which might elicit responses that are unrealistic.

Sprey (1972) has made some of the most devastating criticisms to the area of family-power relations by criticizing the validity of the effort to define power in terms of its association with family decision-making. He argues that this connection is, at best, a hypothetical one. For instance, questions about who will make a given decision are posited as the measure and definition of predicted power. This precludes the possibility that "given decisions" could be seen by the responding spouses to be based on something other than power. He suggests that a more fruitful approach would be to ask the family members what happens in terms of moves, countermoves, threats and promises, aggression or appeasement.

Other techniques used in this area, such as Strodbeck's "Method of Revealed Differences" have also been sharply criticized. In this technique each partner indicates individually an initial position on a question or conflict presented by the

investigator, which is reevaluated after a joint discussion. The person whose opinion prevails in the joint discussion is taken to be the dominant partner. This method, as well as others in which observation of the couple's decision-making process is made, are supposed to permit the researcher to assess the "real" familial power structure. The rationale for this belief is that it is probably more difficult for people to fake actual behavior than to fake responses to a questionnaire. However, there is some evidence (Karlsson, 1964) that observed spouses tend to behave according culturally conventional and socially-desirable norms when in public. In the case of Strodtbeck's technique, even if the spouse not authorized to make decisions, according to conventional norms, were the dominant one in reality, he or she might accept losing out during the public exhibition of power in order not to humiliate the other. Other findings (Kenkel, 1961) suggest that in this situation the sex of the observer greatly influences the decision-making process. In the case of a woman observer, wives tend to assume more active and assertive roles.

Finally, a study by Turk and Bell (1972) in which nine measures of power were replicated and compared to assess numerous families, shows that: (1) Reports of different members of the same family vary. (2) An individual's response to the

questionnaire measures was found to be associated with his normative perspective on male dominance. (3) The independent observational measures were unrelated to each other and to the questionnaire's measures.

The degree of association among measures was so low that it clearly indicated a lack of equivalency among measures. Another validity study, carried out by Olson and Rabunsky (1972) in which they compared four measures of family power--predicted power, process power, retrospective power, and authority, with a criterion measure of outcome power--found none of these four measures to be valid. Individuals were found to be able to report the decisions made in the family, but not who made them. The authors concluded that the concept of family power should be studied in more detail before further substantive studies are done using this concept.

In light of this evidence, and the diversity of criticisms aimed at the techniques used until now, we refrained from using the outcomes of decision-making in the various areas of family life as an index of the families' power structures. Following Sprey's advice, we are more concerned with the process by which decisions are made rather than the outcome as such. It must also be recalled that we are, basically, interested in the wife's perceived influence--how she defines her strategy and

perceives her effectiveness.

Summary

The study proposed here deals with manipulative strategies employed by women in circumventing the male power structure, which are geared towards establishing them as significant members in the decision process of the family. We described the various dimensions of these behaviors, including the attitudinal component that accompanies them. The previous studies on this topic--particularly those carried out in Latin cultures by Safa (1974), Stevens (1974) Pearlin (1971) Lamphere (1974) and Wolf (1953)--suggest that women employ manipulative strategies in order to have a more effective influence on the male. The use of manipulation is often accompanied by derogatory notions about the nature of males and by notions about the moral or characterological superiority of women. Pearlin (1971) and Warner (1971) have argued that this is the reaction to the position of inferiority and subordination in which women find themselves in relation to the male.

While we agree with ~~this~~ notion, we find that in order to understand those behaviors, why they emerge, and what is their functional value, we must turn to an analysis that takes into consideration the role of the woman in the context of the

family, and the role of the family in its historial development in the context of classes.

Following Cintrón's (1974) argument, we touched briefly on the changes in the relationships between members of the proletarian family as the result of changes in the relationship of the family and its members with the mode of production. The idea that the relations among members of the family become increasingly opaque--as the conditions that facilitated the emergence of the patriarchal family disappear--help to explain the conflicted position of the woman and her efforts to cope with it by assuming a manipulative stance. While Cintrón (1974) considers the historial developments as affecting principally the proletarian family, he sees many of these elements as providing the dynamics of the middle-strata families.

We contend that, while the change process affects the proletarian and the middle strata, the relations among members of the middle-strata family are more permeated by the patriarchal value-system. It is in these sectors where the woman, in her aspirations of bourgeois values, vertical mobility and concern for status, finds herself in greater need to resolve the conflict by becoming manipulative rather than direct in her dealings. Thereby, she obviates the need to challenge those behaviors deemed desirable for her role as wife.

We reviewed some of the available literature on family patterns and class, and found some support for the idea that women in the working class appear to adopt a stance of greater straightforwardness in family matters. In many cases, the studies have been couched in terms of the problem of matrifo-
cality among working-class families.

Finally, some related studies on power and manipulation were discussed to clarify our use of the terminology, and try to find an adequate method to study our problem. The studies carried out by the sociologists of the family provide good insights into the problem of measuring power in family relationships. However, most of them are concerned with outcomes of decision-making. While decision-making might be a good index of dominance, it does not tell us about the process and style that takes place. Many of the criticisms of the "sociological method" have been integrated into ours. Others, particularly those of social desirability, still constitute a problem. We will elaborate on these points in the next chapter.

Statement of the Problem and Hypotheses

In view of changing relations among family members as a result of changes in the relation of the families to the economic mode of production, the woman finds it increasingly

irreconcilable to deal with the traditional demands of the role of subordinate woman and wife, and the new possibilities offered by a developed capitalist economy. The relations among the family members lose their concreteness and remain almost a theoretical artifact, whose purpose is to reproduce itself and socialize its members. This situation creates the conditions for greater opacity in familiar relations, and the development of manipulative behaviors which aim at reconciling traditional expectations of docility and new possibilities of self-assertion.

We hypothesize that:

1. There will be significant differences between women belonging to the middle strata and working-class women in the reported use of manipulative strategies. The middle-strata women will tend to make greater use of manipulative strategies in order to reconcile adherence to traditional expectations of male authority and, at the same time, exert influence in family matters.

2. There will be an interaction effect between the variables of class and participation in the labor force. We propose that participation in the labor force has a differential impact in the exercise of influence depending on the woman's class position. In light of the previous literature,

we propose that participation in the labor force sharpens the conflicts which lead to the manipulative option for the middle-strata women. For the working class women the same event leads to greater straightforwardness in their assertion of authority. The concrete economic contribution of the woman to the household provides the material conditions for an increase in authority in the individual family. We have argued that this new position is a source of conflict to the extent that it challenges the women's perception of what is socially desirable and her endorsement of male dominance values. The conditions for the working class women are such that the male provider is often questioned and she is left in charge, her position as worker only reaffirms her situation and allows for greater straightforwardness.

3. We had mentioned the existence of an attitudinal component related to conceptions about the nature of males and females. While we do not venture into hypothesizing differences by class or work variables in this study, we will explore these attitudes and propose that they mediate in the woman's choice of strategies in dealing with males. Generally, we expect women to hold rather negative views about the nature of males, and to have a positive opinion about the nature of women. The following areas will be examined as empirical questions:

- a. The relationship between scores on a marital adjustment scale and the use of manipulative strategies.
- b. The relationship between scores on a sex role rigidity scale and the use of manipulative strategies.
- c. The distribution of scores in an adapted version of Rubin's (1973) influence scale and its relationship to variables such as class, work, status, length of marriage, educational status, and use of manipulative strategies.
- d. The relationship between use of manipulative strategies and variables such as age, length of marriage, educational status, income, and others.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Of the possible methods at our disposal, we selected the field interview technique as the most adequate for our study in light of the assumed specificity of the manipulative behavior of women in relation to their husbands. Short of a prolonged observational study of marital interaction, an interview with the woman in her surroundings was felt more effective in producing a relaxed atmosphere that would permit her to discuss personal matters more openly than would be possible under more controlled conditions.

Subjects

Eighty women, married to Puerto Rican men, were selected from various urban residential areas in the cities of San Juan, Ponce and Mayaguez. The areas were chosen at random from sectors which tend to agglutinate people of specific occupations according to the author's knowledge of local residence patterns. A series of city maps served as sources to define the areas. The sample consists of:

43 middle-strata women: 24 employed, 19 not employed.

37 working-class women: 18 employed, 19 ~~not~~ employed.

The employed women were selected from all levels of the working force and included professionals, clericals, industrial and commercial workers.

The selection of families followed an every-third-house pattern--except in the middle-strata neighborhoods, where people seemed more reluctant to participate in the interview. In these cases, names of neighbors were solicited from the first person interviewed and the investigators called on those individuals, referring in their presentation to the person who provided the names. This decreased the independence of the subjects sampled but increased, considerably, their receptivity and facilitated the data-collecting process.

The criteria to determine the class or social group of the interviewee was guided by the literature of Muñoz (1973) and the Political Thesis of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party (1974). The five major groups are: (a) the industrial proletariat, (b) the non-industrial proletariat--financial and commercial, (c) other salaried, non-proletariat workers, (d) the petit bourgeoisie, and (e) other social groups such as salaried intellectuals and professionals who own instruments of work. These five categories are later recoded into (1) the working class, which includes the first three, and (2) the middle strata,

which includes the last two. (See Table 24, Appendix F)

A number of questions were aimed at establishing property ownership, occupation--or in the case of farmers and small businessmen, number of employees, volume of sales and gross income. (See Appendix A, pp.118). These data serves as a composite index to classify the person in one group or another. (See Appendix F page 189 for details of the class index).

It should be remembered that the efforts towards establishing class affiliation are particularly difficult because classes should not be conceived as being static and nominal, but as entities which are in constant flux and are best understood as complex entities in the course of history. For example, individuals engaged in office work--either clericals or those in low executive positions--might be categorized as part of the middle strata in a given period, and as part of the working class in another.

Procedure

The interviews were carried out by three female investigators in the family's home. They presented themselves as members of a team carrying out a study on the role of the Puerto Rican woman in the context of the family. They mentioned the fact, when asked, that the sponsoring institution was the City

University of New York. The interviews lasted from two to six hours, averaging three hours. They were tape recorded and transcribed into the interview format at a later date.

Twelve interviews were conducted as a pilot test to assess the adequacy of the questions and the instruments. The pilot interviews were conducted in lower-income areas where we suspected greater problems with vocabulary and question comprehension. As a result, several questions were eliminated, modified and added to the interview. During the actual collection of data, where the interviewee seemed to lack interest, or was unable to respond to the questions, the investigators stopped the interview and continued to the next household. At times, the interviewer had to visit the person twice in order to complete the interview. Of a total of ninety three interviews, thirteen were rejected for various reasons such as the husband not being Puerto Rican, subjects inability to respond, lack of interest, mistakes made by the interviewers and in one case the husband's mental incapacity.

The investigators spent an average of 30 hours in training. In these sessions they were advised of the problems inherent in this kind of methodology. Emphasis was given to the idea that they should allow the interview to proceed at the interviewee's pace, and the necessity to foster an atmosphere

of trust and confidence where the respondents could feel at ease, respond spontaneously, refer to anecdotes and feel generally comfortable. They were instructed to annotate any anecdotes and references that might seem relevant to our purpose in a post-interview summary.

Instruments

The Interview

The interview consisted of four sections (see Appendix A). The first part contains questions regarding age, place of birth and other personal information. Other questions are geared to determine the most important concerns of the woman and the family life.

The second part of the interview includes questions that aim to find out what is the person's idea of the most salient characteristics of Puerto Rican men and women. The subjects were asked to respond to questions such as, "What do most people think men are like?", "What are most women like?" Some questions were open ended; others probed into the subject's views on male and female sexuality. Afterwards, a frequency count was made to obtain percentages of those adjectives used to describe males and females.

In the third part, we included questions that dealt more specifically with matters of influence and manipulation. Questions were intended to probe the subject's perception of how they achieve, or fail to achieve, influence in the family's decision-making process. In addition, some questions attempt to obtain information regarding the subject's family of orientation.

In another section, some questions are directed towards eliciting answers regarding those aspects of marriage and male-female relationships that should be changed or modified.

Lastly, we included questions dealing with influence distribution in the household. These consist of six items, five of which were extracted and translated from a questionnaire used by Zick Rubin in a study of patterns of interpersonal attraction. (See Appendix A, p. 118; Appendix C, p. 155).

Scale of Marital Adjustment

The items in the scale were developed by Dohrenwend, and colleagues in their "Survey of Life Events" sponsored by the Social Psychiatry Research Unit of the Columbia University Department of Psychology. Seven items were selected, translated and incorporated into the interview (see Appendix A, p. 118; Appendix D, p. 158). Our computation of the alpha coefficient of

the scale for our sample yielded .90.

Six other questions, aimed at determining the level of rapport during the interview, were excerpted and translated from the same questionnaire.

Sex Role Rigidity Scale

The Sex Role Rigidity Scale developed by Cole, and his colleagues (1974) attempts to measure the extent to which individuals adhere to traditional expectations of sex role behavior. The Scale consists of thirty-four Likert-type items (see Appendix B, p. 142) that tap different areas of sex role behavior, such as the man's involvement in household tasks, the woman's need to maintain virginity, the man's intellectual capacities--as opposed to the female's emotionality and interpersonal competence--and other sex roles stereotypes.

The scale has been administered to various samples of college students, among which, Puerto Rican students were included. A test of internal reliability, with a sample of 204 college students, yielded an alpha coefficient of .94. The same test, considering 52 minority students, yielded a coefficient of .90.

Computation of the alpha measure for our sample of 57 subjects yielded a coefficient of .90. Not all eighty sub-

jects were administered the scale due to an error by one of the investigators. This coefficient, however, is derived from a shortened version of the scale. Ten items worded positively and ten negatively, were used out of the original thirty-four, and translated and put together as a shortened version in order to avoid making the interview excessively long. The translation of the items was done simultaneously by two bilingual judges and the final version was reviewed by three bilingual judges.

The Measures of Manipulativeness

To determine an index of manipulation, we constructed two separate scales. One containing six items, to measure the degree of personal manipulation, and another consisting of five items, to measure the degree of general female manipulation. The items were extracted from the interview questionnaire and, in addition to being analyzed separately as parts of the interview, were grouped in two scales. The first one furnishes an index on the reported use of manipulative techniques--personal manipulation--and the second yields a score of the degree of manipulateness that the subject attributes to women in general--general manipulation.

A pre-analysis of 20 interviews supplied the most frequent responses throughout the sample. These were recorded and assigned values which were later added across the items of the scales for each case. Individual scores ranged from 0-13 for the Personal Manipulation Index, and from 0-10 for the General Female Manipulation Index. (See Appendix G, page 95 for a more detailed explanation).

An internal reliability test for our sample of eighty subjects yielded an alpha coefficient of .81 for the Personal Manipulation Index, and a coefficient of .62 for the General Manipulation Index. There is, in addition, a correlation of .39. $p(r=0) < .001$ between scores on the Personal and General manipulation indices. These serve as the manipulation scores used in all of the statistical analyses of the data.

The Problem of Social Desirability

Social desirability becomes one of the most difficult problems in this study. Not only does the mere notion of manipulation arouse the subject's defensiveness, but the idea of asking questions about influence and decision-making in the family invades the private realm of family life.

In order to deal with these problems, we decided to phrase our questions on the level of "what people generally say and

do" and, gradually, come to ask specific personal questions about the individual and her family.

The investigators were specifically instructed to be non-evaluative at all times. In addition, when dealing with the concept of manipulation, an effort was made to explain it, and accompany it with the notion of indirect techniques to achieve desired ends.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

In this chapter we will present the findings which resulted from the statistical tests and some descriptive statistics of responses to questions throughout the interview. Tables 2 and 3 summarize some of the main characteristics of the sample; age, educational status, income and length of marriage, and offers some notions about the heterogeneity of the sample.

Insert Table 2 & 3 about here

The average subject was around forty years old, though the range of ages was considerable, and had been married for a considerable number of years, 16 years on the average. There were substantial differences in income and educational level for subjects of the different social classes.

Our first hypothesis concerned the differences in the reported use of manipulative strategies by the women of the middle strata and the working class. Table 4 summarizes the means, standard deviations, and number of subjects for these

Insert Table 4 about here

TABLE 2

Summary of the Characteristics of the Sample:

Income, Age, Educational Status of the Woman and Length of Marriage

	Income				Age			Educational Status			Length of Marriage		
	Median*	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N
MIDDLE STRATA	7.16	1000-1200	1.71	42	41.33	13.52	42	14.36	2.75	41	18.04	2.09	42
Employed	7.61	1000-1200	1.56	23	38.56	11.82	23	15.08	2.31	23	13.52	10.70	23
Not employed	6.40	1000-1200	1.85	19	44.68	14.97	19	13.44	3.05	18	23.52	14.88	19
WORKING CLASS	2.96	400-600	1.14	37	38.40	9.06	37	9.78	2.77	37	14.35	9.06	37
Employed	2.78	400-600	3.25	18	40.66	9.73	18	9.72	3.25	18	13.78	2.42	18
Not employed	3.11	400-600	0.73	19	36.26	8.06	19	9.84	2.31	19	14.89	7.96	19
TOTAL	4.40	800-1,000	2.28	80	39.98	11.60	80	12.21	2.56	80	16.40	11.70	80

*See Table 3 for Income Categories

Table 3
Reported Income

Income Group	Absolute Frequency	%
1 Less than \$200 montly	1	1.3
2 \$200 - \$ 400	11	13.8
3 \$400 - \$ 600	18	22.5
4 \$600 - \$ 800	11	13.8
5 \$800 - \$1,000	3	3.8
6 \$1,000 \$1,200	10	12.5
7 \$1,200 \$1,500	7	8.8
8 Over \$1,500	18	22.5
9 Missing data	1	1.3
TOTAL	80	100

TABLE 4

Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects
for Scores on the Personal Manipulation Index: Social
Class and Occupational Status

SOCIAL CLASS	STATUS	
	Not Employed	Employed
Working Class	\bar{X} - 3.89 SD - 3.29 N - 19	\bar{X} - 3.16 SD - 2.14 N - 18
Middle Strata	\bar{X} - 6.57 SD - 3.07 N - 19	\bar{X} - 7.00 SD - 3.70 N - 23

two groups and also for the employed and not employed women within each social class.

A two way analysis of variance yielded an $F = 20.87$, $p < .001$ for Personal Manipulation scores of middle strata and working class women. Table 5 summarizes the sum of squares, degrees of freedom, mean square and F scores.

Insert Table 5 about here

The test confirms our hypothesis that women from the middle strata would report significantly greater use of manipulative techniques in their relationship to the husband. In the following chapter we will elaborate on these results. It should be noted that in both the Personal Manipulation Index, where scores range from 6 to 13, and in the General Female Manipulation Index, where scores range from 0 to 13, higher scores signify greater manipulateness and attribution of manipulateness respectively.

The second hypothesis concerned an interactive effect between the variables of class and participation in the labor force. No significant results were obtained for our sample. See Table 5.

Table 5

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores
on the Personal Manipulation Index

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
Social class	207.92	1	207.92	20.87***
Occupational status	0.46	1	0.46	0.04
Social class and occupational status	6.46	1	6.46	0.64
Unit	746.92	75	9.95	
TOTAL	961.77	78	12.33	

*** $p < .001$

While results on the Personal Manipulation Index yield significant differences between various groups, results on the General - Female Manipulation Index do not reveal such differences. We had not formulated specific hypotheses regarding results in this index, however results on this index were expected to follow the same trend. Table 6 summarizes the sum of squares, degrees of freedom and F scores for this results.

Insert Table 6 about here

In addition to scores on personal manipulation and other women's manipulation attribution, we had also obtained several measures of decision making, sex role rigidity, and marital adjustment. Table 7 presents means, standard deviations, and number of subjects for scores on the various scales and indexes. The Sex Role Rigidity Scale scores range from 20 to 120. The highest scores reflect greater adherence to traditional sex role expectations. Rubins' Influence Distribution scores range from 6 - 54. The higher scores indicate greater influence by the husband in six areas of family concerns. In the case of

Table 6

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on
the General Manipulation Index

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
Social class	7.59	1	7.59	2.2
Occupational status	0.10	1	0.10	0.02
Social class and occupational status	5.24	1	5.24	1.39
Unit	281.04	15	3.74	
TOTAL	294.04	78	3.77	

the Marital Adjustment Scale, scores range from 7 to 35. Higher scores signify greater maladjustment of the couple

Insert table 7 about here

We carried out in an exploratory way, a series of correlations among the various indexes to obtain some notions on their relationship. The next two tables summarize the main correlations obtained for a number of variables. Table 9 includes separate computations for the variable of class. Biserial correlations were needed in this case because we had reduced the various class categories to two--the middle strata and the working class--while assuming an underlying continuity.

Insert tables 8 and 9 about here

In table 8, it is interesting to note the correlation between income and the Personal Manipulation Index, $r = .39$, $p < .001$, and the correlations between scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scales and the variables of age, $r = .36$, $p < .004$, income, $r = -.36$, $p < .004$ and length of marriage, $r = .35$, $p < .006$.

If the sample is divided according to social class, the following Pearson Correlations emerge as significant.

TABLE 7

Summary of Scores Obtained for the Sex Role Rigidity Scale,
Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale, Marital Adjustment
Scale and Personal Manipulation Indexes

	Sex Role Rigidity Scale			Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale			Marital Adjustment Scale			Personal Manipulation Index			General Manipulation Index		
	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N	\bar{X}	SD	N
MIDDLE STRATA	63.00	19.90	38	32.16	6.03	37	15.66	5.85	42	6.81	3.40	42	7.42	2.14	42
Employed	59.00	16.54	21	30.00	4.86	18	15.47	5.36	23	7.00	3.70	23	7.69	1.86	23
Not employed	67.94	22.95	17	33.10	6.96	19	15.84	6.55	19	6.57	3.07	19	7.10	2.44	19
WORKING CLASS	76.68	19.90	19	30.64	6.01	34	16.02	5.95	37	3.54	2.78	37	6.78	1.65	37
Employed	72.30	6.67	10	28.72	6.20	15	16.83	7.27	18	3.16	2.14	18	6.55	1.54	18
Not employed	81.55	18.43	9	32.36	5.40	19	15.21	4.44	19	3.89	0.75	19	7.00	1.76	19
TOTAL	67.46	20.59	58	31.36	6.02	72	15.76	5.85	80	5.20	3.54	80	7.03	2.08	80

Table 8

Selected Pearson Correlations

	Personal Manipulation Index	General Manipulation Index	Rubins' Influence Distri- bution	Sex Role Rigidity Scale Scores	Age	Length of Marriage	Income	Occupational Status*
Personal Manipulation Index								
General Manipulation Index	.39** n - 80							
Rubins' Influence Distribution	.13 n - 72	.06 n - 72						
Sex Role Rigidity Scale	.10 n - 58	-.20 n - 58	.18 n - 53					
Age	.16 n - 80	.00 n - 80	.17 n - 72	.36* n - 58				
Length of Marriage	.19 n - 80	.03 n - 80	.14 n - 72	.35* n - 58	.80** n - 80			
Income	.36** n - 80	.23 n - 80	.05 n - 72	-.36* n - 58	.02 n - 80	.10 n - 80		

* p < .05

** p < .001

(Continuation Table 8)

	Personal Manipu- lation Index	General Manipu- lation Index	Rubins' Influence Distri- bution	Sex Role Rigidity Scale Scores	Age	Length of Marriage	Income	Occupa- tional Status*
Occupational Status*	.03	.07	-.21	-.21	.04	-.24*	.11	
	n - 80	n - 80	n - 72	n - 58	n - 80	n - 80	n - 80	

* Occupational Status consisted of two categories: Women who are employed, and women who are not employed and not seeking employment.

TABLE 9

Biserial Correlations: Social Class

	Mean Score for Working Class Women	Mean Score for Middle Strata Women	SD	Number of SS Working Class	Number of SS Middle Strata	Ordinal Value	r_b
Personal Manipulation Index	3.54	6.81	3.54	37	42	.3977	.57**
General Female Mani- pulation Index	6.78	7.42	2.08	37	42	.3977	.19
Sex Role Rigidity Scale	76.68	63.00	20.59	19	38	.3637	-.40*
Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale	30.64	32.16	6.02	34	37	.3982	.15
Marital Adjustment Scale	16.00	15.64	5.85	37	42	.3977	-.03

** p < .01

* p < .05

For working class women: Personal Manipulation Index
x General - Female Manipulation Index.

$$r = .49^*$$

$$n = 37$$

Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale x Occupational Status

$$r = .33^*$$

$$n = 34$$

Age x Marital Adjustment Scales

$$r = .36^*$$

$$n = 41$$

General-Female Manipulation Index x Marital Adjustment
Scale

$$r = .39^*$$

$$n = 37$$

For middle-strata women:

Sex Role Rigidity Scale x Income

$$r = .37^*$$

$$n = 38$$

* $p < .05$

Sex Role Rigidity Scale x Length of Marriage

$$r = .47^*$$

$$n = 38$$

Two-way analysis of variance were also carried out for the scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale, the Marital Adjustment Scale and Rubins' Influence Distribution Scores. No specific hypothesis had been formulated around these scales and the tests were carried out in an exploratory fashion.

Subjects ($n = 57$) were found to vary in their Sex Role Rigidity Scale scores, $F = 5.86$, $p = .01$, along the class dimension. Also, scores on the Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale were significantly different, $F = 6.71$, $p = .01$ along the occupational status variable. No significant differences between groups were obtained on the Marital Adjustment Scale. Tables 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14 summarize these findings.

Insert tables 10, 11, 12, 13 & 14 about here

The responses to questions regarding the nature of males and females are tested in the tables that follow. It should be remembered that questions such as; what is your opinion about how men are? What do women in general, say about men?,

Table 10

Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects
for Scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale

Social Class	Occupational status	
	Non working	Working
	\bar{X} 81.55	\bar{X} 72.30
	SD 18.43	SD 21.09
Working class	N 9	N 10
Middle strata	\bar{X} 67.94	\bar{X} 59.00
	SD 22.95	SD 16.54
	N 17	N 21

Table 11

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores
on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
Social class	2281.13	1	2281.13	5.86**
Occupational status	1042.72	1	1042.72	2.67
Social class and occupational status	0.31	1	0.31	
Unit	20627.32	53	389.19	
TOTAL	23951.48	56	427.70	

** p < .01

Table 12

Summary of Means, Standard Deviations and Number of Subjects
for Scores on the Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale: Social Class
and Occupational Status

Social Class	Occupational Status	
	Non Working	Working
Working class	$\bar{X} = 32.36$	$\bar{X} = 28.72$
	SD = 5.40	SD = 5.73
	N = 19	N = 18
Middle-Strata	$\bar{X} = 33.10$	$\bar{X} = 30.00$
	SD = 6.96	SD = 4.92
	N = 19	N = 23

Table 13

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variance for Scores on
Rubins' Influence Distribution Scale

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
Social class	19.86	1	19.86	0.59
Occupational status	223.11	1	223.11	6.71**
Social class and occupational status	1.43	1	1.43	0.04
Unit	2493.82	75	33.25	
TOTAL				

** $p < .01$

Table 14

Summary of Two-Way Analysis of Variances for Scores
on the Marital Adjustment Scale

Source	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F
Social class	2.56	1	2.56	0.07
Occupational status	7.75	1	7.75	0.21
Social class and occupational status	19.31	1	19.31	0.54
Unit	2661.93	75	35.49	
TOTAL	2691.56	78	34.50	

were open ended. The adjectives reported were spontaneously mentioned by the subjects. This has the effect of presenting a wider range of responses with small percentages. Tables 15 and 20 present the subject's personal opinion on the nature of males and females, while tables 17, 19 and 22 record the subjects' understanding of what people in general say on the matter.

Insert tables 15, 17, 19, 20 & 22 about here

Tables 16, 18, 21 and 23 present further analyses of the adjectival data. These tables present combined percentages which give an idea of how favorably or unfavorably are women and men described by each subsample. Furthermore, tables 16, 18 and 23 present point-biserial correlations between the adjectival data and scores on the Personal Manipulation Index. It should be noted that in order to construct these tables adjectives were classified as favorable or unfavorable and then grouped to obtain the combined percentages. Decisions regarding the favorability--unfavorability of each adjective were based on the author's knowledge of the colloquial use of those adjectives. (See Appendix E, pages 166-170.)

Insert Tables 16, 18, 21 and 23 about here

Table 24 contains answer to selected questions in the interview which provide a picture of family decision making

Table 15

Adjectives Used to Describe the Woman's Personal Opinion
About the "way men are": Percentages

	%		%
Dominant	33.8	Not understanding	12.5
"Machistas"	30.0	Mean	8.8
Good fathers and husbands	25.0	Insecure	8.8
Good providers	25.0	Inmature	7.5
Responsible	18.8	Conceited	7.5
Selfish	16.3	Irrespectful	2.5
Indifferent to family affairs	17.5	Tranquil	2.5
Dependent	13.8		
Irresponsible	13.8		

Table 16

Ss Responses to the Question: What is Your Opinion About
How Most Puerto Rican Men Are?

Social Class		Positive or Mixed Adjectives %	Negative Adjectives only %	Rpb
	N			
Working class, not employed	19	36.8	63.2	-.03
Working class, employed	17	29.4	70.6	.06
Middle-Strata, not employed	17	29.4	70.6	-.07
Middle-strata, employed	23	34.8	65.2	-.28
Total Sample	77	33.8	66.2	-.10

Table 17

Adjectives Used to Describe What "Most People Generally Think"
About the "way men are": Percentages

	%		%
		Jealous	8.8
Unconsiderate	30.0	Proud	8.8
"Machistas"	28.8	Insecure	6.3
Promiscuous	28.8	Vicious	5.0
Irresponsible	21.3	Sexual	5.0
Selfish	17.4	Familial	5.0
Responsible	16.3	Inmature	5.0
"Callejero" (Wanderer)	15.0	Irrespectful	2.5
Despotic	15.0	Abussive	2.5
Lazy	11.3	Daring	1.3

Table 18

Ss Responses to the Question: How do Most People See
the Puerto Rican Man? and Point Biserial Correlations
With Personal Manipulation Scores

		Positive or Mixed Adjectives %	Negative Adjectives only %	Rpb
	N			
Working class, not employed	19	15.8	84.2	-.05
Working class, employed	18	16.7	83.3	.10
Middle-strata, not employed	17	35.3	64.7	.04
Middle-strata, employed	23	8.7	91.3	.00
Total Sample	77	17.9	82.1	.02

Table 19

Adjectives Used to Describe What Other Women Generally
Think About Men: Percentages

	%		%
		"Spoiled"	13.3
Thoughtless	35.0	Dependent	12.6
Negative opinion in general	30.0	Inmature	8.8
Promiscuous	28.8	Need a great deal of attention	8.8
Domineering	26.3	Insecure	8.8
		Lack of tenderness	6.3
Irresponsible	21.3	Abussive	5.0
		Agressive	5.0
Good providers	17.6	Tractors	3.8
		Hard-working	3.8
"Like children"	15.0	Mean	3.6
Good fathers & husbands	13.8	Superior	2.6

Table 20

Adjectives Used to Describe the Woman's Personal Opinion
About Puerto Rican Women: Percentages

	%		%
Good wives and mothers	51.3	"Suffering"	6.3
Submissive	37.5	Manipulative	5.0
		Unaggressive	3.8
Self-sacrificing	28.8	Domineering	3.8
		Provocative	2.5
Responsible	25.0	Discrete	2.5
Hard-working	20.0	Mature	1.3
"Homebody"	15.0		
Docile	12.5		
Dynamic, concerned with self-improvement	11.3		
Serious, decent	10.0		
Understanding	10.0		
Passive	8.8		

Table 21

Ss Responses to the Question: What is Your Opinion
About How Most Puerto Rican Women Are?

		Positive Adjectives only %	Negative Adjectives only %	Mixed Adjectives %
	N			
Working class, not employed	19	75.64	5.13	19.23
Working class, employed	18	83.33	11.11	5.56
Middle-strata not employed	18	55.56	5.56	38.89
Middle-strata, employed	22	72.73	4.55	22.73
Total Sample	78	72.73	4.55	22.73

Table 22

Adjectives Used to Describe What People Generally Think
About Puerto Rican Women: Percentages

	%		%
Good mothers and wives	53.8	Serious	8.8
Submissive	30.0	Silly	6.3
Self-sacrificing	28.8	Familial	5.0
		Irresponsible	3.8
Responsible	26.3	Aggressive	3.8
		Strong	3.8
Hard-working	21.3	Independent	3.8
Good housewife	18.8	Traditional	3.8
Honest	13.8	Mature	2.5
		Martyr	2.5
		Inferior	2.5
Slave	10.0	Dependent	1.3
Dynamic	10.0		
Passive	10.0		

Table 23

Ss Responses to the Question: How do Most People See the Puerto Rican Woman? and Point Biserial Correlations With Personal Manipulation Scores

		Positive Adjectives only %	Negative and Mixed Adjectives %	Rpb
	N			
Working class, not employed	18	83.3	16.7	.36
Working class, employed	18	83.3	16.7	-.03
Middle-strata, not employed	17	58.8	41.2	.00
Middle-strata, employed	23	82.6	17.4	-.19
Total Sample	77	77.9	22.1	.07

and manipulation.

Insert table 24 about here

Table 24 indicates responses to questions about the use of authority by the subjects' mothers and table 26 presents answers to question: Do you remember what your mother used to say about men--how they are--and how to deal with them? Table 27 shows the ways in which women manipulate men according to our respondents.

Insert tables 25, 26, and 27 about here

Table 24

Responses to Selected Questions on Family Decision Making,
Influence and Manipulation: Percentages

		%		%		%
Who has more influence in family decisions	The husband	46.3	The wife	43.8	Both	10.0
How does the woman make her influence felt?	Directly	5.0	Indirectly	76.3	Both ways	17.3
How were decisions made in your family? (orientation)	Joint deci- sions	23.8	Father de- cided	32.5	Mother decided	6.3
	Joint discus- sion but fa- ther decided	18.8	Joint dis- cussion but mother de- cided	8.8		
How do you reach deci- sions in your present family?	Joint decisions	57.5	Husband decides	15.0	Wife decides	1.3
	Joint discussion but husband decides	17.5	Joint discus- sion but wife decides	6.3		

(Continuation Table 20)

		%		%	%
How do you achieve influence in family decisions	Directly	62.5	Indirectly	32.6	
How desirable is the use of manipulative tech- niques	Desirable	53.8	Undesirable, but necessary	16.3	Undesirable 20.1
Are most Puerto Rican women manipulative?	Yes	82.5	No	12.5	
Do you manipulate your husband?	Yes	67.5	No	32.5	
Does your husband mani- pulate you?	Yes	53.8	No	41.3	

Note: Percentages for missing data have not been included.

Table 25

Wife's Mother Use of Authority

		%
How did your mother exercise authority in the family?	Directly and openly	50
	Indirectly	23.8
	Both ways	2.5
	Directly with children, indirectly with husband	3.8
	No authority at all	15.0

Table 26

Mothers' Advice on Men

Do you remember what your mother used to say about men -
how they are - and how to deal with them?

	%
To treat them kindly	41.3
To respect them	30.0
Make them feel boss	10.0
Not to be domineering	8.8
Explain things to them calmly, not to rush them	7.5
Deal with them in indirect ways	5.0
Deal with them always openly	5.0
One has to know them and adjust to them	3.8
Wait for the appropriate time to speak to them	3.8
They are like children	3.8
To find his preferences "buscarle la vuelta"	2.5
Humor him	1.3

Table 27

Ways in Which Women Manipulate Men

	%
In which ways do women manipulate men?	
By being sweet	68.8
Finding his prefer- ences "Buscándoles los gustos"	28.8
Through submissiveness	18.8
Making them feel as the boss	13.8
Through sex	13.8
Talking to them at special moments	10.0
Through dependency and guilt	10.0
Lying	7.8
Crying	7.5
Deceiving	6.3
Playing "sick"	2.5
Through admiration	1.3

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

In this chapter we will restate our hypotheses and discuss our findings. A second section will be devoted to analyze the explanatory value of the cultural learning model in relationship to our problem and its applicability, as compared to the class model. This will be followed by a discussion of the concept of manipulation and the possibilities of alternative options available for women in their relationship with men. The concluding section will attempt to explore generalizations of the model presented to other relationships-parent-child, women-women and some general considerations regarding various approaches to the study of women and the value of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of behavior.

Summary of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results

1. We hypothesized the existence of significant differences between middle strata and working class women in their reported use of manipulative strategies. Women of the

middle strata were predicted to make greater use of manipulative strategies in order to reconcile adherence to traditional expectations of male authority while attempting to exert influence. The literature available on normative expectations in the middle strata (Muñoz, 1972; Wolf, 1953) suggest that individuals in these sectors adopt to a greater extent the dominant values in society, particularly those of vertical mobility and the desirability of social status and prestige. This is generally supported by several studies (González, 1974 and Nash, 1915). Our own data, however, does not offer specific information on this matter.

Our results confirm that women from the middle strata report significantly greater use of manipulative strategies as indicated by the Personal Manipulation Index. This is indicated by the analysis of variance carried out, as well as by a correlation coefficient of $r_b = .57$, $p < .01$ between scores on this index and social class.

On the General-Female Manipulation Index, which measures the degree to which the women attributes manipulateness to women in general, no significant differences were found in our sample. This can be understood as a relative autonomy of her reported personal behavior from that which the woman considers to be the behavior of other women. It is interesting to note

that for both groups, middle-strata and working class women, the mean scores on the General Female Manipulation Index are rather high, 7.12 for the working class women, and 7.05 for the middle-strata women, when the maximum score is 10. This signifies that women in our sample, regardless of class, consider manipulative behavior to be quite prevalent among women in general. A Pearson correlation between both indices yielded a coefficient of $r = .39$, $p < .001$ ($N = 80$). It can be expected that personal behavior and that attributed to others are not separate dimensions, however, subjects were able to distinguish from what others generally do and their own behavior. In this sense, questions aimed at the "general" level seemed to have served the function of introducing the subject to the topic of manipulateness, decreasing the negative social desirability component while allowing the subject to discriminate from their own behavior. The discrepancy between the results obtained in the Personal Manipulation Index and the General Female Manipulation index might suggest that responses to the questions included were not automatic and involved a differentiation by the subjects. A criticism offered by Zuñiga (1975) about the possibility that women from the middle strata may appear as more manipulative because their verbal skills allow them to express their views in more detail, is attenuated by

these results. If this were the case middle strata women would be expected to obtain significantly higher scores on both indices. However, further explorations into this matter are needed before we can reach firmer conclusions.

2. The second hypothesis predicted that women from the middle-strata who participate in the labor force would differ significantly from working women in the working class. This hypothesis was derived from the notion that participation in the labor force would have a differential effect on the woman's choice of strategies, depending on the woman's class position. For the women of the middle strata, her direct participation in the labor force would sharpen the conflict between her adherence to values of male-dominance and the emancipating effects and increase in authority, that accrue from her role as economic contributor. This conflicted situation would provide the conditions for manipulative behavior to emerge as a compromise option.

For the working class woman, participation in the labor force would decrease the likelihood of using manipulation. Because her objective possibilities of vertical mobility are more limited and the function of the man as wage-earner and manager of income is less certain, she is "freer" to exert her authority straightforwardly. Her role as economic contributor

these results. If this were the case, middle strata women would be expected to obtain significantly higher scores on both indices. However, further explorations into this matter are needed before we can reach firmer conclusions.

2. The second hypothesis predicted an interaction effect between the variables of class and participation in the labor force. This hypothesis was derived from the notion that participation in the labor force would have a differential effect on the woman's choice of strategies, depending on the woman's class position. For the women of the middle strata, her direct participation in the labor force would sharpen the conflict between her adherence to values of male-dominance and the emancipating effects and increase in authority, that accrue from her role as economic contributor. This conflicted situation would provide the conditions for manipulative behavior to emerge as a compromise option.

For the working class woman, participation in the labor force would decrease the likelihood of using manipulation. Because her objective possibilities of vertical mobility are more limited and the function of the man as wage-earner and manager of income is less certain, she is "freer" to exert her authority straightforwardly. Her role as economic contributor

has a greater impact in family matters.

It should be remembered that the previous analysis does not imply that working class families are not permeated by the patriarchal value-system. While values regarding male prepondance permeate all of society, the more direct relationship to the means of production for these groups and their concrete experience limit the extent to which they can fullfill these values.

This hypothesis was not confirmed by the results obtained. Table 4, which summarizes the means, standard deviations and number of subjects indicates a certain ordering of the groups in relation to the Personal Manipulation scores in accordance with our prediction. Employed women in both classes are found in the extremes, while middle strata women who do not work obtain higher scores than their working class counterparts.

3. We proposed the existence of an attitudinal component related to conceptions about the "nature" of males and females. We attempted to explore the extent to which these attitudes mediate the woman's choice of strategies in dealing with men.

While it is reasonable to expect differences among middle-strata and working class women, since they show differences in manipulative behavior, we did not hypothesize significant differences between the groups.

An analysis of the qualities attributed to both males and females yield some interesting findings. When subjects were asked their personal opinion about the nature of males we find that they are mostly described with adjectives that involve negative qualities, while the attributes that describe "how women are" are mostly positive in nature. For examples, of 16 adjectives spontaneously used to describe males throughout the samples only three emphasize positive qualities such as "good providers", "good fathers" and "responsible". Examples of negative qualities include, "selfishness", "machistas", "domineering", "dependent", "irresponsible". Women, on the other hand, are mostly described with positive attributes such as "self-sacrificing", "good mothers", "hard-working", "responsible" and others (see Table 18). Of 18 adjectives used to describe women, only three denote undesirable elements, "provocative", "manipulative", and "domineering".

A similar trend is observed when subjects are asked how do "people in general" see men and women. Of 19 adjectives used to describe males, only two, "responsible" and "familiar"

denote positive qualities. Of 22 adjectives regarding the "nature" of females, only one, "abusive" is negative. When asked specifically what do "other women" think about men, only four out of 20 adjectives, "good father", "good providers", "Hard-working", and "superior" denote positive attributes.

In order to understand the extent to which these attitudes about the nature of males and females mediate the woman's use of manipulative strategies we carried out further analyses of these adjectival data. (See Tables 16, 18, 21, 23.)

We predicted, on the basis of previous studies (Safa, 1974, Pearlin, 1971, Stevens, 1973, and Wolf 1953) that women hold negative views about men and that this may serve to justify their use of manipulative behaviors. Tables 16-23 indicate that most women in our sample expressed considerably negative views of men and positive views on women. There do not seem to be large differences among the women of the various subgroups in the extent to which they attribute positive or negative qualities to men and women. However, women from the middle strata tend to express a greater number of mixed responses--those which include both positive and negative attributes--than those from the working class.

Correlations computed between these quality attributions and scores on the Personal Manipulation Index do not indicate significant relationships between how favorably or unfavorably subjects evaluate men and women and their use of manipulative strategies. That is, the attitudinal component seems to be independent of their disposition to engage in manipulation. We may conclude that there seem to be generalized negative opinions about men and generalized positive opinions towards women. In addition, there are no significant relationships between the favorableness of the evaluation attributed to males and females, and the subjects' use of manipulative tactics, and no large differences among the subgroups in this respect.

4. The relationship between scores on the Marital Adjustment Scale and the use of manipulative strategies was assessed and was found not to be significant as measured by a Pearson correlation coefficient. No significant differences were found between middle strata and working class women.

5. The relationship of scores in the Sex Role Rigidity scale with scores on the Manipulation Indices is not significant for our sample. Correlations for the Personal Manipulation Index yield a coefficient of $r = .10$, ($N = 58$) and for the General Female Manipulation Index a coefficient of $r = -.20$ ($N = 58$), which is consistent with the inverse relationship obtained between the Sex Role Rigidity Scale scores and social

class. It seems as if subscription to traditional sex role stereotypes is not associated with the personal use or attribution of manipulative behaviors to others.

That is, greater subscription to traditional sex role stereotypes does not necessarily imply that individuals will abide by them. We had previously suggested that while the traditional "patriarchal" conceptions about the nature of males and females permeate all of society, the concrete life conditions modify the practice of such expectations. In the case of working class women we expect them to subscribe to these values while being less bound by them in their daily actions.

Scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale were found to correlate negatively, $r_b = -.40$, $p < .05$ with social class. Higher scores in the scale were associated with the working class. Similarly, the analysis of variance carried out indicated the existence of significant differences between middle-strata and working class women. Working class women subscribe to traditional sex role expectations to a greater extent. It should be noted that scores on this scale are associated with the woman's formal schooling, $r = -.55$, $p < .001$ ($N = 57$) and also to the husbands' schooling, $r = -.43$, $p < .001$ ($N = 58$). For both, longer years of schooling are associated

with depressed scores on the Sex Role Rigidity Scale.

It seems reasonable to assume that the more educated an individual is, the less likely he is to adopt traditional sex role stereotypes. Social class and schooling in turn, are closely associated, $r = .58$, $p < .001$ ($N = 79$), which is consistent with the inverse between the Sex Role Rigidity Scale scores and relationship obtained social class.

6. An analysis of variance of Rubins' Influence Distribution scores revealed significant differences between women who participate in the labor force and those who do not. Women who do not participate in the labor force obtained higher scores on this scale. This indicates that in families where the wife stays at home, the husband is reported as having greater influence in six areas of family concerns--money, recreational activities, sexual relations, children's activities, activities with relatives, and conversation. This finding supports the notion that the wife's direct participation in the labor force increases her influence and authority in the family. No significant differences are obtained between middle-strata and working class women.

7. An analysis of selected questions throughout the interview yields some interesting results (see Tables 20-23).

Forty-six percent of the respondents believe that the woman has more influence in family decisions and 76% indicated that this influence is exercised indirectly. Thirty-two percent report using manipulative techniques to achieve influence themselves. While 53% agree that their husbands manipulate them with varying degrees of frequency as well, only 3.8% report manipulation as the tactics used by men to achieve influence. Men are seen as mostly straightforward. Eighty-two percent of the subjects believe that most Puerto Rican women are manipulative and 53.8% consider the use of manipulation desirable. Manipulation was seen as desirable for several reasons: 1) it avoids conflict between spouses, 2) it allows the man to feel he is the dominant figure in the family and this was evaluated positively, 3) it is seen as the only way for obtaining the things the woman wants, 4) it is desirable to maintain the appearance of the "pater-familias" in the eyes of others. This last reason offered by our respondents coincides with our argument regarding the need for maintaining a patriarchal family facade felt more acutely by the women of the middle strata. These responses were integrated into the Personal Manipulation Index. (See Appendix G p. 195).

For the subjects who evaluate manipulation negatively, these tactics are degrading for both men and women or imply a lack of faith or trust in the partner.

In general, there seem to be generalized notions about the use of manipulation especially by women.

Decision-making in the family is reported as being a shared process. Fifty-seven percent of the respondents claim that they reach decisions by consulting and discussing with each other, although 32.5 percent say that the husband makes the decisions with or without consultations with the wife.

In responding to questions about the authority structure of the subjects' family of orientation, a less than egalitarian picture is presented. Only 23.8% report decisions as being taken jointly by their parents, while 51.3% say the father decided all matters, with or without consultation with the wife.

Another area of interest investigated was the extent to which manipulative behaviors are learned in the socialization of the child through female members of the family. Fifteen percent of the respondents who said they used manipulative tactics explicitly denied having learned them at home, and claimed to have developed them after marriage or learned from

other married friends. In response to the question about the mothers' exercise of influence, 50% said these mothers were open and straightforward as compared to 26.3% who said they were manipulative or were both direct and manipulative.

The subjects were asked to recall the things that their mothers, or other female members of the family, used to tell them about men and "how to deal with them". Responses to this question (see Table 22) indicate that emphasis was placed on the woman's need to recognize her subordination to the man. Forty one percent were told to "treat them kindly" and thirty percent were told to "respect them". Emphasis was placed by the mothers on the desirability of being submissive, receptive and subtle. Same percent of women, 5.0, reported being told to be open and to use manipulative techniques. It is not likely that one could derive from these results the notion that women are socialized in the use of manipulation. We could argue that they are socialized to assume an attitude of respect and submissiveness. While it is possible that some learning about manipulative strategies takes place in the family we cannot conclude that it is pervasive or homogeneous.

We may, instead, speak of these manipulative strategies as being situationally defined by the woman's position in relation to the socioeconomic order.

Lastly, we were interested in women's understanding of the specific ways in which they, and women general, use to manipulate men (see Table 23). The most frequent responses included "being sweet", "finding his preferences" and pleasing them ("buscarles los gustos") "pretending he is the boss", "through sex" and through submission, dependency, and guilt.

The Cultural Learning Hypothesis and the Model of Class

In chapter one we mentioned that one of the reasons to carry out the study in Puerto Rico was the fact that studies dealing with the use of manipulative strategies by women have emerged mainly from research on Latin America. Manipulative tactics have been understood (Stevens, 1973, Safa 1971) as a response to the cultural norms of machismo or as an element in family relationships in Latin America, where supposedly, women are highly influential (Wilhamson, 1973).

Several authors (Stevens, 1973; Wilhamson, 1973) describe the phenomenon of machismo as a New World development. The Spanish-Arabic influence--with strong values of male-dominance--were brought to the New World and supposedly flourished there. It is interesting to note that while the traits attributed to Latin American "machismo" are present in Middle Eastern, Oriental and Western societies, the focus of machismo continues to be seen by social scientists as residing in Latin America.

The notion that the prevalence of machismo creates a counter-phenomenon, marianismo, that becomes as cultural as machismo, obscures the heterogeneity of the behavior and the understanding of the concrete determinants of the use of manipulative techniques.

We have proposed that these behaviors are best understood as compromises that women make, in view of their changing relation to the means of production, as well as that of the family as a whole. In light of this, a historical analysis of changes in the family and the economic, political and ideological functions it serves is more adequate. This type of analysis allow us to see differences, particularly class differences, among sectors of society and to relate these differences to their relative integration to the economic production of society. According to Marxist thought (Marx K and Engels, F. 1962) the middle strata of society lacks a direct relationship to the means of production, they neither own capital nor produce surplus value. This lack of a direct relationship is assumed to keep them in a vacuum that makes them more vulnerable to adopt the values of the dominant class. In this sense women of these sectors get more caught up in the traditional expectations of male dominance, prestige; mobility and consumerism. In order to reconcile these values and assert their influence

they resort to manipulation which, as a strategy, does not challenge directly their sex role requirements.

The working class on the other hand, while pervaded by dominant values as well, has a direct relation to the means of production which allows for an anchorage in the economic process that modifies the extent to which they can subscribe the bourgeois values.

The results obtained in the Sex-Role Rigidity scale may appear to contradict the notion that women from the middle strata are more traditional. However, if we analyze the content of the items we find that they address themselves to questions of sex role stereotypes in areas that do not necessarily challenge the values of the patriarchal family. As mentioned before, the woman's greater education in these sectors allow her to reject as "old fashioned" ideas about the woman's role as homemaker, intellectual inferiority, lack of leadership and greater emotionality. This understanding does not necessarily facilitate the condition for a more openly assertive style in the woman. In fact, a Pearson correlation computed for the relationship between the woman's schooling and her use of manipulative tactics, yielded a coefficient of .21, $p < .06$, (N=79). Education and the use of manipulative tactics hold a positive relationship, although no conclusions can be drawn from these

data at the present time. It is likely that the woman's notion about the lack of precision and necessity of sex role stereotypes sharpens her conflicted position in the capitalist family.

It should be clarified that we are not proposing an antagonistic dichotomy between the cultural explanation and the class model. They are not conceptualized as exclusive of each other. Once the compromise mechanisms we speak of are set into motion they can be transmitted through socialization and, to that extent, become cultural. Nevertheless, to conceptualize these problems from a strictly cultural perspective negates the class basis of culture itself, and the differences between sectors of society which are differentially integrated into the economic production.

It is often the case of "culturalist" studies that they attempt to explain societal and individual processes and transformations as a matter of cultural values. The values of the dominant ideology are taken to be representative of the values of the whole of society and, what is more obfuscating, to represent them as "natural" responses of individuals in total divorce from a analysis of the economic, political and juridical infrastructure which supports such values and their own relativity. Behaviors are understood as "local curiosities",

a result of traditions and adaptations agreed upon by the individuals. Alain Touraine (1973) in his book Production de la Société offers the following passage:

What is therefore the value system of a society? At the level of maximal extension, it is the unity of the discourse of the ruling classes or of the ruling political forces of a society, discourse whose main function is to identify technical activity with the forms of social organization, fusing both in the concept of values. Social power is therefore presented as the spirit or the soul of a society and postulates that all social conflicts take place within a general consensus.

It is essential to accept that the totality of the social practice, even when isolated from the complexity of a social formation, is an uncontrolled and unintegrated one, representing class relations, political influence confrontations, and all the other types of social relations, in spite of the efforts of unification carried in the name of values, principles or traditions by the ruling class and its ideologies. In order for a value system to unify social practice, it is necessary that society be totally dominated both politically and culturally by a sovereign, be it capitalist enterprises or the central committee. (p. 53-54).

The Concept of Manipulation and the Dilemma of the Oppressed

Most of us value the concepts of honesty and straightforwardness. A manipulative individual is valued negatively

for his or her behavior insofar as he seeks to gain advantage over other persons while maintaining his her position in the relationships invulnerable. His or her lack of authenticity make them the object of distrust and lessens, in the eyes of others, their dignity as human beings.

The question that remains is whether individuals who find themselves in a position of subordination and lack of power vis a vis other--slave-master, worker--employer, child-parent, women-men--have other possible options in their relationships. In our case, this may be an important question in order to avoid what Ryan (1971) has called "blaming the victim". Is the oppressed able to "play a fair game"? What happens to him or her if they "play the game" according to the rules established by the oppressor? Can they subscribe to the conceptualization of authenticity of the oppressor? Behaviors that are understood as manipulative may be only so in the eyes of the oppressor. Still, it can be argued that while manipulation has a survival value for the oppressed, it cannot be understood as a stable state of affairs or as an emancipating alternative. It is an unstable situation insofar as the manipulator can be discovered at any moment. Also, the subtle balance between benevolent manipulation--manipulation which is understood as accruing benefits for

the manipulated--and malevolent manipulation--that which has no redeeming value for the manipulated--makes the manipulator an object of suspicion and distrust. Even though the manipulated one may condone a certain degree of manipulation it, nevertheless, obscures the contingencies of each others' behavior.

It may be this same instability of the manipulative option which will provide the elements for a more emancipating solution for both parties. What the elements are in this situation that can potentially induce change in a relationship, is not clear. It is likely that a change in the socio-economic context of individuals come first.

Our study evidence differences among middle-strata and working class women. This indicates that while women in general may be seen as oppressed, the nature of the oppression may be different. As we pointed out in the introductory chapter, in absolute terms, the working class woman seems to be more oppressed than her middle-strata counterpart. She is more deprived economically, less educated, and more parochial. However, it can be argued that the middle strata woman is relatively more deprived. She is more educated, has a greater income and the possibility of having a career. Nevertheless,

she is bound by the very things she subscribes to in order to fulfill her expectations. This contradiction provides the conditions for greater inauthenticity and artificiality in her personal relations. Our results confirm the notion that it is the middle-strata woman who is actively participating in the labor force the one with a higher index of manipulation.

It is interesting to note here the parallel suggested by Ricardo Zuñiga (1975). He points out the differences between the relationship of the worker-employer and the manager-employer. While the worker occupies a lower step in an industry or organization he may be in a position of acting more directly or aggressively in his relationship to the employer. The manager, on the other hand, occupies a higher position which requires greater loyalty, tact and in general a more accomodating attitude towards the employer. Because the worker is more disadvantaged in terms of income, education, and status, less is expected from him and more from the middle-range employees. In this situation the middle-range employee is relatively more limited in his personal relations within the work structure.

Our last point concerns the self-perception of the manipulator in regard to the desirability and moral aspects of his tactics. As we suggested, the moral considerations of manipu-

she is bound by the very things she subscribes to in order to fulfill her expectations. This contradiction provides the conditions for greater inauthenticity and artificiality in her personal relations. Our results support the notion that the middle-strata woman uses manipulative tactics to a greater extent.

It is interesting to note here the parallel suggested by Ricardo Zuñiga (1975). He points out the differences between the relationship of the worker-employer and the manager-employer. While the worker occupies a lower step in an industry or organization he may be in a position of acting more directly or aggressively in his relationship to the employer. The manager, on the other hand, occupies a higher position which requires greater loyalty, tact and in general a more accomodating attitude towards the employer. Because the worker is more disadvantaged in terms of income, education, and status, less is expected from him and more from the middle-range employees. In this situation the middle-range employee is relatively more limited in his personal relations within the work structure.

Our last point concerns the self-perception of the manipulator in regard to the desirability and moral aspects of his tactics. As we suggested, the moral considerations of manipu-

lativeness cannot be considered separately from the conditions that may make it a necessary option. Nevertheless, the use of these tactics run counter the normative expectations of honesty and sincerity.

Our results (see Table 20) suggest that most of the women do not perceive their use of manipulative techniques as undesirable. They are seen as part of the repertoire of behaviors women must use in their relationship with men. We can hypothesize that the derogatory notions about the nature of men that women espouse attenuate the negative value of manipulation. If men are conceived as children or as unreliable individuals, it may be seen as justifiable to manipulate them. In addition, manipulation may be seen to accrue benefits for him as well. The following quote from one of our respondent is illustrative in this respect:

Men don't know. They don't do things correctly. Women on the other hand decide better, more calmly. In the end it is best for both that she makes sure to get her way. (case 7)

The question of whether manipulative strategies actually succeed in making the woman more powerful, or merely are perceived equivocally by women as serving that function, remains to be answered by future research. In that case, interviews with the husband and participant observation in the family

would have to be included as part of the method.

Whether manipulation objectively obtains greater success in the woman's effort to assert herself remains as a question. Nevertheless, women seem to perceive it as an effective and necessary mechanism.

Conclusion

Throughout these chapters we have attempted to understand the existence of manipulative behavior among women and their perception of it. We have tried to describe the behavior and to explain it by referring it to its socio-historical context. The contention that behavior cannot be studied in isolation from its historical context or as an expression of individual history is supported by this study. The relations between individuals and the seemingly "natural" components of their behavior can be understood in a more profound way when we study the material conditions under which people live. Both "natural" and "situational" explanations of behavior appear limited if we are to understand the relationship between man and his social environment. The "situational" approach while recognizing the importance of the context in which behavior occurs, does not study the historical development and determination of the context itself. This brings us to recognizing the need

and the value of an interdisciplinary approach to the study of behavior. Sociology, political science, anthropology, history and economics should not be visualized as mere complements to an understanding of behavior. Rather, they interact to provide an integrated picture of man in the world. Psychology cannot negate its own socio-historical determination and that of its scholars. It can only understand itself and its object of study as a complex political, economic and ideological product. In this sense the more recent emphasis on the sociology of knowledge should provide us with some of these insights.

One of the realizations that come quickly within this perspective, and from our study particularly, is the notion that individuals in a society, in our case women, cannot be studied as a homogeneous group even when they share a master role--sex role. In our case, we understand that the problems we address become obfuscated unless women themselves are seen in their class context. It is not merely that women who belong to different classes are different. That fact is often recognized in the absence of a theoretical framework to explain it. It entails a more profound understanding of the nature and development of classes, and the antagonistic nature of classes in capitalist societies. This analysis does not propose class as the sole explanatory variable of individual differences. It recognizes

the complexity of human behavior while insisting that one be aware of the importance of material conditions of existence in a particular historical moment. It emphasizes the material base of individual and collective consciousness as well as the role of the individual in the modification of that consciousness. In this sense a psychological study of behavior illuminates the study of man in his political economic scientific and artistic endeavors.

This study represents a limited effort in that direction. Future research in this area can be designed to include the husbands' perception of his relationship with the wife. In addition, it may be important to consider the relationship of the wife to other women in the household and the extent to which she validates her perception of the male-female relationship with other women. We have addressed mainly the problem in the context of a nuclear family. The study of the extended family may provide insights into a wider network of support among women which may sustain and modify the husband-wife relationship.

In a more general way, it is our intention here to add information as to the problem of female assertiveness. It is sometimes the case that the model of assertive behavior which is operant and deemed desirable is restricted to what we could

call masculine assertiveness. When women are advised to behave in a more assertive way, they are often offered a model of assertiveness which coincides with normative expectations of assertiveness for males. The model emphasizes aggressiveness, straightforwardness, a strong will, the exercise of authority and generally the use of confrontation strategies.

We have discussed the limitations of this model for women. While it is structurally difficult for women to engage in the more masculine style of assertiveness, we are not proposing as an alternative that psychologists should reinforce manipulative behavior by women. Nevertheless, we are expressing a concern for the lack of understanding of the woman's needs and limitations in the area of assertive behavior. Perhaps, we could formulate a new model which would not be an imposition from the masculine model nor a reinforcement of manipulative behaviors. However, in order that this model may not represent another adjustment to non-egalitarian relationships, sexual equality must be a prerequisite.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW FORMAT

Entrevista número: _____

Nombre del entrevistador: _____

Hora en que comienza la entrevista: _____

Hora en que termina la entrevista: _____

Fecha: _____

Nombre del entrevistado: _____

Dirección: _____

Teléfono: _____

Estado Civil: _____

CL _____

TM _____

OC _____

EDU. _____

EDA. _____

1. De donde es Ud.? Donde nació? Indique barriada.

2. En que año? _____
3. Cuántos hijos tiene? _____
4. De que edades? _____
5. Se crió Ud. en el mismo sitio que nació? Si no, donde vivió durante el mayor tiempo? Indique barriada.

6. A que se dedicaba principalmente la gente de ese pueblo o ciudad? (Averigue si la persona se crió en el campo o en la ciudad). Es decir, sus padres y la gente alrededor de donde Ud. vivia, en que trabajaban? (Si a la agricultura, que cultivaban? Si a la industria, cuáles?)

7. Y sus padres, de donde eran? Indique pueblo, campo, barriada. Se criaron allí mismo? (Apunte la información de acuerdo a donde se criaron principalmente).
Padre: _____
Madre: _____
8. Recuerda Ud. a que se dedicaban principalmente la gente en el pueblo de su padre? De su madre? (Si a la agricultura, que cultivos? Si a la industria, cuáles?)
Padre: _____
Madre: _____
9. Cuántos años lleva de casada? _____
10. Estuvo casada antes o es este el único matrimonio? (Si estuvo casada antes, cual fue la causa de la separación?)

11. Ha pensado Ud. alguna vez en los problemas que confrontan las familias puertorriqueñas de hoy? Es decir, sus preocupaciones, sus problemas principales? Qué diría Ud.?
-
-

12. Específicamente hablando de la mujer dentro de la familia, cuáles diría Ud. que son los problemas de la mujer dentro de la familia? Es decir, sus preocupaciones y problemas principales?
-
-

13. Si yo le preguntara cual es su opinión acerca de como son la mayor parte de los hombres puertorriqueños, qué diría Ud.? Es decir, cual es su manera de ser? (Es posible que haya que formular la pregunta varias veces enfatizando no como debían ser sino como son). En la experiencia suya, como son los hombres en general?
-
-

14. Y de las mujeres, qué diría Ud. acerca de como son las mujeres puertorriqueñas?Cuál es su manera de ser?
-

15. Yo quisiera saber su opinión acerca de la sexualidad o la conducta sexual de los hombres. Como expresan su sexualidad? En comparación con las mujeres, como son iguales o diferentes? Cuan fuerte es la sexualidad.
-
-

16. Cómo visualiza la gente, la mayoría de la gente al hombre puertorriqueño y su manera de ser? Cuáles son los comentarios que se oyen acerca del hombre?
-
-
17. Cómo ven al hombre como miembro de la familia? Es decir, su participación en los asuntos de la familia? Cuánto se interesa él en la vida de la familia? Cuánto contribuye? Cuando digo miembro de la familia, me refiero al hombre en su papel de esposo, hijo o padre. Qué cosas son esenciales para él como miembro de la familia?
-
-
18. Cómo visualiza la gente a la mujer puertorriqueña y su manera de ser? Cuáles son los comentarios que se oyen acerca de las mujeres en general? (Si la persona contesta que algunos dicen unas cosas y otros otras, pregunte cuál es la opinión o comentario más común, que más prevalece.
-
-
19. Cómo se visualiza a la mujer como miembro de la familia? Es decir, en su rol y su participación e interés en los asuntos de la familia? Qué cosas son esenciales para ella como parte de la familia?
-
-
20. Cómo visualizan a la mujer los hombres en general? Los hombres que Ud. conoce, familiares, amigos, como visualizan a la mujer? Qué piensan de ella?
-

21. Quien cree Ud. que lleva el peso de las responsabilidades en la familia? Por el peso quiero decir, la persona que está encargada de hacer las cosas, de hacer decisiones.
-
22. Qué opinión cree Ud. que tienen las mujeres acerca de los hombres? Por ejemplo, cuando las mujeres están solas entre sí, que cosas dicen acerca de los hombres y de su relación con ellos? (Si la persona dice que algunas dicen unas cosas y otras otras, pregunte cual es el comentario u opinión más común, lo que prevalece). Aclare que son las mujeres en general, sus amigas, familiares y conocidas.
-
23. Quien tiende a tener mas influencia (y por influencia quiero decir, que logra tener más control, que es más persuasiva, que logra convencer) en las decisiones que se toman en la familia, el marido o la mujer? Por qué es esto así? (Explique que aun cuando al fin y al cabo los dos decidan, siempre hay alguien que tiene más influencia en el proceso de hacer la decisión).
-
24. Como diría Ud. que la mujer hace sentir su influencia en los asuntos y decisiones de la familia? (Añada que hay maneras directas e indirectas de una ejercer influencia. Directa, cuando se plantean las cosas directamente y cada uno dice lo que quiere y piensa. Indirecta, cuando uno busca distintas formas de convencer la persona sin necesariamente plantear abiertamente sus ideas y deseos. Si la persona ha contestado antes que el esposo es el que tiene la influencia, añada: pero aún así tenemos que reconocer que la mujer tiene influencia. Como la hace sentir ella? (Aclare: las mujeres en general, sus amigas, familias, las mujeres que Ud. conoce).

-
-
25. Si una mujer quiere ir a visitar a alguien y su esposo no quiere, como lo convence ella para que el vaya? Como hace ella sentir su influencia?
-
-

26. En su casa de pequeña, recuerda usted qué cosas decía su mamá acerca de los hombres y cómo hay que tratarlos? Por ejemplo, como lograr convencerlos de algo, qué estilos usar para bregar con ellos? (Si dice que su mamá no mencionaba eso, pregunte si las amigas en la escuela hablaban de eso. Por ejemplo, cuando querían convencer al novio de algo).
-
-

Si la persona no recuerda a nadie hablando de esas cosas pero usa algún tipo de conducta especial para bregar con el esposo, pregunte como lo aprendió.

27. Como ejercía su padre la autoridad o la influencia en la familia? Como lograba el que se hiciera su voluntad?
-
-

28. Como la ejercía su madre? Si menciona el uso de estilos especiales, pregunte porque no se le podía pedir o hacer directamente?
-
-

29. ¿En qué áreas del funcionamiento de la familia tenía su madre más influencia? Por ejemplo:

En cuanto a en qué y cómo se gastaba el dinero

En cuanto a la escuela y el trabajo de los hijos

En cuanto a qué amigos tener en la familia

En cuanto a qué familiares ver y visitar con más frecuencia

En cuanto a la vivienda, a dónde mudarse, muebles, etc.

30. ¿Cómo se hacían las decisiones en su casa en general?
-
-

31. Recuerda Ud. quién finalmente decidía sobre:

El dinero y cómo se gastaba

En cuanto a la escuela y el trabajo de los hijos

En cuanto a quiénes eran los amigos de la familia

En cuanto a qué familiares ver y visitar

En cuanto a dónde se escogía para vivir, los muebles, etc.

32. ¿Cómo se llega a decisiones usualmente en su familia? En general, cómo llega Ud. a decisiones con su esposo?
-
-

33. ¿Cuánta influencia tiene Ud. sobre su esposo? ¿Como Ud. logra tener esa influencia? ¿Cómo logra Ud. que él acepte sus ideas? ¿Qué estilos usa Ud.?
-
-

34. ¿Cuánta influencia tiene su esposo sobre Ud.? ¿Cómo él logra tener esa influencia? ¿Cómo el logra que Ud. acepte sus ideas? ¿Qué estilos usa?
-
-

35. ¿Cree Ud. que parte de eso que se llama "ser una buena mujer" es el poder hacer que el esposo acepte o haga lo que uno quiere de ciertas maneras indirectas (que pudieramos llamar manipulativas) sin que ni el mismo se dé cuenta?
-
-

36. ¿Cuán bueno o deseable cree Ud. que es el usar esas estrategias o técnicas que pudiéramos llamar indirectas y manipulativas?
-

37. ¿Cree Ud. que las mujeres en general son calculadoras y manipuladoras con los hombres? En particular me refiero a la mujer puertorriqueña.

38. ¿Son todas las mujeres las que son así, son algunas o son la mayoría?

Algunas_____ Todas_____ La mayoría_____

39. ¿De qué maneras manipulan las mujeres a los hombres?
¿Qué técnicas, estrategias y estilos usan más a menudo?

40. ¿Diría Ud. que en ocasiones manipula Ud. a su marido?
¿Con cuánta frecuencia?

41. ¿En qué ocasiones tiende a hacerlo más?

42. ¿Para qué cosas tiende a hacerlos más? Por ejemplo:

En cuanto a cosas relacionadas a cómo y en qué se gasta el dinero

En cuanto a la escuela de los hijos _____

En cuanto a las actividades de los hijos _____

En cuanto a qué amigos tener y a quién invitar o visitar

En cuanto a qué familiares ver con más frecuencia

En cuanto a la compra de ropa, muebles, _____

En cuanto a dónde salir _____

En cuanto a dónde vivir _____

En qué otras áreas diría Ud. que usa esas estrategias?

43. ¿Qué mujeres en la sociedad puertorriqueña cree Ud. que son más manipuladoras? Por ejemplo:

Las mujeres de la clase podre o las mujeres de clase media? Porqué?

Las mujeres educadas o las que tienen poca educación? Por qué?

Las mujeres que trabajan fuera o las que se quedan en la casa? Por qué?

44. ¿Diría Ud. que los hombres manipulan a las mujeres? Es decir, son ellos en general manipuladores y calculadores con las mujeres? Igual de mucho o menos de lo que las mujeres manipulan a los hombres? ¿Son ellos más directos?
-
-

45. ¿De qué maneras manipulan los hombres a las mujeres?
¿Qué técnicas y estilos usan? ¿Igual que las de las mujeres?

46. ¿Diría Ud. que en ocasiones su marido la manipula a Ud.
¿Con cuánta frecuencia diría Ud. que eso pasa?

47. ¿En qué ocasiones tiende a hacerlos más?

48. ¿Para qué cosas tiende a hacerlos más?

En cuanto a cosas relacionadas a cómo y en qué se gasta el dinero

En cuanto a salidas (cuando el quiere ir a algún sitio)

En cuanto a la escuela de los hijos _____

En cuanto a las actividades de los hijos _____

En cuanto a qué amigos tener, a quién visitar e invitar

En cuanto a qué familiares ver con más frecuencia

En cuanto a la compra de ropa, muebles, etc.

En cuanto a dónde salir _____

En cuanto a dónde vivir _____

En qué otras áreas diría Ud. que el tiende a usar esos estilos indirectos manipulativos?

-
49. ¿Qué hombres dentro de la sociedad puertorriqueña pensaría Ud. que tienden a usar estos estilos y a ser manipuladores? Por ejemplo:

Los hombres de la clase pobre o los de clase media?
Por qué?

Los hombres educados o los que tienen poca educación?
Por qué?

-
50. ¿Qué cosas Ud. cree que deben o se deben cambiar en las relaciones entre el hombre y la mujer? Si pensáramos en el futuro, qué tipo de cambios y en qué cosas, habría que hacer para que hubiera mayor comprensión y mejores relaciones? ¿Qué cosas te molestan o te han molestado a tí y que se deban cambiar?

51. ¿Qué cambios sugerirían en el matrimonio en particular para que éste mejorara?

52. ¿Piensa Ud. que los papeles de marido y mujer han cambiado en la sociedad puertorriqueña? Es decir, en comparación como eran antes y como son ahora?

¿Cómo han cambiado los papeles de esposo?

53. ¿Cómo han cambiado los papeles de la mujer?

Entrevistador: Debido a que hay cierta repetición en las preguntas que siguen, debe explicar que le va a hacer preguntas en cuanto a aspectos específicos del funcionamiento de la familia.

54. ¿Quién cree Ud. que tiene más influencia en las decisiones que Uds. (Lea las categorías)

_____ él tiene más influencia

_____ él tiene un poco más de influencia

_____ los dos decidimos por igual

_____ Ud. tiene un poco más de influencia

_____ Ud. tiene más influencia

Las actividades de una pareja a menudo demuestran sus gustos e intereses. En algunas áreas de la vida familiar el esposo o la esposa puede tener más influencia el uno en el otro. Es decir, en algunas cosas él tiene más influencia (aún cuando al fin y al cabo la decisión la tomen ambos al final) y ella en otras. Para cada una de las siguientes áreas circule el número que indica quién tiene más influencia usualmente en cada una de las áreas. Los números van del 1 al 9. El uno indica que Ud. tiene más influencia en esa área, los números del centro significan que más o menos los dos tienen igual influencia y el 9 significa que él tiene mucha más influencia.

	YO TENGO MAS INFLUENCIA			LOS DOS TENE- MOS IGUAL INFLUENCIA			EL TIENE MAS INFLUENCIA		
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
55. Actividades recreativas como pasan el tiempo juntos, a dónde van y qué cosas hacen juntos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
56. Conversación de qué hablan, de qué no se habla cuando están juntos	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

	YO TENGO MAS INFLUENCIA			LOS DOS TENE- MOS IGUAL INFLUENCIA			EL TIENE MAS INFLUENCIA		
57. Actividades sexuales: el tipo y frecuencia en la actividad sexual en su relación	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
58. Actividades con otros (amigos y familia) con qué amigos y familiares se pasa tiempo y cuánto tiempo. Con qué amigos se sale o se hacen cosas	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
59. En cuanto a los hijos: disciplina, salidas, dinero, escuela	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
60. En cuanto al dinero de la casa: cuánto se gasta y en qué	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

EN LOS CASOS QUE LE VOY A PRESENTAR SE TRATA DE UN MARIDO Y LA MUJER Y COMO ELLOS DECIDEN LO QUE VAN A HACER EN CUANTO A UNA SITUACION O PROBLEMA ESPECIFICO. LO QUE YO QUIERO ES QUE UD. ME DIGA COMO SE RESOLVERIA FINALMENTE LA SITUACION. QUE UD. SE INVENTE QUE ES LO PROXIMO QUE VA A PASAR Y COMO TERMINARA EL ASUNTO.

Caso #1

61. Eduardo y Eugenia tienen un fin de semana libre. Los niños van a ser cuidados por una tía así que no tienen esa preocupación. Eduardo quiere ir a pasar esos días con unos parientes de él, pero Eugenia desea pasarlos con la familia de ella. ¿Qué Ud. cree que va a pasar? ¿Quién convence a quién y cómo?

Caso #2

62. Enrique y Josefina piensan mudarse a una nueva casa. Enrique prefiere una casa lejos de la ciudad, los ruidos, el polvo etc. Sin embargo Josefina desea una casa en la ciudad cerca de las tiendas, supermercados y otros lugares. ¿Cómo cree Ud. que se va a resolver la situación? ¿Quién convence a quien y cómo?

63. Piense en su matrimonio así como es ahora. ¿Le gustaría a Ud. que continuara igual, que cambiara en parte, o que cambiara totalmente?
- | | | |
|----|---------------------|----|
| a. | Continúe igual | 01 |
| b. | Cambiara un poco | 02 |
| c. | Cambiara totalmente | 03 |
64. ¿Cuán a menudo se siente Ud. incómoda e insatisfecha con su esposo?
- | | | |
|----|--------------|----|
| a. | Muy a menudo | 01 |
| b. | A menudo | 02 |
| c. | A veces | 03 |
| d. | Casi nunca | 04 |
| e. | Nunca | 05 |
65. ¿Cuán a menudo le dá a Ud. por pensar que su marido no la quiere de veras?
- | | | |
|----|--------------|----|
| a. | Muy a menudo | 01 |
| b. | A menudo | 02 |
| c. | A veces | 03 |
| d. | Casi nunca | 04 |
| e. | Nunca | 05 |
66. ¿Cuán a menudo le da a Ud. por pensar que no quiere a su marido de veras?
- | | | |
|----|--------------|----|
| a. | Muy a menudo | 01 |
| b. | A menudo | 02 |
| c. | A veces | 03 |
| d. | Casi nunca | 04 |
| e. | Nunca | 05 |
67. En general, cuán satisfecha se siente Ud. con su matrimonio?
- | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|----|
| a. | Muy satisfecha | 01 |
| b. | Satisfecha | 02 |
| c. | Ni satisfecha, ni insatisfecha | 03 |
| d. | Algo insatisfecha | 04 |
| e. | Insatisfecha | 05 |

68. En general, cuán satisfecho cree Ud. que está su esposo con su matrimonio?

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| a. Muy satisfecho | 01 |
| b. Satisfecho | 02 |
| c. Ni satisfecho, ni insatisfecho | 03 |
| d. algo insatisfecho | |
| e. Muy insatisfecho | |

69. Tomando Ud. todas las cosas en cuenta, diría Ud. que su matrimonio es:

- | | |
|-------------------------|----|
| a. Muy feliz | 01 |
| b. Feliz | 02 |
| c. Ni feliz, ni infeliz | 03 |
| d. Infeliz | 04 |
| e. Muy infeliz | 05 |

Al entrevistador: Deberá indicarle al entrevistado que a continuación se le harán una serie de preguntas en cuanto a su trabajo, ingreso, educación, etc. y que esta información será estrictamente confidencial. Deberá añadir que aunque muchas personas se incomodan de que se le pregunten estas cosas, en realidad en nuestro caso sirven sencillamente para obtener una imagen más clara de la familia.

70. ¿A qué se dedica Ud. actualmente? (si menciona alguna ocupación, obtenga más detalles en cuanto al trabajo que desempeña)

SI TIENE NEGOCIO PROPIO:

71. ¿Qué clase de negocio? _____

72. ¿Cuánto dinero hace el negocio mensualmente (o anualmente según sea más fácil recordar)?

73. ¿Cuántas personas emplea el negocio? (Incluya familiares con y sin paga)

74. ¿A qué se dedica su esposo? (si menciona alguna ocupación, obtenga detalles en cuanto a la naturaleza del trabajo que desempeña)

SI TIENE NEGOCIO PROPIO:

75. ¿Qué clase de negocio es? _____

76. ¿Cuánto dinero hace el negocio mensualmente (o anualmente)?

77. ¿Cuántas personas emplea el negocio (incluya familiares con o sin paga)?

78. ¿Cuál fue el último grado escolar (o universitario) que Ud. estudio? Completados.

01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 11 12 13 14

15 16 17

79. ¿Cuál fue el último grado escolar (o universitario) que su esposo estudió? Completados

80. Posee Ud. o su esposo alguna propiedad?

81. Si posee casas: Cuántas? _____

Alquiladas? _____

82. Si posee edificios: Cuán grandes? _____

83. Si posee terrenos: Cuántas acres o cuerdas? _____

Los cultiva? _____

Qué cultiva y cuánto del terreno cultiva?

Quien trabaja la tierra? (incluya familiares con y sin paga)

84. ¿Cuál diría Ud. es el ingreso mensual de la familia? (contando con todas las personas que contribuyen económicamente. Si la persona no le puede dar una cifra exacta proveale categorías, Menos de 200 mensuales, Entre 200 - 400, entre 400 - 600, entre 600 - 800, entre 800 - 1000, más de 1000).

85. ¿A qué se dedicaba su padre principalmente? (si menciona ocupación obtenga detalles sobre la naturaleza del trabajo)

SI POSEE NEGOCIO PROPIO:

86. ¿Qué clase de negocio era?

87. ¿Cuán grande era? Cuánto dinero hacia? _____

88. ¿Cuántos empleados tenía? (incluyendo familiares con y sin paga)

89. ¿A qué se dedicaba su madre principalmente?

SI TENIA NEGOCIO PROPIO:

90. ¿Qué clase de negocio era? Cuán grande? _____

91. ¿Cuánto dinero hacia?

92. ¿Cuántos empleados tenía? (incluyendo familiares con y sin paga)

93. ¿Tenían sus padres propiedades?

94. Si posee casas: Cuántas? _____

Las alquila? Por cuánto? _____

95. Si posee edificios: Cuan grandes? Los alquila? Cuántos empleados?

96. Si posee terrenos: ¿Cuántos acres o cuerdas?

Los cultiva? ¿Qué productos? _____

Cuántos acres o cuerdas dedica al cultiva _____

Quién trabaja la tierra? (incluya familiares con y sin paga)

97. ¿Recuerda Ud. aproximadamente qué ingreso había en su casa mensualmente? (contando todas las personas que contribuían económicamente)

OBSERVACIONES DEL ENTREVISTADOR: LLENE ESTA PARTE UNA VEZ TERMINADA LA ENTREVISTA Y DESPUES DE HABER DEJADO LA CASA DEL ENTREVISTADO.

98. En cuanto al entrevistado:

-no mostraba interés en la entrevista	01
-tenía un poco de interés	02
-demostraba tener interés	03
-el interés variaba dependiendo de las preguntas	04

99. Nivel de tensión del entrevistado:

- nervioso, intranquilo 01
- nerviosidad esporádica 02
- mayormente relajado 03

Si la nerviosidad era esporádica especifique en qué partes de la entrevista era más evidente.

100. El entrevistado:

- estaba hostil hacia el entrevistador 01
- tenía una actitud de sospecha 02
- amigable 03
- extremadamente amigable 04
- la actitud variaba con la parte o pregunta en la entrevista 05

101. Privacidad durante la entrevista:

- no había nadie más en los alrededores
- niños pequeños en los alrededores
- niños mayores y/o adultos que podían oír
- hombres adultos

102. Interrupciones durante la entrevista:

- llamadas por teléfono
- visitas
- niños demandando atención
- otros

103. ¿Hubo alguna pregunta/s que fuera especialmente difícil de contestar para el entrevistado?

Sí ----- 01

No ----- 02

Si sí, qué preguntas?

APPENDIX B

INVENTORY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN AND WOMEN

INVENTORY OF ATTITUDES TOWARD MEN AND WOMEN

This inventory is made up of a number of statements which describe attitudes and beliefs that different people have regarding the role of men and women in society. There are no "right" and "wrong" answers because each of us has the right to our own views.

After each statement, the following list of possible answers will appear:

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

Read each statement and indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree by circling the ONE answer among this list that best describes how you feel with regard to the statement.

You should circle STRONGLY AGREE if you feel that the statement is definitely characteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

You should circle MODERATELY AGREE if you feel that the statement is moderately characteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

You should circle SLIGHTLY AGREE if you feel that the statement is only slightly characteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

You should circle SLIGHTLY DISAGREE if you feel that the statement is only slightly uncharacteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

You should circle MODERATELY DISAGREE if you feel that the statement is moderately uncharacteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

You should circle STRONGLY DISAGREE if you feel that the statement is strongly uncharacteristic of your beliefs or attitudes.

ANSWER EVERY STATEMENT, even if you are not completely sure of your answers.

1. It is fair to expect a man who works to do household chores.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

2. In general, men are more intelligent than women.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

3. Success as a mother is the true measure of a women's femininity.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

4. A woman could serve just as effectively as President of the United States as can a man.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

5. If there must be a national draft, women should be drafted as well as men.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

6. I think it is acceptable for a woman to accompany a man to his apartment even at night.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

7. Women naturally are more interested in taking care of a home than are men.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

8. Women can be fulfilled without ever marrying.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

9. In situations where both the husband and the wife are employed, the wife still should take responsibility for cooking and meal planning.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
10. The job of raising children should not be left to men because they lack the maternal instinct.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
11. Care of the home is primarily a woman's responsibility.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
12. There is nothing wrong with giving a boy dolls to play with.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
13. There are good reasons why men should have more freedom, status, and power than women.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
14. Primary responsibility for taking care of the children need not rest with the mother if she has a job.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
15. It is neither more nor less important for a woman to remain a virgin than it is for a man to do so.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
16. It is perfectly alright for a man to allow a woman to pay a taxi, buy tickets, or pay a check.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|

17. Some occupations contain too much emotional stress to be adequately handled by women.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

18. A woman may have a completely satisfying and fulfilling life without bearing children.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

19. The woman's traditional role of wife and mother is an unnatural confinement of her energies and vision.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

20. Women seem to be inherently less capable than men of logical and scientific thinking.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

21. On the whole, children of working mothers are as well-adjusted as children of nonworking mothers are.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

22. Repairs in the home are the responsibility of the husband.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

23. When a man and a woman are found to have identical credentials for hiring or promotion, the man should get the position.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

24. Women are less capable of making decisions and then sticking to them than are men.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
25. Women are just as rational as men.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
26. A woman's proper place is in the home.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
27. In the event of an emergency at home, the mother should be the first one to leave work to attend to it.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
28. Men make better leaders than women.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
29. Mothers who work are not devoting enough effort to their primary responsibility, their family.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
30. Sex before marriage is no better or worse an idea for men than for women.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
31. Women are as capable of controlling their emotions as are men.
- | | | | | | |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Strongly Agree | Moderately Agree | Slightly Agree | Slightly Disagree | Moderately Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|

32. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

33. A woman should not be required to change her name when she gets married.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

34. It is ~~all~~right for a woman to ask a man for a date.

Strongly Agree	Moderately Agree	Slightly Agree	Slightly Disagree	Moderately Disagree	Strongly Disagree
-------------------	---------------------	-------------------	----------------------	------------------------	----------------------

Este inventario está compuesto de una serie de declaraciones que describen las actitudes y creencias que tienen diferentes personas sobre el papel que juegan las mujeres y los hombres en la sociedad. Sus contestaciones no se juzgarán como correctas o incorrectas sino como descriptivas de su opinión personal a la cual tiene perfecto derecho.

Después de cada declaración aparecerá la siguiente lista de opciones para que usted escoja una:

- _____ 1) Completamente de acuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración verdadera y completamente describe sus actitudes y creencias.
- _____ 2) Bastante de acuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración describe sus creencias y actitudes con bastante fidelidad pero no completamente.
- _____ 3) Levemente de acuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración describe sus creencias y actitudes en algo pero de una manera incompleta.
- _____ 4) Levemente en desacuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración describe unas actitudes y creencias en algo contrarias a las suyas pero de una manera incompleta.
- _____ 5) Bastante en desacuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración describe unas creencias y actitudes bastante contrarias a las suyas pero no completamente.
- _____ 6) Completamente en desacuerdo: indique esta contestación si la declaración describe unas creencias y actitudes completa y claramente contrarias a las suyas.

Lea cada una de las declaraciones y escoja la contestación que mejor describa lo que usted piensa de cada una de ellas. Escoja una contestación para cada una de las declaraciones aunque no este completamente seguro de su contestación.

1. Es justo pedirle a un hombre que trabaja que ayude con las tareas de la casa.
 - a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

2. El éxito de la mujer como madre es la mejor medida de cuán buena mujer es.
 - a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

3. La mujer, por su naturaleza, está más interesada en las cosas de la casa que el hombre.
 - a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

4. Una mujer puede sentirse feliz y que vive una vida plena aunque nunca se case.
 - a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

5. Aún cuando tanto la mujer como el marido trabajen fuera es a la mujer a quien le toca estar encargada de la cocina.
 - a. Completamente de acuerdo

- b. Bastante de acuerdo
 c. Levemente de acuerdo
 d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 f. Completamente en desacuerdo
6. No hay nada malo en regalarle muñecas a los niños varones.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 b. Bastante de acuerdo
 c. Levemente de acuerdo
 d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 f. Completamente en desacuerdo
7. El hombre siempre debe tener más libertad, poder y privilegios que la mujer.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 b. Bastante de acuerdo
 c. Levemente de acuerdo
 d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 f. Completamente en desacuerdo
8. La mujer, si trabaja afuera, no debe tener que estar encargada de ocuparse de los niños ella sola.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 b. Bastante de acuerdo
 c. Levemente de acuerdo
 d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 f. Completamente en desacuerdo
9. Las mujeres no tienen que guardar su virginidad más de lo que cuidan su virginidad los hombres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 b. Bastante de acuerdo
 c. Levemente de acuerdo
 d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 f. Completamente en desacuerdo

10. En general, los hijos de madres que trabajan fuera de la casa son tan normales como los hijos de madres que se quedan en la casa.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
11. Las mujeres son más indecisas e inestables en sus decisiones que los hombres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
12. Algunas ocupaciones provocan una cantidad de tensión emocional tan grande que no se le pueden dar a las mujeres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
13. Una mujer puede vivir una vida feliz y plena aún cuando no tenga hijos.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

14. Es bueno que haya cierta cantidad de igualdad entre el hombre y la mujer pero al fin y al cabo debe ser el hombre el que decida.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
15. Tener relaciones sexuales antes del matrimonio es tan correcto o incorrecto para los hombres como para las mujeres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
16. El lugar de la mujer es en la casa.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - e. Completamente en desacuerdo
 - f. Levemente en desacuerdo
17. Las madres que trabajan no le dedican todo el tiempo que debieran a aquello que es su principal responsabilidad, es decir, su familia.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

18. Los hombres tienen más liderato que las mujeres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
19. Las mujeres deben poder invitar a salir a los hombres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo
20. Las mujeres pueden controlar sus emociones tan bien como los hombres.
- a. Completamente de acuerdo
 - b. Bastante de acuerdo
 - c. Levemente de acuerdo
 - d. Levemente en desacuerdo
 - e. Bastante en desacuerdo
 - f. Completamente en desacuerdo

APPENDIX C

RUBINS' INFLUENCE DISTRIBUTION SCALE

RUBINS' INFLUENCE DISTRIBUTION SCALE

(Complete if you are NO LONGER dating or going with (____))

The activities of a couple often reflect the interests and preference of both members. But in any particular area, one member may have more influence than the other. For each of the areas listed below, circle the number which indicates how much of a say you and (____) generally had in determining each kind of activity. Your answers should refer to the time when you and (____) were still dating or going together.

I HAD MUCH MORE SAY	WE HAD EXACTLY EQUAL SAY	(____) HAD MUCH MORE SAY

1. Recreational activities --
how you spent your free time together, where you went and what you did together.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

2. Conversational activities --
what you talked about and didn't talk about when you were together

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

3. Sexual activities --
the type and frequency of sexual activity in your relationship.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

I HAD MUCH MORE SAY WE HAD EXACTLY EQUAL SAY () HAD MUCH MORE SAY

4. Activities with others --

which other people (friends, family, etc.) you as a couple spent time with and did things with.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

5. Time --

how much time you and () spent together, when and for how long you saw each other.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

APPENDIX D

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

1. How often do you feel uncomfortable with your (wife/husband) -- would you say very often, fairly often, sometimes, almost never, or never?

Very often 1 08/
Fairly often 2
Sometimes 3
Almost never 4
Never 5

2. Do you feel affectionate towards your (husband/wife) (READ CATEGORIES)

Very often 1 10/
Fairly often 2
Sometimes 3
Almost never, or 4
Never 5

3. How often does the thought come to your mind that your (husband/wife) doesn't really love you, would you say (READ CATEGORIES)

Very often 1 11/
Fairly often 2
Sometimes 3

Almost never, or 4

Never 5

4. In general, how satisfied are you with your marriage, would you say you are (READ CATEGORIES)

Very satisfied 1 21/

Somewhat satisfied ... 2

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied 3

Somewhat dissatisfied 4

Or, very dissatisfied 5

5. In general, how satisfied is your (husband/wife) with your marriage, would you say (READ CATEGORIES)

Very satisfied 1 22/

Somewhat satisfied ... 2

Neither satisfied nor
dissatisfied 3

Somewhat dissatisfied 4

Or, very dissatisfied 5

6. All things considered, would you say your marriage is (READ CATEGORIES)

A very happy one 1 23/

A fairly happy one ... 2

Neither happy nor un-
happy (ASK A) 3

Fairly unhappy (ASK A) 4

Or very unhappy (ASK A) 5

APPENDIX E

CODING BOOK

CODING BOOK

Columns

1 Card Number

2,3 Case Number

Social Class

1. Industrial Proletariat

2. Non-Industrial proletariat

3. Salaried Non-proletariat

4. Petite Bourgeoisie

5. Professional

Categories 1 through 3 equal 1 working class

Categories 4 and 5 equal 2 Middle Strata

5 Status ocupacional de la mujer / women's occupational status

1 equals working status

0 equals non-working status

6 Income

1. Less than 200 dollars monthly

2. 200-400

3. 400-600

4. 600-800

Columns

- 5. 800-1000
 - 6. 1000-1200
 - 7. 1200-1500
 - 8. over 1500
 - 9. missing data
- 7,8 (Q77) 5 Wife's completed school years
- 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11
 - 12 13 14 15 16 17 and over
- 9,10 (Q78) 6 Husbands' completed school years
- 01 02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10 11
 - 12 13 14 15 16 17 and over
- 11,12 (Q11) 7 Wife's Age (in years)
- 13 8 What are the main problems confronted by today's Puerto Rican family?
- 1. The children
 - a. drugs
 - b. education
 - 2. Marital Adjustment
 - a. communication between partners
 - b. sexual adjustment
 - c. lack of determination to make each other happy
 - 3. The existence of double standards of behavior for the husband and wife
 - 4. Financial problems

Columns

5. Lack of religious convictions and moral support
 - a. lack of "spirituality"
 6. Change in sex roles
 - a. lack of definition of sex roles
 - b. no respect for the traditional sexual roles
 7. Family disarray, because of the woman's need to take an outside job
 8. Missing data
- 14, (Q12) 9. Specifically talking about the woman in the context of the family: Which would you say are the major problems she confronts?
0. Problems with the husband
 - a. his lack of responsibility
 - b. loneliness
 - c. lack of communication
 - d. lack of recognition and stimulation
 - e. fear of expressing her viewpoints
 1. Problems with the children
 - a. worry about their welfare
 - b. worry about their education
 - c. worry about their getting "into trouble"
 2. Financial troubles
 3. Too many responsibilities in the home
 4. Having to work outside
 5. The existence of double standards of behavior for the husband and wife
 6. Birth Control
 7. Lack of Day Care Centers

Columns

8. Having to maintain good relationship among the members of the family. Maintaining familial harmony

9. Missing data

15-30 What is your opinion about how most Puerto Rican men are?

15	machistas	negatively	valued
16	inmature	negatively	valued
17	insecure	negatively	valued
18	selfish	negatively	valued
19	not understanding	negatively	valued
20	good fathers and husbands	positively	valued
21	cumplidores, responsables	positively	valued
22	tranquilos	positively	valued
23	good providers	positively	valued
24	indifferent to the family	negatively	valued
25	dominant	negatively	valued
26	irrespectful	negatively	valued
27	conceited (think superior)	negatively	valued
28	sinverguenza	negatively	valued
29	dependent	negatively	valued
30	prejudiced against woman	negatively	valued

31-49 What is your opinion about how most Puerto Rican women are?

31	sumisas, sometida	positively	valued
32	abnegadas	positively	valued
33	sufridas	positively	valued
34	maduras	positively	valued
35	"de la casa"	positively	valued
36	dócil	positively	valued
37	buena madre	positively	valued
38	serias	positively	valued
39	decentes	positively	valued
40	con deseos de superación	positively	valued
41	provocativas	negatively	valued
42	trabajadora	positively	valued
43	comprensiva	positively	valued
44	poco agresiva	negatively	valued

Columns

	45	responsable	positively valued
	46	discreta, comedida	positively valued
	47	pasiva	negatively valued
	48	dependientes	negatively valued
	49	comodonas	negatively valued
50		What is your opinion about male sexuality (Q15)	
		1. Women are more sexual	
		2. Both males and females have the same needs and drives	
		3. Both males and females can be potentially the same	
		4. The male is more sexual	
		9. missing data	
51		Does the man needs a greater number of sexual relations?	
		1 no 2 yes 9. missing data	
52	If yes	Does this justify that he have extramarital affairs?	
		1 no 2 yes 9. missing data, does not apply	
53		Would you accept it?	
		1 no 2 yes 9. missing data	
54		How would you manage a situation like this one?	
		1. Lo dejaría permanentemente	
		2. Lo dejaría temporeramente	
		3. Esperaría a que se le pasara	
		4. Después que no lo vea, no me importa	
		5. Trataría de reconquistarlo	
		6. Lo aceptaría, el hombre es hombre	
		9. missing data	

Columns

55-73 How do most people see the Puerto Rican man?
What do they think of him?

55	son machistas	neg.	66	callejero	neg.
56	mujeriego	neg.	67	irresponsable,	neg.
57	sexual	neg.		despreocupado	
58	vagos	neg.	68	celoso	neg.
59	viciosos	neg.	69	atrevido	neg.
60	responsable	pos.	70	irrespetuoso	neg.
61	familiar	pos.	71	abusadores	neg.
62	egoísta	neg.	72	orgullosa	neg.
63	inmaduro	neg.	73	déspota	neg.
64	inseguro	neg.			
65	desconsiderado	neg.			

Card #2

4-12 How do most people see him as a member of the family? (Q17)

4. Buen padre y esposo, buen hijo
5. Buen proveedor
6. Responsable, protector, familiar
7. Irresponsable
8. Dependiente
9. Como niños
10. Mal compañero
11. Mal proveedor
12. Mal padre, no cumple

13-34 How do most people see the Puerto Rican woman?
What is she like?

13.	como madre y esposa	positively valued
14.	sumisa	positively valued
15.	abnegada	positively valued
16.	buenas amas de casa	positively valued
17.	responsable	positively valued
18.	madura	positively valued
19.	seria	positively valued
20.	tradicional, anticuada	positively valued
21.	familiar	positively valued
22.	trabajador	positively valued
23.	honestas	positively valued

Columns

24. abusadora	negatively valued
25. esclava	positively valued
26. mártir	positively valued
27. zángana	negatively valued
28. inferior	negatively valued
29. agresiva	negatively valued
30. fuerte	positively valued
31. dinámica	positively valued
32. pasiva	negatively valued
33. dependiente	negatively valued
34. independiente	positively valued

35-39 How do most people see her as a family member?
(Q19)

- 35. como la que tiene las responsabilidades de la cas
- 36. La que lleva la carga del matrimonio
- 37. Tiene las responsabilidades de los familiares
- 38. es más madre que esposa
- 39. logra el bienestar familiar ocultando problemas

40-59 How do men see the woman?

- | | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| 40. dependientes | 50. mandonas, dominantes |
| 41. independientes | 51. regañonas |
| 42. inferiores (como) | 52. "de la casa" |
| 43. como superiores | 53. como una esclava |
| 44. "liberada" | 54. como objeto |
| 45. malas | 55. como compañera |
| 46. andariegas | 56. depende de ella |
| 47. buenas madres y esposas | 57. inseguras |
| 48. manipuladoras | 58. resistentes |
| 49. celosas | 59. dos clases; para salir y para esposa |

60 Who do you think carries the weight of responsibilities in the family?

- 1. El
- 2. Ella
- 3. Ambos

Columns

4. Las decisiones grandes él, las del hogar, ella.
5. Las decisiones económicas el, las del hogar ella.
6. La última palabra la tiene él aunque le pide su opinión.

9. missing data

61-80 What opinion do women have of men? (When they are among themselves?)

61. superiores	positive
62. inmaduros	negative
63. irresponsables	negative
64. buenos padres y esposos	positive
65. mujeriegos y enamorados	negative
66. como niños	negative
67. no quieren ser tiernos	negative
68. despreocupados	negative
69. inseguros	negative
70. dependientes	negative
71. buenos proveedores	positive
72. tienen mala opinión en general	negative
73. abusadores	negative
74. canallas	negative
75. traicioneros	negative
76. necesitan mucha atención	negative
77. dominantes	negative
78. consentidos	negative
79. trabajadores	positive
80. agresivos, violentos, bruscos	negative

1,2,3,4 Who tends to have more influence in the decisions that are taken in the family?

1. la mujer 2. el hombre 3. ambos

9. missing data

5 How would you say the woman makes her influence felt? (Q24a)

1 directly 2 indirectly 3 both ways

9 missing data

Columns

- 6 Specifically how? (modos manipulati) (Q24B)
1. Trata abierto primero, agotando el diálogo si no resulta entonces usa modos indirectos
 2. Directo, nunca usa subterfugios
 3. De modo indirecto para mantener las apariencias de él como jefe y autoridad, para que el no se sienta amenazado
 4. De modo indirecto para mantener las apariencias de autoridad masculina frente a otras personas
 5. De modo indirecto, abiertamente no se consigue nada
 9. missing data
- 7-11 For example, if the woman wants to visit somebody and the husband doesn't want to, How does she convince him to go?
7. Le plantea la cuestión directamente
 8. Con cariñitos y changuerías (this is not indirectly?)
 9. Con humildad (still directly)
 10. Trata de persuadirlo diciéndole que le va a gustar
 11. De modos indirectos
- 12-23 As a child, do you remember what your mother use to say about men and how to deal with them?
12. Hay que respetarlos
 13. Hay que hacerlos sentir que son el jefe
 14. Hay que conocerlos y ajustarse a ellos
 15. Hay que tratarlos con dulzura y cariño, irse a la buena
 16. No ser dominantes
 17. Esperar el momento apropiado para hablarle
 18. Coger las cosas con calma, explicarle con paciencia
 19. Buscarle la vuelta
 20. "Humor him"
 21. Son como niños

Columns

22. Tratarlos de modos indirectos
23. Tratarlos siempre abiertamente
24. How did she learn the "indirect techniques"
(if it was not at home)
1. After marriage, with experience
 2. From other women
 9. Missing data
25. How did your father exercise authority in the family?
1. Abierta y directamente (gritando, dando órdenes, con dulzura...)
 2. De modos indirectos (con engaños)
 3. Entre ambos se decidían las cosas
 4. Usa modos directos e indirectos
 9. Missing data
26. How did your mother exercise authority and influence in the family?
1. Abierta y directamente
 2. De modos indirectos
 3. De ambas formas
 4. Con los hijos abiertamente, con el esposo, indirectamente
 9. Missing data
- 27-31. In which area of family functioning did your mother have more influence?
27. En cuanto en qué y cómo se gastaba el dinero
 28. En cuanto a la escuela y el trabajo de los hijos
 29. En cuanto a qué amigos tener en la familia
 30. En cuanto a qué familiares ver y visitar con más frecuencia
 31. En cuanto a la vivienda, donde mudarse, muebles, etc.

Columns

- 32 How were decisions made in your family?
1. Se discutían entre ambos y se decidía en conjunto
 2. Se hacía lo que el padre decía
 3. Se hacía lo que la madre decía
 4. Se discutía entre ambos pero el tenía la última palabra
 5. Se discutía entre ambos pero ella al fin decidía
9. Missing data
- 33-37 Who finally decided?
33. About money
1. él 2. ella 3. Ambos 9. missing data
34. About school and work (children's)
1. él 2. ella 3. Ambos 9. missing data
35. About which friends to have
1. él 2. ella 3. Ambos 9. missing data
36. About which relatives to see and visit
1. él 2. ella 3. Ambos 9. missing data
37. About where to live, furniture, etc.
1. él 2. ella 3. Ambos 9. missing data
-
-
- 38 How do you usually reach decisions in your family?
1. Se hace lo que él diga
 2. Se discute entre ambos, él tiene la última palabra
 3. Se discute entre ambos y se llega a decisiones conjuntas
 4. Se discute entre ambos pero ella decide al fin y al cabo

Columns

5. Ella hace casi todas las decisiones
 6. Deciden independientemente
 7. Unas veces en común, otras cada uno por su lado pero siempre están de acuerdo
 9. Missing data
- 39 How much influence do you have on your husband?
 (Q33a)
 1. mucha 2. bastante 3. poca 4. ninguna
 9. missing data
- 40 How do you do it? What styles or ways? (Q33b)
 1. Directamente, expone su punto de vista
 2. A la buena, con paciencia, cariño y dulzura
 3. Imponiéndose
 4. Indirectamente, pintándose las cosas más bonitas de lo que son
 5. Indirectamente, haciéndose creer que él es el jefe
 6. Usando modos directos e indirectos
 9. Missing data
- 41 How much influence does your husband have on you?
 (Q34a)
 1. mucha 2. bastante 3. poca 4. ninguna
 9. Missing data
- 42 How does he do it? What styles does he use?
 1. Se sientan a hablar el asunto, directamente
 2. Siendo cariñoso y atento y complaciéndola
 3. Enojándose
 4. Usando persuasión lógica
 5. De ambos indirectos (diciendo que el es el que gana dinero)
 9. Missing data

Columns

- 43 Do you think that part of that which is called "being a good woman" is to make the man do things one wants without him even being aware of it?
1. Si
 2. No
 9. Missing data
- 44 How good and/or desirable is the use of Manipulative strategies? (Q36)
1. Bastante bueno, a la buena todo se consigue
 2. Bueno, porque la mujer debe poder hacer sin que el hombre se sienta dominado, para que no se enojen
 3. Bueno porque se evitan peleas
 4. Malo pero necesario por la posición de inferioridad de la mujer
 5. Malo, implica degradar al hombre y a una misma
 6. Malo, porque manipular es malo
 7. Malo, es rebajarse mucho
 9. Missing data
- 45 Do you think that most Puerto Rican women are calculating and manipulative with the man? (Q37)
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. No sabe
 9. Missing data
- 46 Why? (Q37)
1. Tienen más tiempo para pensar
 2. Por su situación de inferioridad
 3. Porque son así por naturaleza
 4. Son así culturalmente
 9. Missing data
- 47 Are all women like that? (Q38)
1. Some
 2. All
 3. Most of them
 4. Don't know
 9. Missing data

Columns

48-59 In which ways do women manipulate men? (Q39)

- 48. Se ponen cariñosas
- 49. Se ponen a llorar
- 50. Haciéndoles creer que ellos son los que mandan
- 51. Con medias verdades
- 52. Cogiéndolos en momentos especiales
- 53. Buscándoles los gustos
- 54. Con la relación íntima
- 55. Valiéndose de artimañas
- 56. A través de la sumisión
- 57. A través de la dependencia y culpabilidad
- 58. Haciéndose las débiles y enfermas
- 59. Usando la admiración

60 Would you say that on occasions you manipulate your husband?

Yes - 2 No 1 Missing Data-9

61 In which occasions do you tend to do it more?
 1 Para comprar cosas 2 Para salir 3 Por los hijos
 4 Dinero 5 Familia 9 Missing data

62-69

For what purposes do you tend to do it more?

- 62. Money yes 2 No 1 missing data 9
- 63. Children's school yes 2 No 1 missing data 9
- 64. Children's activities yes 2 No 1 " " 9
- 65. Which friends to have yes 2 No 1 " " 9
- 66. Which relatives to see and visit & listen yes 2 No 1 " " 9
- 67. Buying of cloth furniture yes 2 No 1 " " 9
- 68. Where to go out to? Salidas yes 2 No 1 " " 9
- 69. Where to live yes 2 No 1 " " 9

Columns

- 70 Which women in Puerto Rican society tend to be more manipulative?
1. Clase pobre 2. Clase media 3. Todas 4. No sabe
 9. Missing data
- 71 Porqué las pobres?
1. Están más oprimidas
 2. Tienen más necesidad
 3. Tienen que conseguir las cosas a lo escondido
 4. Los hombres de esa clase son más autoritarios
 5. Son más ignorantes
 9. Missing data
- 72 Por qué las de la clase media?
1. Las de la clase pobre hacen todo lo que diga el hombre (la clase media es más independiente)
 2. Tienen más preparación
 3. Las de la clase pobre tienen menos aspiraciones (la clase media tiene más aspiraciones)
 4. La clase pobre no tiene ingenio
 5. La clase media tienen que estar más pendientes de las apariencias (la clase pobre no tiene nada que perder)
 9. Missing data
- 73 Which women tend to be more manipulative the educated ones or the ones with little education?
1. The ones with little education
 2. The educated ones
 3. All women
 4. Dont know
 9. Missing data

Columns

- 74 Why the uneducated ones?
1. Cometen más errores
 2. No se dan cuenta que es malo
 3. Por su ignorancia
 9. Missing data
- 75 Why the educated ones?
1. They know more
 2. Tienen más técnicas
 3. Tienen que mantener el status
 4. Tienen más alternativas
 9. Missing data
- 76 Which women tend to be more manipulative the ones who work or those who dont? (work outside)
1. Those who do not work
 2. Those who work
 3. All women
 4. Dont know
 9. Missing data
- 77 Why those who do not work?
1. They have less money and depend more on the man
 2. Las que trabajan son más independientes
 3. Están más limitadas
 9. Missing data
- 78 Why those who work?
1. Tienen más malas mañas, oyen más formas de manipulación
 2. Las que se quedan en la casa se conforman con poco (las que trabajan fuera son más ambiciosas)
 3. Son más independientes dependen menos del hombre
 9. Missing data

Columns

- 79 Por qué todas?
1. Porque se les enseña a ser así de pequeñas
 2. Porque son así por naturaleza
 3. No sabe
 9. Missing data
- 80 Would you say that men manipulate women?
1. No ellos son más directos
 2. Manipulan pero poco
 3. Son igual de manipuladores
 4. Si, son bastante manipuladores
 5. Son más manipuladores
 9. Missing data
- 4 Why not?
1. Porque ellos no tienen nada que perder
 2. Tienen menos necesidad de manipular porque ellos pueden imponer sus criterios y su poder
- 5-14 In which ways do men manipulate women?
5. Trayendo regalos
 6. Poniéndose cariñosos
 7. Haciéndose dependientes
 8. Pretendiendo debilidades
 9. Con mentiras blancas
 10. Diciendo que ellos son los que trabajan
 11. A través del halago y la conquista
 12. Amenazndo irse con otras
 13. Creando inseguridad en la mujer
 14. De la misma forma que las mujeres lo hacen
- 15 Would you say that your husband manipulates you on occasion?
- Yes - 1 No - 1 No sabe - 3 9. Missing data

Columns

- 16 In which occasions would he do it more?
1. En cuanto a las salidas (juntos)
 2. En cuanto a las salidas solos
 3. Cuando quiere imponer "double standards"
 4. Para cambiar actitudes tradicionales en ella
 5. Por cuestiones de dinero
 6. Por cuestiones de familia
 9. Missing data
- 17-25 For what things does he tend to do it more?
17. Money
 18. En cuanto a salidas
 19. En cuanto a la escuela de los hijos
 20. En cuanto a las actividades de los hijos
 21. En cuanto a los amigos
 22. En cuanto a los familiares
 23. En cuanto a la compra de ropa, muebles
 24. En cuanto a dónde salir
 25. En cuanto a dónde vivir
- Yes - 2 No - 1 9 Missing data
- 26 Which men in Puerto Rican Society tend to be more manipulative?
1. Los de clase pobre
 2. Los de la clase media
 3. Todos
 4. No sabe
 9. Missing data
- 27 Why the poor ones?
1. Son más a la cañona, más autoritarios
 2. Son más ignorantes
 9. Missing data

Columns

- 28 Why the middle class men?
1. Están más preparados
 2. Saben más técnicas
 3. Tienen que guardar las apariencias
 9. Missing data
- 29 Which men tend to be more manipulative, the educated ones or those who aren't?
1. The uneducated
 2. The educated
 3. All men
 4. Don't know
 9. Missing data
- 30 Why the uneducated?
1. Son más autoritarios
 2. Por su misma ignorancia
 3. Porque dependen más de la mujer
 9. Missing data
- 31 Why the educated?
1. Saben más técnicas
 2. Tienen que guardar más las apariencias
 3. Saben más
 9. Missing data
- 32 Why all men?
1. En su manera de defenderse en contra de las mujeres
 2. Por naturaleza son así
 3. Por su machismo
 9. Missing data
- 33-45 Which things in Male-Female relationships would you say ought to change?
33. La mujer debe expresarse más directamente
 34. Que cada uno sea más independiente

Columns

35. Más independencia de sus respectivas familias
36. La mujer debe oír y hacerle más caso al hombre
37. Debe haber más seguridad
38. Debe haber más igualdad
39. Debe haber más tolerancia
40. Que se compartan las responsabilidades
41. Que el hombre no le dé a la mujer
42. Que la mujer tome una parte más activa en lo económico
43. Debe haber más diálogo
44. Debe haber más respeto y consideración de parte del hombre
45. Que el hombre esté menos prejuiciado en contra de la mujer

Yes - 2 No - 1 9. Missing data

46-54

What changes would you suggest in marriage?

46. Que los hombres no tuvieran otras mujeres
47. Que la mujer no debiera trabajar
48. Que la mujer debiera trabajar afuera
49. Mas madurez en ambos
50. Que el hombre sea más cariñoso
51. Que hubiera un período de prueba
52. Más independencia
53. Que se tomen las decisiones en común
54. Más comunicación

Yes - 2 No - 1 9. Missing data

55-60

How has the role of husband changes in Puerto Rican Society?

55. Ya no se siente tan comprometido con su matrimonio, se divorcia fácil
56. Ahora se envuelve más en las responsabilidades del hogar
57. Respeta y considera más a la mujer
58. Se está volviendo más espiritual
59. Ya no se ocupa de la mujer
60. Esta empezando a ver a la mujer como igual

Yes - 2 No - 1 9. Missing data

Columns

61-72 How has the role of wife changed in Puerto Rican Society?

61. Ahora tiene más voz
62. Tiene responsabilidades fuera de la casa
63. Está más educada
64. Tiene más libertad
65. Los hijos tienen más confianza
66. Tiene que trabajar fuera
67. Tiene un lugar más alto en el hogar
68. Ya no se ocupa de la familia
69. Más materialista
70. Más egoísta, quiere menos responsabilidades
71. Es más segura
72. Es más independiente

Influence Scale

Escala de Rubin (Q55-60)

- | | | |
|----------------------------|-----|-----|
| 4. Actividades recreativas | 1-9 | |
| 5. Conversación | 1-9 | |
| 6. Actividades sexuales | 1-9 | |
| 7. Actividades con otros | 1-9 | 1-3 |
| 8. En cuanto a los hijos | 1-9 | 4-6 |
| 9. En cuanto al dinero | 1-9 | 7-9 |

Yo tengo más influencia

Los dos tenemos igual influencia

El tiene más influencia

- | | |
|-----------------|------|
| 10. Score total | 6-54 |
| 11. Blank | |

Projective Stories

12 I. Historia de Eduardo y Eugenia

1. El la convence a ella, explicando argumentos (i.e., la próxima vez sería como ella quiere)
2. El la convence con modos indirectos y manipulativos (pretendiendo estar enojado)

Columns

3. Ella lo convence de modo directo
4. Ella lo convence con modos indirectos y manipulativos
5. No sabe
6. No resolution
9. Missing data

13 II. Historia de Enrique y Josefina

1. El la convence a ella directamente
2. El la convence a ella usando modos indirectos y manipulativos
3. Ella lo convence a él de modos directos
4. Ella lo convence de modos indirectos y manipulativos
5. No sabe
6. No resolution
9. Missing data

Scale of Marital Adjustment

14. Think of your marriage as it is now, would you like it to

1. Stay the same 2 Change a little 3 Change a lot

9. Missing data

15. How often do you feel dissatisfied with your husband?

1. Muy a menudo 2. A menudo 3. A veces

4. Casi nunca 5. Nunca 9. Missing data

16. How often do you think that your husband really doesn't love you?

1. Muy a menudo 2. A menudo 3. A veces

4. Casi nunca 5. Nunca 9. Missing data

Columns

17. How often do you think you do not really love your husband?
1. Muy a menudo 2. A menudo 3. A veces
4. Casi nunca 5. Nunca 9. Missing data
18. In general, how satisfied do you feel with your marriage?
1. Muy satisfecha
2. Satisfecha
3. Ni satisfecha, ni insatisfecha
4. Insatisfecha en algo
5. Insatisfecha
9. Missing data
19. All in all, how satisfied do you think your husband is with your marriage?
1. Muy satisfecho
2. Satisfecho
3. Ni satisfecho ni insatisfecho
4. Algo insatisfecho
5. Insatisfecho
9. Missing data
20. Taking all thing into account would you say that:
- Your marriage is
1. Muy feliz 2. Feliz 3. Ni feliz, ni infeliz
4. Infeliz 5. Muy infeliz
9. Missing data

Score total de la escala de felicidad 7-33

Total score

Columns

Interviewer Observations

23. Level of interest:

No mostraba interés en la entrevista
 Tenía un poco de interés
 Demostraba tener interés
 El interés variaba dependiendo de la
 pregunta

24. Level of tension of the interviewee

Nervioso, intranquilo	1
Nerviosidad esporádica	2
Mayormente relajado	3

25. Friendliness-Hostility

Estaba hostil	1
Tenía actitud de sospecha	2
Amigable	3
Extremadamente amigable	4
La actitud variaba según la parte pregunta de la entrevista	5

26. Privacy during the interview

No había nadie más	1
Niños pequeños en los alrededores	2
Niños mayores y/o adultos que podían oír	3
Hombres adultos	4

Columns

27. Disruptions during the interview

Llamadas por teléfono	1
Visitas	2
Niños demandando atención	3
Otros	4
Missing data	9

Sex-Role Rigidity Scale

28 Questions 1 through 20 See attached pages

Total Score ____ 20-120

Manipulation Indexes

1. Personal Manipulation Index (includes questions 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41)

51 How do you usually reach decisions in your family?
How do you reach decisions with your husband?

1	2
El decide o se Hablan las cosas entre ambos	Ella discute las cosas con él pero al fin decide

3

Ella decide de antemano

52 How much influence do you have over your husband?
What styles do you use?

0 Directamente, expone sus puntos de vista

1 Trata directamente, cuando se agota el diálogo
recurre a modos indirectos y manipulativos

(missing data)

2 Indirectamente, haciéndole creer que el manda,
pintando la cosa más bonita de lo que es

(missing data)

Columns

- 53 Do you think that part of that which is called being a "good woman" is to make the husband do the things one wants without him even being aware of it?
- 1 No 2 Yes 9 Missing data
- 54 How good and or desirable is the use of manipulative techniques?
- Malo, es degradante para ambos; manipular es malo
- Bueno, porque la mujer debe poder hacer sin que él se sienta dominado
- Bueno, porque se evitan peleas, a la buena todo se consigue
- 55 Would you say that you manipulate your husband on occasion?
- 0 No, nunca 0
 1 Casi nunca 0
 2 Sí, pero poco 1
 3 Sí, bastante 2
 4 Sí, mucho 3
 9 Missing data
- 56 En qué ocasiones tiende a hacerlos más?
- In which occasions do you tend to do it more?
- 1 nunca 0
 2 para decisiones pequeñas 1
 3 para decisiones grandes 2
 9 Missing data
- 57-58 Total Score Highest score

Columns

General Manipulation Index

How manipulative are women in general?
(Includes questions 23, 24, 37, 38, 39)

- 59 Who tends to have more influence in family affairs?
1. el hombre 2. la mujer 3. ambos 9. missing data
- 60 How do women make their influence felt?
0 Directo, nunca usa subterfugios
1 Se trata abierto primero, si no trabaja entonces se recurre a manipulación
2 De modo indirecto, directamente no se consigue nada
3 De modo indirecto para mantener las apariencias
9 Missing data
- 61 Do you think that women in general are calculating and manipulative with men?
0 No 2 Sí 3 No sabe 9 Missing data
- 62 Are all women manipulative?
0 Ninguna
1 Algunas
2 La mayoría
3 Todas
9 Missing data
- 63 In what ways do women manipulate men?
1. Buscándoles los gustos, poniéndose carinosas, cogiéndolos en momentos especiales
2. Con medias verdades, tratando de hacerse las enfermas, con la relación íntima
3. A través de la sumisión, haciéndolos creer que ellos mandan, a través de dependencia y culpabilidad, valiéndose de artimañas
- 64-65 Score total _____

APPENDIX F

THE MEASURE OF SOCIAL CLASS

THE MEASURE OF SOCIAL CLASS

The measure of social class was achieved through the use of a composite index which included the occupation of both husband and wife and their property ownership. In the case where one or both were self-employed questions were asked regarding the volume of sales, number of employees and the income of the business. Where income was derived from land ownership, acres of land, number of employees and products cultivated were used to determine the relationship to the means of production.

Individuals who held a large number of stocks in a corporation, large industries--defined by number of employees, volume of sales, acres of land, number and size of the property--were excluded from the sample. They may be categorized as members of the intermediary national bourgeoisie and were not part of our study.

Persons owning businesses --whether commercial, industrial or agricultural--that were administered and/or worked by the family and a few employees were classified as members of the petit bourgeoisie.

Individuals who were engaged in professional occupations, salaried or self-employed, were classified as part of the middle strata. They own no property but possess an "instrument" of work. They share the interests of the petite bourgeoisie and are placed close to them. In addition they are clearly distinguished from the proletariat in that they do not produce surplus value.

Salaried workers in industry, commerce and finances constitute the bulk of the working class in addition to sales clerks, unskilled office clerks, maintenance servicers and others who do not produce surplus value but are considered part of the working class.

It is precisely between this last group salaried non-proletariat and low executives, teachers and clerks, where the distinction between working class and middle strata becomes blurred and classificatory decisions become more arbitrary.

The following questions were extracted and translated from the interview and represent the information obtained from each family regarding social class.

1. What do you do now? (If the person mentions an occupation obtain details as to the nature of his functions i. e. is she a supervisor?)

2. If S owns a business
 - a. What kind of business?
 - b. What is the approximate montly or annual income?
 - c. How many persons are employed? (Include relatives with and without pay)
3. What does your husband do? (If the person mentions an occupation, obtain details as to the nature of his functions)
4. If he owns a business:
 - a. What kind of business?
 - b. What is the approximate monthly or annual income?
 - c. How many persons are employed?
5. Do you or your husband own property?
6. If they own houses
 - a. How many? Are they rented?
7. If they own buildings?
 - a. What size?
8. If they own land:
 - a. How many acres? Are they used agriculturally?
What products?
 - b. Who tends the land?

c. How many acres are used in this way?

d. Who are the employees?

e. What others uses are given to the land?

9. What is the monthly income of the family? (Include all the numbers of the family who contribute economically. If the person is unable to offer an exact figure provide the following categories - less than 200.00 montly, between 200 - 400, 400 - 600, 600 - 800, 800 - 1000, 1000 - 1,200, 1200 - 1500, over 1500)

Table 28

Distribution of Subjects by Social Class

Class Sector	Absolute Frequency	%
Industrial Proletariat	9	11.3
Non-Industrial Proletariat	18	22.5
Salaried Non- Proletariat	11	13.8
Petite Bourgeoisie	15	18.8
Professional	27	33.8
TOTAL	80	100

APPENDIX G

THE MEASURES OF MANIPULATIVENESS

THE MEASURES OF MANIPULATIVENESS

I. Personal Manipulation Index

An index was constructed from questions contained throughout the interview (questions 32, 33, 35, 36, 40, 41) relating to the reported use of manipulative techniques to achieve influence. Values were assigned to various types of answers which reflected various degrees of manipulateness. These were added across questions to obtain a score of personal manipulation.

The following questions and answer categories illustrate the manipulation index:

- A. How do you usually reach decisions in your family?
How do you reach decisions with your husband?

	<u>Value</u>
1. He decides	0
2. Decisions are made jointly	0
3. She discusses things with him, but she decides	1
4. She decides beforehand	2
Missing data	9

B. How much influence do you have over your husband?

What styles do you use?

	<u>Value</u>
1. Directly, she expresses her points of view	0
2. She tries directly at first, when dialogue is not possible she uses manipulative modes	1
3. Indirectly, making him believe he is in command	2

C. Do you think that part of that which is called "being a good woman" is to make the husband feel he is in command?

	<u>Value</u>
1. No	0
2. Yes	2
Missing data	9

D. How good or desirable is the use of manipulative techniques?

	<u>Value</u>
1. Bad, it is degrading for both partners, it is wrong to manipulate	0

Value

- | | |
|--|---|
| 2. Good, it avoids fights, you can
get the things you want | 1 |
| 3. Good, the woman should be able
to obtain the things she wants
without threatening the husband | 2 |
| Missing data | 9 |

E. Would you say that you manipulate your husband on occasion?

Value

- | | |
|--------------------------|---|
| 1. No, never | 0 |
| 2. Seldom | 0 |
| 3. Yes, very little | 1 |
| 4. Yes, quite frequently | 2 |
| 5. Yes, a lot | 3 |

F. In which occasions do you tend to do it?

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. Never | 0 |
| 2. For small things and decision | 1 |
| 3. For big things and decisions | 2 |

TOTAL SCORE 0 - 13

II. The General-Female Manipulation Index

The same procedure was elaborated to obtain a measure of the degree of manipulateness that the respondents attribute to other women in general. The questions used for the index correspond to questions, 23, 24, 37, 38, and 39 in the questionnaire.

A. Who tends to have more influence in family affairs?

	<u>Value</u>
1. The man	0
2. The woman	1
3. Both	0
Missing data	9

B. How do women make their influence felt?

	<u>Value</u>
1. Directly, never use subterfuges	0
2. Tries directly first, then uses manipulative modes	1
3. Indirectly, directly nothing is achieved	2
4. Indirectly, to maintain a facade of male authority	2
Missing data	9

C. Do you think that women in general are calculating and manipulative with men?

	<u>Value</u>
1. No	0
2. Yes	2
Missing data	9

D. Are all women manipulative?

	<u>Value</u>
1. None	0
2. Some	1
3. The majority	2
4. All	2
Missing data	9

E. In what ways do women manipulate men?

1. "Buscándoles los gustos" Being sweet, speaking at special moments	1
2. With half-truths. "Playing sick" Through sex	2
3. Making them believe they are the boss, through submission, dependency and guilt, through lies and deception	3
Missing data	9

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aidous, J. Strategies for Developing Family Theory. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 8, 250-257.
- Althusser, L. Ideologie et appareils ideologiques d' ETAT. Notes pour une recherche. La Pensée, 1970, 151, 338.
- Angrist, S. S. The Study of Sex Roles. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 215-232.
- Bahr, S.J. Wolfe's Measure of Conjugal Power: A research Note. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 5, 293-295.
- Bahr, S.J. Comment on The Study of the Family Power Structure: A Review of 1960-1969. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 239-245.
- Bouman, G & Roman, M. Interaction Testing in the Study of Marital Dominance. Winter, W. & Ferreira, A. (eds.) Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1969, 177-187.
- Benston, M. The Political Economy of Women's Liberation. Monthly Review, 1969, 21, No. 4, 13-27.
- Berger, P. and Kellner, H. Marriage and the Construction of Reality. In Dreitel, H.P. (ed.) Recent Sociology No. 2, New York: MacMillan, 1970, 49-73.
- Birch, D. & Veroff, J. Motivation: a Study of Action. Belmont: Brooks/Cole, 1966.
- Blood, R. O. & Wolfe, D.M. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1960.
- Boserup, E. Woman's Role in Economic Development. New York: Martin's Press, 1970.
- Bott, E. Family and Social Network. London: Tavistock, 1957.
- Bottomore, T.B. Classes in Modern Society. London, 1966.
- Brooks, S. Freudianism is not the Counterpart of Marxism. In Brown, R. (ed.) Radical Psychology. New York: Penguin Books, 1971.
- Broverman, I., Vogel, S., Clarkson, F. & Rosenkrantz, P. Sex Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.
- Burgess, E. The Family as a Unit of Interacting Personalities. In Heiss, J. (ed.) Family Roles and Interaction: An Anthology. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Carlos, M.L. & Sellers, L. Family, Kinship Structure, and Modernization in Latin America. Latin American Research Review, 1972, 70, 95-124.

Carlson, R. Understanding Women: Implication for Personality Theory and Research. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 17-33.

Center, R. & Raven, B. Conjugal Power Structure: A Re-Examination. American Sociological Review, 1971, 36, 264-278.

Christensen, H.T. Development of the Family Field of Study. In Christensen, H.T. (ed.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, 3-33.

Christie, M. & Geis, C. Studies in Machiavellianism. New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Cintrón, R. The Family as a Reified Process. Manuscript submitted for publication, 1975.

Cole, J. O. Sex Role Rigidity Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Department of Psychology, Howard University, 1975.

Dalla Costa, M. & James, S. Women and the Subversion of the Community. In The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community, Briston: The Falling Wall Press, 1972.

Dreitzel, H.P. Introduction: Family, Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes. In Dreitzel, H.P. (ed.) Family Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes. New York: MacMillan, 1972, 5-23.

Engles, F. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and The State. New York: International Publishers, 1972.

Fannon, F. The Wretched of the Earth. New York: Grove Press, 1966.

French, R.P. & Raven, B. The Basis of Power. In Hollander, E. & Hunt, R. (eds.) Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. New York: Oxford Press, 1967.

Giddens, A. The Class Structure of Advanced Societies. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.

Gillespie, D.L. Who Has the Power? The Marital Struggle. In Dreitzel, H.P. (ed.) Family, Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes. New York: MacMillan, 1970.

Gisii, J. Mitología de la Feminidad. In Opresión y Marginalidad de la Mujer en el Orden Social Machista. Buenos Aires: Humanidas, 1970, 125-173.

González, N. Towards a Definition of Matrifocality. In Whitten, M. & Swed, D. (eds.) Afro-American Anthropology: Contemporary Perspectives. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Greene, P. & Winter, D. Involvement and Leadership among Black College Students. In McClelland, D. & Steele, A. (eds.) Human Motivation, New York: CRM, 1974.

- Haley, J. Family Experiments: A New Type of Experimentation. In Handel, G. (ed.) The Psychosocial Interior of the Family. Chicago: Aldine, 1967, 54-80.
- Hess, R.D. & Handel, G. The Family as a Psychosocial Organization. In Handel, G. (ed.) The Psychosocial Interior of the Family. Chicago: Aldine, 1967, 10-25.
- Hess, R.D. & Handel, G. Some Comments on Method. In Handel, G. (ed.) The Psychosocial Interior of the Family. Chicago: Aldine, 1967, 46-54.
- Hill, R. & Hansen, D.A. The Identification of Conceptual Frameworks Used in Family Study. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 299-311.
- Hochschild, A.R. A Review of Sex Role Research. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 249-268.
- Holler, H. Sex Roles and Social Change. In Dreitzel, H.P. (ed.) Family, Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes. New York: Macmillan, 1972, 153-173.
- Karlsson, G. Adaptability and Communication in Marriage. Totawa, N.J.: Bedminster Press, 1963.
- Kelman, H. The Three Processes of Social Influence. In Hollander, E. & Hunt, R. (eds.) Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. New York: Oxford Press, 1967, 438-446.
- Kenkel, W.F. Influence Differentiation and Family Decision Making. In Heiss, J. (ed.) Family Roles and Interaction: An Anthology. New York: Harper, 1969, 185-197.
- Kenkel, W.F. Husband-Wife Interaction in Decision Making and Decision Choices. Journal of Social Psychology, 1961, 21, 334-339.
- Kenkel, W.F. Sex of the Observer and Spousal Roles in Decision-Making. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 5, 185-186.
- Kinzer, N.S. Women in Latin America. Introduction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 99-312
- Komarovsky, M. Blue-Collar Marriage. New York: Random House, 1962.
- Komarovsky, M. Cultural Contradictions and Sex Roles. American Journal of Sociology, 1946, 52, 508-516.
- La Alternativa Socialista. Political Thesis of the Puerto Rican Socialist Party, 1974.
- Laing, R.D. Sanity, Madness and the Family. New York: Pelican, 1969.

- Lamphere, L. Strategies, Cooperation and Conflict Among Women in Domestic Groups. In Rosaldo, M.Z. & Lamphere, L. (eds.) Woman Culture and Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Landy, D. Tropical Childhood. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1959.
- Leacock, E.B., ed. The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels with introduction by Leacock. New York: International Publishers, 1972.
- Leavitt, R. Women in Other Cultures. In Gormick, B. & Moran, E. (eds.) Woman in Sexist Society. New York: Basic Books, 1971, 393-431.
- Lewin, K. Field Theory and Social Science. New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
- Lowenthal, D. West Indian Societies. New York: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Magas, B. Sex Politics: Class Politics. In Dreitzel, H.P. (ed.) Family Marriage and the Struggle of the Sexes. New York: Macmillan, 1972, 217-251.
- Manners, R.A. & Steward, J.H. The Cultural Study of Contemporary Societies: Puerto Rico. In Fernandez Mendez, E. (ed.) Portrait of a Society. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, 1972, 29-38.
- Martinez Monfort, A. The Puerto Rican Family: Its Impact on the Emotional Development of Youth. In Moran, E. (ed.) Emotional Disturbances in Puerto Rican Children. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, 1974.
- Mark, K. The German Ideology. International Publishers, 1962.
- Marx, K. Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. New York: Humboldt, 1890.
- Marx, K., Engels, F., Lenin, V.I. & Stalin, J. The Woman Question: Selected Writings. New York: International Publishers, 1951.
- Memmi, A. The Colonizer and the Colonized. Boston: Beacon Press, 1965.
- Middleton, R. & Putney, M. Dominance in Decisions in the Family: Race and Class Differences. American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 65, 605-609.
- Millman, M. Observations on Sex Role Research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 2, 773-776.
- Mintz, S.W. Worker in the Cane: A Puerto Rican Life History. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1960.

- Muñoz, M. La Clase Media en Puerto Rico. In Ramirez, R., Buitrago, C. & Levine, B. (eds.) Problemas de Desigualdad Social en Puerto Rico. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, ~~1973~~, Ediciones Librería Internacional, 1972.
- Murphy, D.C. & Mendelson, L.A. Use of Observational Methods in the Study of Live Marital Communication. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 5, 256-263.
- Nash, J. Life in the Mines: An Autobiography of a Bolivian Woman. Unpublished Manuscript, 1975.
- Nieves Falcon, L. Bases Empíricas para Entender el Comportamiento del niño Puertorriqueño. In Nieves Falcon, L. (ed.) Diagnostico de Puerto Rico. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, 1972.
- Nye, I.F. Field Research. In Christensen, H.T. (ed.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, 247-275.
- Olsen, M. The Process of Social Power. In Hollander, E. & Hunt, R. (eds.) Current Perspectives in Social Psychology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971, 533-544.
- Olson, D.H. & Rabunsky, C. Validity of Four Measures of Family Power. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 224-234
- Pearlin, L. Class Context and Family Relations: A Cross National Study. Boston: Little, Brown and Co. ~~1971~~, 1971.
- Pescatello, A. Female and Male in Latin America: Essays. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.
- Pescatello, A. The Female in Ibero-America: An Essay on Research Bibliography and Research Directions. Latin American Research Review, 1972, 8, 125-135.
- Raven, B. Social Influence and Power. In Steiner, I. & Fishbein, M. (eds.) Current Studies in Social Psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1959, 321-381.
- Rubin, Z. Measurement of Romantic Love. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 265-273.
- Rubin, Z. Patterns of Interpersonal Attraction. Unpublished manuscript, 1957.
- Ryan, W. Blaming the Victim. New York: Random House, 1971.
- Safa, H.I. Class Consciousness Among Working-Class Women in Latin America: A Case Study in Puerto Rico. Paper presented at the Conference on Feminine Perspectives in Social Science Research, Buenos Aires, March 1974.
- Safa, H.I. The Urban Poor of Puerto Rico: A Study in Development. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1974.
- Safa, H.I. The Female-Based Household in Public Housing: A Case Study in Puerto Rico. Human Organization, 1965, 24,

- Saffiotti, H. B. A Mulher na Sociedade de Classe: Mito e Realidade. Sao Paulo: Quatio Artes, 1960.
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. Answer to Stephen J. Bahr A Comment of the Study of Family Power Structure: A Review of 1960-1969. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 245-250
- Safilios-Rothschild, C. The Study of Family Power Structure: A Review of 1960-1969. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 32, 539-552.
- Sanchez Hidalgo, E. Machismo Versus Momismo in Puerto Rico. In Moran, R. (ed.) Emotional Disturbances in Puerto Rican Children. Rio Piedras: University of Puerto Rico Press, 1974.
- Sartre, J. P. Anti-Semite and Jew. New York: Schocken Books, 1965.
- Schneider, J. Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honor, Shame and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Societies. Ethnology, 1971, 10, 1-25.
- Schopler, J. Social Power. In Berkowitz, L. (ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, 1965, 177-214.
- Seward, G. H. Sex Roles, Ancient to Modern. In Seward, G. H. & Wilhamson, R. C. (eds.) Sex Roles in Changing Society. New York: Random House, 1970, 109-126.
- Silvestrini, B. Roles Femeninos en Puerto Rico. Paper presented at the meetings of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August 1973.
- Simon, E. Administrative Behavior. New York: Macmillan, 1957.
- Smith, R. T. The Negro Family in British Guiana: Family Structures and Social Status in Villages. London: Routledge & Kegan, 1965.
- Sprey, J. The Family as a System in Conflict. In Delora, J. & Delora, M. (eds.) Intimate Lifestyles. California: Goodyear, 1972, 173-184.
- Sprey, J. Family Power Structure: A Critical Comment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 235-239.
- Stevens, E. P. Marianismo: The Other Face of Machismo in Latin America. In Pescatello, A. (ed.) Female and Male in Latin America, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1973.
- Stevens, E. P. The Prospects for a Women's Liberation Movement in Latin America. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 313-322.
- Stevens, E. P. Mexican Machismo: Politics and Value Orientations. Western Political Quarterly, 1965, 18, 848-857.

- Steward, J.H., Manners, R.H., Wolf, E.R., Padilla Seda, E., Mintz, S.W. & Scheele, R.L. The People of Puerto Rico. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Straus, M. Measuring Families. In Christensen, H.I. (ed.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964, 335-403.
- Strodbeck, F.L. Husband-Wife Interaction Over Revealed Differences. American Sociological Review, 1951, 16, 468-473.
- Thibaut, J. & Kelly, T. The Social Psychology of Groups. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Tumin, M.M. & Feldman, A.S. Social Class and Social Change in Puerto Rico. New York: Babbs-Merrill, 1961.
- Turk, J.L. & Bell, N.W. Measuring Power in Families. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 215-222.
- Turner, R.H. Family Interaction. New York: Wiley, 1970.
- Veroff, J., Feld, A., & Gurin, G. The Use of Thematic Apperception to Assess Motivation in a Nationwide Interview Study. Psychological Monographs, 1960, 74, whole number.
- Vilar, E. The Manipulated Man. Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1972.
- Waller, W. The Family: A Dynamic Interpretation. New York: Dryden, 1938.
- Waxler, N.E. & Mishler, E.G. Sequential Patterning in Family Interaction: A Methodological Note. Family Process, 1970, 9, 411-415.
- Waller, R.H. The Employment of Wives, Dominance and Fertility. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1968, 4, 437-450.
- Warner, S., Wellman, D. & Weitzman, L. The Hero, The Sambo and The Operator: Reflections on Characterizations of The Oppressed. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Sociological Association, 1971.
- Wilhamson, R.C. Role Themes in Latin America. In Seward, J.H. & Wilhamson, R.C. (eds.) Sex Roles in Changing Society. New York: Random House, 1970, 109-128.
- Wilkening, E. & Denton, M. A Comparison of Husband and Wife Responses Concerning Who Makes Farm and Home Decisions. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1963, 25, 349-351.
- Winter, D. The Need for Power. In McClelland, D. & Steele, A. (eds.) Human Motivation. New York: CRM, 1974, 279-286.
- Winter, D. & McClelland, D. The Two Faces of Power. In McClelland, D. & Steele, A. (eds.) Human Motivation. New York: CRM, 1974, 287-300.

- Wolf, K.L. Growing Up and its Price in Three Puerto Rican Subcultures.
In Fernández Méndez, E. (ed.) Portrait of a Society. Río Piedras:
University of Puerto Rico Press, 1972, 233-272.
- Zaretsky, E. Capitalism, the Family and Personal Life. Socialist
Revolution, 1974, 2, 85-120.
- Zúñiga, R. B. Personal Communication, 1975.