The Dissertation Committee for Ma. Eugenia González Alafita
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Communication and the Division of Labor about Household Tasks: Perceived Strategies Used to Negotiate Tasks in the Mexican Household

Committee:

John A. Daly, Supervisor

Mark L. Knapp

Anita L. Vangelisti

Diane L. Schallert

Larry D. Browning

Communication and the Division of Labor about Household Tasks:

Perceived Strategies Used to Negotiate Tasks in the Mexican Household

by

Ma. Eugenia González Alafita, B.A.; M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

December 2008

Dedication

Thank you, Jesus for giving me the strength to go on all the way, showing me Your love during the darkest phases of my journey.

I want to dedicate my dissertation to Pepe and Manola, my loving parents who always stood by me in all my life projects. Mom, dad: I made it! You can see me from heaven!!!

To Héctor, Luis Fernando, Fabiola & Miranda, for their unconditional and loving support all these years, while mom was juggling home and work trying to finish and getting her degree.

To my brothers and sisters who were proud of me for being so stubborn and a fighter.

To all my friends, colleagues, directors and students who believed in me and were there for me to cheer me up when I thought I would never make it.

To my professors at UT, for teaching me more than I could handle, and for changing the way I see the field of Interpersonal Communication now.

Communication and the Division of Labor about Household Tasks: Perceived Strategies Used to Negotiate Tasks in the Mexican Household

Publication No._____

Ma. Eugenia González Alafita, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2008

Supervisor: John A. Daly

The purpose of the study was to examine: (a) the influence communication strategies Mexican men and women reported using when negotiating household work with their partners; (b) the influence communication strategies perceived their partners use when negotiating with them; (c) whether spouses considered the reported strategies as being effective to make their partners do what they need/want, and (d) whether spouses perceived the influence communication strategies used by their partners effective. This dissertation consisted of two inter-related studies performed in Monterrey, Nuevo León, México. The first study was an interview project, where 24 males and females were questioned about how they influence and are influenced by their partners in regard to participating in household tasks. The population consisted of married dual-income Mexicans with at least one child. The second study used the results of Study I to probe, via questionnaire, how couples influence and are influenced by their partners in regard to participating in household tasks, the relative reported frequency of use of the different

strategies, and their perceived effectiveness when using them. 92 couples participated in this study: 46 males and 46 females who live in a double-income marriage.

Mexican couples perceived equity about how the household tasks are distributed within their homes. Moreover, the degree of happiness about the contribution each partner makes to the household is high, and participants reported being very satisfied with their relationship. The influence communication strategy men and women reported using most often to make their partners participate in household tasks, and the one they perceive their partners used most often is *positive affect*. The reported strategies that are rarely or never used or perceived are: *humor, sarcasm, ignore, and threat. Positive affect* was perceived by husbands and wives to be the most effective influence, while the least effective was *threat* and *ignore*. The most significant correlation between strategies reported used by husbands and perceived by wives were *positive affect, delegate* and *ignore*. The most significant correlation between strategies reported used by wives and perceived by husbands were: *suggest, avoid,* and *reciprocation*. This study found a negative and significant relationship between using the strategy *ignore* and marital satisfaction, and a negative and significant relationship between perceived partners' use of the strategy *threat* and marital satisfaction.

Table of Contents

Tables

Chapter 1: *Introduction and Purpose of the Study*

The number of dual income couples is growing because of several factors: economic uncertainty; increased educational level of women; philosophical changes about the role of women; and the growth in women's employment (Edwards, 2001). This trend applies even in the Mexican household, where women traditionally have worked at home, taking care of the housework and children. In contemporary México, women join their partners in the labor market and contribute their salaries to household incomes. This change in roles, which started in México during the 1960s, has had an impact on the traditional household division of labor paradigm in México: breadwinners and housewives.

The division of household labor has interested scholars from different academic disciplines and has been studied from different theoretical perspectives, including: the effects of the changing workforce on the family dynamics; the idea of successful family "functioning;" the division of labor across the transition to parenthood; the role of attitudes towards household labor; equity distribution of household duties; and differences between men and women in household decision-making (e.g., Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson , 2000; Duxbury & Higgins, 1994; Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993; Gentry, Suraj, & Sunkyu, 2003; Holder & Anderson, 1989; Hook, 2003; Hudley, 2001; Kluwer, Heesink, & van de Vliert, 2000; Kromelow, Touris, & Harding, 1990; Segalen, 1992; Shellenberger & Hoffman, 1995).

Findings from studies of household labor indicate that housework "tends to be trivialized in the popular imagination, in part because it is considered 'women's work'" (Coltrane, 2000, p. 1209). Observations from a number of researchers confirm that family work is divided by gender, with women spending much more time on domestic tasks than do men. Although roles within the family were expected to change as wives entered the outside domain (Gentry, Suraj, & Sunkyu, 2003), it is still debatable whether or not there have been real changes in the distribution of work within the home. The vast majority of studies have consistently found that men are not doing much in terms of housework and childcare, even though a large number of women have entered the workplace (Gentry et al., 2003). Home chores and child care remain primarily a woman's responsibility due to social or cultural reasons (e.g., Collado, 1999; Cunningham, 2001; Googings, 1991; Hundley, 2001; Shellenberger & Hoffman, 1995; Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993).

The division of household labor has been studied in different countries such as the United States, Spain, and Canada. Within the Mexican culture, it is a latent issue given the social, economical, and historical changes this country has experienced in the last century. Although there have been research in México related to how Mexicans live (Collado, 1999; Pozas Horcasitas, 1999); feminine labor force participation (Cunningham, 2001; Pagán & Sánchez, 2001); women in important social spaces (Franco, 1999), or the economics of gender (Katz & Correia, 2001), the way couples negotiate in their households about the division of labor, is a factor that needs to be researched. We know relatively little about the influence strategies couples,

particularly Mexican couples use to manage their childrearing roles or their household tasks. Considering negotiation as "the process whereby initially divergent interests reach accord by means of trade, barter, or any form of exchange" (Weiss, Birchler & Vincent, 1974, p. 322), people need to express what they want through requests, and these count as attempts by which the speakers try to get their targets to perform actions. The goal of these requests is to achieve compliance to satisfy a need or desire of another person within a relationship, and this may be accomplished through different influence strategies.

The work of Marwell and Schmitt (1967), Falbo and Peplau (1980), and others offer different typologies of ways people try to influence one another, as well as evidence about the perceived use of the various strategies. In this dissertation, I am interested in exploring if Mexican dual-income couples influence each other to negotiate household work responsibilities, and if so, how are those influence attempts communicated. In order to answer my inquiry, this research consisted of two interrelated studies. *Study I* was an interview project, where dual-income married Mexicans with at least one child, were questioned about how they influence and are influenced, through communication with their spouses, to participate in household tasks. *Study II* used the results of the first study and via questionnaire, first, I examined the influence communication strategies Mexican men and women report using when negotiating tasks about household work with their partners. Second, I focused on the influence strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use when negotiating tasks with them. Third, I examined whether spouses consider the

3

strategies as being effective to make their partners do what they need/want. Finally, I explored whether spouses perceive that the influence strategies used by their partners to make them do what they need/want are effective.

The sample for this study was drawn from the industrial city of Monterrey, in the northern Mexican state of Nuevo León, México. According to the last Population and Housing Counting 2005 (*II Conteo de Población y Vivienda 2005*), this state has 4,199,292 inhabitants. 50.2% of the population is female and 49.8% are males. This state accounts for 4.1% of the total 103.3 million inhabitants of México. In Nuevo León, the average number of children born to women 15 years old and older has decreased from 2.5 to 2.4 children per woman. Although women in Nuevo León have achieved a place in the labor market and have improved their quality of life, according to the *Programa de Equidad y Género 2006* (*Equity and Gender Program 2006*) women participate less in the labor market than men, salary gaps continue to persist, family violence has increased, and poverty and social exclusion still affect those households with female family heads. Clearly, the women of Nuevo León and Monterrey are making progress, but against a deep-seated bias against women in the workplace.

Chapter 2: *Review of the Literature and Research Questions*

In this chapter, I first examine how researchers and scholars have conceptualized the division of labor between men and women. I then review research about female and male share of responsibilities in doing household labor, noting for example, the role of each partner as caregiver for their children, and the role of culture as a factor that differentiates how societies perform division of labor within the household. Then I summarize communication and gender differences and specifically focus on influence strategies in intimate relationships (e.g., what is the role of requests and reciprocation in negotiations, and what kind of interpersonal strategies people use in order to influence each other), by reviewing, among others, the work Falbo & Peplau (1980) and their taxonomy of influence strategies which helped me to identify and classify the strategies Mexican couples use. Finally, after including a summary of communication and cultural differences, I review the Mexican culture. In this last section, I present a general perspective about the country, such as the concept of household, the role of men and women in the Mexican home, the participation of Mexican men and women in the labor market, and some personal and cultural traits of Mexicans.

Division of Household Labor

During past decades, the division of labor between husbands and wives has been explored from various perspectives. The *Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres* (INM-National Women Institute) defines household labor as "the set of activities performed daily at every home: these are the activities that day-by-day millions of individuals

perform to guarantee the well-being and development of thousands of families and communities" (2000, p. 35). Lord (2002) suggests that "*household production* time involves the creation of goods or services, such as a clean house or child care, in the home for personal consumption" (p. 269). In this context, household production refers to the creation of services and goods that are consumed at home. Housework is the "unpaid, non-market work" done to maintain family members and/or a home (Shelton & John, 1996).

> Historically, domestic labor has been devaluated, because, wrongly, it is
> conceived as non-productive or without economic value. However, today
> there is a strong call to highlight the fact that domestic labor does indeed
> generate value, and because of that, it is imperative to make it visible and
> to value it economically (INM, 2004, p. 35).

According to Coltrane (2000), the history and development of household labor research has its foundation in the classic housework and marriage studies performed in past decades (e.g., Bernard, 1972; Blood & Wolfe, 1960). However, housework came of age in the 1990s as a topic worthy of serious academic study. During this decade, the number of books and articles on the subject expanded in a dramatic way, mainly revealing "how housework cannot be understood without realizing how it is related to gender, household structure, family interaction, and the operation of both formal and informal market economies" (p. 1209). Coltrane's review of more than 200 scholarly articles and books on household labor published between 1989 and 1999, summarized how researchers have attempted to specify and evaluate the linkage between household

labor and life-course issues, marital quality, kin relations, gender ideology and display, among other aspects.

However, while the origins of the division of household labor among partners are subject to debate (Hundley, 2001), there is a general agreement that household partners typically divide responsibilities "with one specializing in house work and the other in market work" (p. 123-124). Thus the typical division of labor in the household is that women bear the burden of household production, and men specialize in market work (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000). Throughout history, men and women have had different participation within the division of household labor because they have had different investments: while women acquire skills on how to make clothes, preserve foods, and cook from scratch, men acquire market skills. Thus, most families achieve an "'equilibrium' characterized by complete specialization of men in market work and women in home production" (Lord, 2002, p. 289).

According to Lord (2002), for many centuries home-based agriculture predominated, with some cash from the crops being used to procure those few items not produced at home. Then, the movement of men from home-based agriculture to market work began and women continued to specialize in household production. Later, women entered the labor force in large numbers, working fewer hours than men, and nonetheless continued to perform all of the home production (Lord, 2000).

This shift in work patterns initially led many scholars to expect "a parallel drop in women's household labor and a move to a more equitable division of labor both within and outside the household" (Artis & Pavalko, 2002, p. 746). However, despite the

homogenizing changes in the allocation of time, "men on average have continued to perform more market work and much less household work than women" (Lord, 2002, p. 270). Findings show that in modern industrial economies, in spite of the fact that the majority of married women have joined their husbands in the paid labor force (Galinsky, Bond, & Friedman, 1993), wives still do a much larger share of child care than their husbands, regardless of their own employment status or that of their husbands (Kluwer, Heesink, & Van de Vliert, 2000). It appears that the traditional division of household tasks by gender and the expectations that women place on themselves and their families have changed little over the years (Coltrane, 2000; Bianchi et al., 2002; Brines, 1993; Duxbury & Higgins, 1994; Holder & Anderson, 1989).

Today, many women have the same full time jobs as their husbands; yet still take care of most household activities (e.g., Bernardo, Shenan, & Leslie, 1987; Cunningham, 2001; Robinson, 1988; Thompson & Walker, 1989). Consequently women are often described as working a "second shift" at home, a term coined by Hochschild (1989) to refer to the work women do at home after returning from their day in the workplace, since the burden of the household traditionally has fallen on them (Cunningham, 2001).

To some degree, this "second shift" may be slowly changing. Shelton and John (1996) found that in spite of disagreement over the significance of change in the division of household labor, the nature of the recent shifts is clear: "Women still do the majority of housework, but they are doing less and their spouses more than in the past" (p. 300). In this regard, several studies using time diary data describe a significant drop in women's housework, and a slight increase in men's participation from 1960 to the 1990s. One

possible reason for the decrease in the amount of housework women do could be the availability of new technologies, such as household appliances and processed and long-life foods, which facilitate house work and the couples' division of labor. Another possible explanation for the decrease in the amount of housework women do could be the presence of domestic help. In the case of México, having a paid female or male assisting with household tasks daily, is a common practice even when only one of the partners has a job. Nonetheless, as Galinsky, Bond, and Friedman's (1993) showed more than a decade ago, despite the tendencies toward greater sharing of household work in families, few employed men with either employed or non- employed spouses take primary or equal responsibility for the main household chores.

Gender Roles and Household Labor

In order to talk about gender roles and the division of household labor, there is a need to define some terms. According to the *Glosario de Términos Básicos sobre Género* (1999) (*Glossary of Basic Terms about Gender), sex* refers to biological differences, natural and unchangeable, between man and woman, while *gender* is a set of ideas, beliefs, social attributions and representations built within each culture and based on a sexual difference. Gender refers to those structural and ideological areas that comprehend the relations between the sexes; it is socially constructed roles and socially learned behaviors and expectations associated with females and males. Gender roles are learned early on through socialization. "Both girls and boys learn their place in society and, once they have learned it, the majority of them *want it that* way" (Hosftede, 2001, p. 298).

Although at first it seems rather difficult to differentiate between sex and gender,

9

the glossary of terms cited above offers a rule to follow: one has to think if the concept refers to something socially constructed or biological by nature. For example, breastfeeding is biological; therefore it is related to sex. The notion that "women who breastfeed do not go to public places" is not biological but rather probably a cultural issue and therefore related to gender. This is probably why we assume that "all cultures interpret and elaborate these innate biological differences into social expectations about what behaviors and activities are appropriate for males and females and what rights, resources, and power they possess" (The World Bank, 2001, p. 34). Moreover, gender is acquired through interaction in a social world. "We are born male or female –a classification based on biology- but we learn to be masculine and feminine" (Wood, 1999, p. 22). Gender is a social construction that may vary across cultures, and since it is a symbolic category that reflects the meanings a society confers, "These meanings are communicated through structures and practices of cultural life that pervade our daily existence, creating the illusion that they are the natural, normal ways for women and men to be" (p.29).

Furthermore, since gender roles are a set of expectations about social behaviors that are considered appropriate for people who have a determined sex, gender includes the norms, principles, and cultural representations within a society about behaviors and attitudes expected from men and women. In this sense, roles are "socially constructed patterns of behavior and sets of expectations that provide us a position in our families" (Turner & West, 2000, p 112), and researchers have explicitly noted that "contextual differences are crucial to understanding division of household processes" (Davis &

Greenstein, 2004, p. 1261). Thus, role behavior is also constructed as we interact with family members. Hosftede (2001) affirms that there is a common trend among the vast majority of societies, both traditional and modern, as to the distribution of gender roles apart from procreation: Men must be more concerned with economic and other achievements, and women must be more concerned with taking care of people in general and children in particular. With this in mind, it is not difficult to see how this role pattern fits the biological sex roles. Women first bear children and then breast-feed them; therefore, they must stay with them.

According to the World Bank's Policy Research Report Team (2001), gender roles relationships have evolved out of interactions among biological, technological, economic, and other societal constraints. At first, gender roles reflected efficient survival strategies and sexual division of labor, but, as societies advanced technically and economically, those gender asymmetries became inefficient and limiting; imposing significant costs on societies and on development. Gender roles vary considerably across societies. Still, there are some similarities, for example "nearly all societies give the primary responsibility for the care of infants and young children to women and girls, and that for military service and national security to men" (The World Bank, 2001, p. 34).

From Shellenberger & Hoffman's (1995) perspective, it is in our family of origin, usually through gender-based roles, where we learn our norms and values regarding gender roles. "Households are the first place of gender socialization, passing along knowledge, skills, and social expectations. Children acquire a gender identity that shapes the set of socially acceptable activities for women and men and the relations between

them." (The World Bank, 2001, p. 151). Indeed, social norms and customs determine the roles that women and men have in the family and the community: "They shape individual preferences and power relations between the sexes. They dictate the type of work considered appropriate for women and men" (p. 109). Social norms create powerful guidelines for people's behavior as spouses, parents, citizens, and workers, therefore, these systems of gender norms vary across and within countries.

Gender and childcare

Gentry, Suraj, and Sunkyu (2003) assert that in nearly all of the world's societies, women, due to their stronger link to young children because of the birth process and to their generally small physiques, have been assigned roles inside the home, while men have been responsible for the outside roles, whether it was the provision of fresh meat, financial dealings with others, or, more recently, yard work. In this sense, men have fulfilled a more instrumental family role, while women have fulfilled a more traditional, nurturing, supportive role. Some scholars affirm that in the last 30 years males have started to change notably, and have become aware of the problems of gender roles in families (Maldonado Martinez, 1993). However, even when there are claims that gender differentials are narrowing and that men are beginning to do more housework, data generally indicate that childcare is still largely viewed as the primary responsibility of women, while men are supposed to provide for the family (Friedman & Greenhaus, 2000).

However, among contemporary U.S. married mothers and fathers there are strong egalitarian expectations for equal father involvement across some parenting spheres (i.e.,

discipline, emotional support, playing with children, monitoring activities and friends), whereas care-giving remains an area in which equal father involvement is less often seen as ideal (Milkie, Bianchi, Mattengly, & Robinson, 2002). Gerstel and Gallagher's (2001) study about men's care-giving, found that "it is primarily the women in men's lives -their wives, daughters, and sisters who shape the amount and types of care men provide" (p. 21).

According to Rapoport and Rapoport (1977), the meaning of *equity* is important, given that equity is a social value or norm. By equity "we mean equality of opportunities plus a fair sharing of constraints and the achievement of a sense of social justice" (p. 362). The equity notion in regard to gender suggests that difference must be confronted in an attempt to remove unfair inequalities, and the interests of one partner are not subordinate to the other. Other forces challenge the expectation of equity in child rearing. For example, role theory suggests "one determinant of father's participation in child care is men's beliefs about appropriate roles for men and women" (Bonney, Kelley, & Levant, 1999, p. 401). The ideology that fathers have about their gender role affects their beliefs about appropriate fathering behaviors. Bonney, et al. (1999), for example, suggest that beliefs about masculinity are related to attitudes about father's involvement in child care: Fathers who reported more liberal gender role ideology held more progressive views of the father's role and, in turn, had greater involvement in child care activities and spent more time as the child's primary caregiver. Moreover, wives have their own role identities and what they believe is reasonable and appropriate fathering behavior. It seems that "some women, many of whom were raised in families with more traditional

sex role behaviors, may not have the expectation that men share parental responsibilities"
(p. 402). Consequently, men's involvement in childcare is unlikely to occur unless there
is approval and support for this behavior by wives. In other words, men's participation
may be determined by social and cultural expectations, which are shaped, as noted
earlier, by learned norms and values regarding gender roles. To summarize, father's
limited participation in childrearing may depend upon his gender role ideology, as well as
his partner's consent (Bianchi, Milkie, Sayer, & Robinson, 2000). In the next section, I
summarize communication and gender differences and specifically focus on negotiations
within relationships, for example, what is the role of requests and reciprocation in
negotiations, and what kind of interpersonal strategies people use in order to influence
each other.

Communication in relational partners

Generally, in order to assign *who* has to do *what*, consensus is key. To get
housework and childcare done, negotiation among household members usually needs to
take place to avoid conflicts or disagreements. In this regard, communication within
dual-income couples matters in understanding the household division of labor roles.

In any social relationship, individuals attempt to influence one another through
communication in order to achieve their own ends (Dillard, Segrin, & Harden, 1989).
After all, "need satisfaction frequently involves changing the affects, cognitions, or
behaviors of others" (Dillard, Anderson & Knobloch, 2002, p. 425). In a marriage, the
role of communication is basic (Burleson & Denton, 1997): it is the underlying process
used to define, negotiate, and develop a relationship (Stewart, Stewart, Friedle, &

Cooper, 1991). The lives of individuals are made by their conversations with others, and their relationships are also constituted by the same means. Continuous interaction is important to developing and maintaining relationship satisfaction and intimacy. Often, though, men and women communicate differently, both because their goals vary, and their socio-cultural contexts are different.

Wood (1999) argues that studies of gender and communication have shown that men and women operate from dissimilar assumptions about the goals and strategies of communication. Research has shown that the practices and purposes of communication vary according to gender. Mair (1999), based on the work of several scholars (e.g., Belenky et al., 1986; Eisler, 1993; Gilligan, 1982; Glazer, 1997), offers a view of how masculine and feminine use of communication reflects gender differences. Mair states that males use communication to *fix* and *solve*, to establish status, to signal independence, and to convince. Females, on the other hand, use communication to *listen* and *respond*, to establish connection, to signal intimacy, and to seek understanding. Tannen's (1990) research in the U.S. shows that men often use communication to focus on manipulation for status in conversations, whereas women's communication is more often "attuned to the negotiation of connections" (p. 110).

Negotiation Request within the Relationship

These sorts of differences between how men and women communicate may affect how married couples negotiate and influence one another's management of the communication process. Weiss, Birchler, and Vincent (1974) define negotiation as "the process whereby initially divergent interests reach accord by means of trade, barter, or

15

any form of exchange" (p. 322). In order to negotiate, interactants need to express what they want through requests. Requests are considered a prototype for a broad class of related speech act types, such as commands, invitations, pleas, suggestions, prohibitions, and threats (Jacobs & Jackson, 1983). All of these requests count as attempts by speakers to get targets to perform actions once targets have recognized that an attempt has been made. The final goal is to achieve compliance to satisfy a need or desire of another person within a relationship.

According to Dillard, Anderson & Knobloch (2002), speech act theories have focused on the performative structure of requests and the ways in which requests are communicated. In the language of speech act theory "requests are *communicative speech acts,* meaning that their *intended illocutionary point* is to communicate the speaker's desire by means of the hearer recognizing the speaker's intention to express that desire" (p. 287). According to Jacobs and Jackson (1983), in analyzing how people are able to express and interpret speech acts, speech act theorists have focused on *indirect requests-utterances,* noticing that there is a discrepancy between the surface form and the illocutionary force (e.g., "Can you pass the salt?", "Why don't you give me some salt?", "I need some salt,". "I wonder if there's any salt," and "Is that a salt shaker over there?"). Although such utterances have an intention and can be taken to "count as" information questions and statements, they also may be intended and understood as requests given that "the interrogative and declarative surface forms suggest that the request force is not the literal meaning of the sentence" (p.288).

On the other hand, there are sentences in which the literal meaning of the surface form, for example, directly conveys the request force with imperatives (e.g., "Pass the salt!") or with explicit performatives (e.g., "I demand that you pass the salt!"). In any case, there is an identifiable range of strategic variation in the expression of an influence attempt, either in a direct or indirect form, given that "the assertion that influence attempts are *designed* to achieve compliance follows from the position that individuals seek to satisfy their needs and desires" (Dillard, Anderson & Knobloch, 2002, p. 426).

Gender roles, according to Shimanoff (1987), affect how requests are interpreted. For example, when tasks are more typically associated with males (e.g., fixing a car), males are more likely than females to provide help, and the reverse is true when tasks are frequently associated with females (e.g., clerical tasks). When a task requested is reasonably appropriate for both males and females to fulfill, the gender of the requester does not influence the effectiveness of the request, at least not when the requests are made between spouses and when the opportunity exists for reciprocation.

Reciprocation as Influence

Reciprocation is "one of the most potent of the weapons of influence around us … The 'rule of reciprocation' says that we should try to repay, in kind, what another person has provided us" (Cialdini, 2001, p. 20). Cialdini affirms that the rule of reciprocation is a unique property of human culture, which allows for the division of labor, the exchange of goods and services, and the creation of interdependencies. As members of society, we comply with and believe in this rule of reciprocation. When we do not live up to it, there are social sanctions and derision consequently, "because there is a general distaste for

17

those who take and make no effort to give in return, we will often go to great lengths to avoid being considered a moocher, ingrate, or freeloader" (p. 22).

Reciprocation can be used as a means for gaining compliance from another person. However, Cialdini (2001) argues that reciprocity is "unnecessary and undesirable in certain long-term relationships such as families or established friendships" (p. 35). Based on the work of Clark, Mills, & Corcoran (1989), Cialdini (2001) argues that in intimate relationships what counts in the reciprocation exchange is the willingness to give what the other needs when it is needed without calculating who has given more or less.

To this point, I have argued that in negotiation with another person one has to express a request, which, in some instances, may lead to a reciprocation exchange or compliance. The concepts of requests and reciprocation matter a great deal in the way couples negotiate their childrearing arrangements. Equally important is how each member of a relationship tries to influence their partners.

Interpersonal Influence Strategies

Jacobs and Jackson (1983) argue "conversationalists work their way through CIA (Conversational Influence Attempts) episodes by making complex, multi-level decisions about how to express an intent and about what intent has been expressed" (p. 299). The process of making someone comply with their requests involves (1) the strategies speakers use; (2) the likelihood that different strategies will be used given certain circumstances, and (3) the reasons the strategies are chosen (Shimanoff, 1987). In an interpersonal influence attempt, the use of different tactics varies as a function of the context and propensities of the interactants (Dillard, Anderson, & Knobloch, 2002). After

18

all, "the goal of the request maker is ultimately to get a target to perform a desired action or behavior" (Paulson & Roloff, 1997, p. 263).

According to Cataldi and Reardon (1996), researchers have attempted to create the taxonomy of the influence strategies used by males and females in their relationship with the opposite sex. Noting that the attempts to create influence taxonomies exist since the 1980s, Rhoads (1997) affirms that some think that we should be looking for basic, underlying dimensions to influence approaches, while others attempt to identify families or clusters of tactics, and still others attempt to collate the number of individual tactics that can be identified. Moreover, there has been criticism about the methodology used to derive the list and about the non-theoretical nature of the lists that result. However, the effort to create taxonomies has contributed to the understanding of social influence processes by providing a structure.

Influence Strategies in Intimate Relationships

Among the research on influence strategies that is relevant for its contributions is the work of Marwell and Schmitt (1967). The researchers constructed a questionnaire designed to elicit the respondents' likelihood of performing various types of compliance-gaining techniques in different situations. The data provided "strong support for the conceptualization of compliance-gaining techniques by general dimensions on the basis of use" (p. 364). Five factors, defined by different techniques, were extracted: 1) Rewarding activity: giving, liking, and promise; 2) Punishing activity: threat and aversive stimulation; 3) Expertise: positive and negative; 4) Activation of impersonal commitments: positive and negative self-esteem, positive and negative altercasting,

19

positive and negative esteem, and moral appeals, and 5) Activation of personal commitments: altruism, negative esteem, debt, and negative altercasting. Marwell and Schmitt found that there was a general correspondence between their factors and French and Raven's (1959) "bases of social power" concluding that individuals may separate classes of compliance-gaining techniques from one another primarily "in terms of the type of interpersonal power which is most relevant" (p. 365).

More than a decade later, Falbo and Peplau (1980) developed a taxonomy of influence strategies used in intimate relationships. The creation of this taxonomy has contributed to the understanding of interpersonal influence processes by providing a guide that allows researchers to study the basic dimensions of individual tactics of social influence. The results of their research yielded a typology of influencing strategies including: asking, bargaining, laissez-faire, negative affect, persistence, persuasion, positive affect, reasoning, stating importance, suggesting, talking, telling, and withdrawal. Their research generated a two-dimensional model of power strategies in intimate relationships; a model of interpersonal influence that has been used by subsequent researchers to classify or label influence strategies. These dimensions are the *directness* dimension, which ranges from direct ways of influence (e.g., talking, asking, telling) to indirect ways of influence (e.g., hinting, positive and negative affect, withdrawing), and the *interactive* dimension, which reflects whether a strategy is unilateral versus bilateral. This dimension is anchored at one end, by unilateral strategies, in which one person takes independent action by simply doing what she or he wants (e.g., withdrawal, laissez-faire, telling), and at the other end by bilateral strategies which

involve interaction between the partners (e.g., reasoning, bargaining, persuasion, positive affect). Among the findings of Falbo and Peplau's research was that "Individuals who are satisfied with their relationships are likely to use such direct tactics as asking, whereas less satisfied individuals are likely to use more indirect strategies, such as hinting" (p. 625).

Some studies investigating influencing strategies in intimate relationships have found differences in the reports of strategies used by men and women (e.g., Zwahr-Castro, Strenth, McDaniel, & Speed, 2004; Snell, 2001). Other studies have revealed that men make more influence attempts than women insofar as they try to take control over the situation and the target (e.g., van Knippenberg & Steensma, 2003). Yet other researchers have failed to find any gender differences (Beckman, Harvey, Satre, & Walker, 1999). These contradictions may be partly due to differences in measurement and sample characteristics (e.g., married couples vs. college students in dating relationships; native born white U.S. citizens vs. Mexican immigrants). In most studies, however, the association between influence strategies and various factors such as gender, resources, individual and contextual factors has been considered.

Zvonkovic, Schmiege, & Hall (1994), based on the work of Sexton and Pearlman (1986) on influence strategies and actual influence behaviors in dual-income and single-income couples, found no gender differences in influence strategies in regard to work-family decisions. However, their findings showed that direct influence strategies (e.g., reward, bargaining) were used when decisions directly affect the individual and his or her daily schedule. They also found, in regard to gender role ideology (i.e. the extent to

21

which partners have "traditional" versus "liberal" attitudes about the role of women in society), that when women get paid for their work and the couple shares liberal roles ideology, they are more likely to use direct influence strategies. Additionally, Snell (2001) found that as individuals interact in an intimate relationship, they express what they want out of the relationship, as well as how willing they are to respond to their partner's desires, and within this exchange process, there are different types of social influence strategies that partners use with an intimate partner. In a later research, Snell (2004) found that men who endorsed conventional stereotypes about male sexuality reported using unilateral types of power and avoidance strategies in their intimate relations. By contrast, women who reported more traditional views about male sexuality reported using indirect types of power strategies and both compliance and unilateral types of avoidance strategies with their intimate partners.

Moreover, influence strategies vary depending on the desired outcome. For example, in a study about influence strategies used by sexual partners to encourage condom use, Thornburn and Bird (2004) found that the strategies most frequently reported by U.S. couples were neither weak nor indirect. The influencing strategies reported by participants were verbal, and included (a) persuading their partner to use condoms or suggesting condom use, (b) commanding or asserting their desire for condom use, and (c) threatening to withhold sex if condoms were not used.

In a different vain, a small number of studies have examined the cultural context in which influence strategies are used (e.g., Beckman, Harvey, Satre & Walker, 1999; Oropesa, 1997; Zwahr-Castro, Strenth, McDaniel & Speed, 2004). Zwahr-Castro et al.

(2004) highlight gender differences in the power strategies Hispanic and non-Hispanic American men and women choose to use as well as in the strategies they perceive their significant others use. They found, in general, that women reported explaining how important issues were and crying if their partner did not concede. The women sample also reported that their partner's strategies involved doing what they wanted regardless of the woman's wishes. On the other hand, men perceived their partner's influence strategy as withdrawing ("the silent treatment"), hinting, and becoming affectionate in an attempt to influence outcomes. They did not find differences in the use of influence strategies between Hispanic and non-Hispanics.

Beckman, Harvey, Satre & Walker (1999) focused on Mexican culture. Their research objective was to explore and identified the cultural models of Mexican immigrant heterosexual couples concerning the influence strategies women and men are believed to use within their relationship. The study measured power strategies culturally specific to Mexican women and men (immigrant couples) by assessing influence strategies. Beckman et al., argue that even when traditional gender roles of Mexican couples seem to be accepted, they may be idealized in the larger social and cultural context. "There is evidence that on an individual level, some Mexican men and women may not necessarily believe in, strictly adhere to or abide by these norms" (p.875). They argue that, "if traditional gender norms were adhered to in Mexican intimate relationships, one might expect men and women to engage in different power strategies with men adopting strategies associated with the more powerful partner in a relationship" (p. 876). However, when they explored the influence strategies of Mexican couples, they

found that influence strategies used by each partners are "perceived as remarkably similar and with one exception (men are believed more likely to buy gifts for their partners) and do not support the assertion that men and women use different influence strategies because of power imbalances in their relationships" (p. 891).

In conclusion, making someone comply with their requests involves several factors such as the strategies speakers use, the likelihood that different strategies will be used given certain circumstances, and the reasons the strategies are chosen. In social relationships such as marriages, individuals attempt to influence one another through communication in order to achieve their own ends. Moreover, influence strategies will vary depending on the desired outcome of their communication. Several studies, like Falbo and Peplau's (1980), help us understand that these influence strategies may fall along dimensions of *directness*, which ranges from direct ways of influence (e.g., talking, asking, telling) to indirect ways of influence (e.g., hinting, positive and negative affect, withdrawing), and the *interactive* dimension, which reflects whether a strategy used by a person is unilateral versus bilateral. This is, whether one person takes independent action by simply doing what she or he wants (e.g., withdrawal, laissez-faire, telling), or the strategies involve interaction between the partners (e.g., reasoning, bargaining, persuasion, positive affect).

In some studies, influence strategies are instances of how power is exercised and how partners get what they want, within an intimate relationship. Further, other studies have shown that influence strategies are affected by factors such as gender and culture.

That is: the strategies individuals use to verbally communicate are guided by a definition of the situation within their own culture.

Communication and Cultural differences

Cultural differences are "individual differences that meaningfully affect communication" (Daly, 2001, p. 139), and although research on cultural differences has been explored from different perspectives, some researchers suggests that one of the dimensions along which national cultures differ has been called *masculinity*, with its opposite *femininity*, and it is a fundamental fact with which different societies cope in different ways (e.g., Hosftede, 2001). Hosftede refers to this dimension as the dominant gender role patterns in the majority of both traditional and modern societies; the patterns of male assertiveness and female nurturance in terms of behaviors. This dimension has an impact on cultural performance, since it shapes the way men and women from different cultural backgrounds communicate. Men are suppose to be assertive, competitive, and tough, while women are supposed to take the tender roles by being more concerned with taking care of the home, the children, and people in general.

Communication, culture and gender are interlinked, and interact in ongoing patterns (Wood, 1999). It is through language that individuals express their cultural views of gender and define it, leading to expectations about how men and women should act and communicate. Meanings of gender are conferred by society and are communicated "through structures and practices of cultural life that pervade our daily existence, creating the illusion that they are the natural, normal ways for women and men to be" (Wood, 1999, p. 29).

25

Some communication scholars (e.g., O'Keefe & Delia, 1990) argue that language is deeply interconnected with cultural practices and believe that some crucial features of the interrelationship of language, culture and communication should be clearly recognized. From O'Keefe and Delia's (1990) perspective, there is a deep connection between language use in the production of speech acts and the cultural context. That is, many events of speaking are organized by cultural knowledge. They argue that "each culture sets limits on the forms and functions of speech" (p. 31). Thus, the actors' strategies to verbally communicate are guided by a definition of the situation within their own culture, from which they can draw inferences concerning the other's probable behavior expectations. Furthermore, O'Keefe and Delia (1990) state that in order to be able to formulate a strategy for self-presentations and for casting the other into a desired role, some cultural considerations and abilities are needed:

> [T]he ability to tacitly recognize exactly what the socioculturally common understandings are in a given situation (so that interaction can proceed smoothly) and the ability to anticipate the other's reactions to alternative tactics (so that strategies designed to influence the other's view of the situation or self can be selected). In learning to organize and articulate complex communicative strategies, one must learn to coordinate communicative choices within a given speech event and adapt them together toward some end. In order to do this, one must both tacitly understand the shared cultural constraints on communication and be able

to erect, sustain, and adapt a cognitive assessment of the message recipient across interaction sequences (p. 32).

O'Keefe and Delia (1990) emphasize that "[e]ach communicative episode is framed or organized within alternative systems of deeply tacit expectations and beliefs acquired in acculturation" (p. 31) and affirm that somehow "*culture* has an impact on the habitual ways we see reality" (p. 36). In this sense, in learning a language, an individual learns the distinctions that the language encodes, and through his/her social perception capacities, is able to construct and organize goal-directed strategies in communication.

To understand how individuals from a specific cultural context use influence strategies within a marriage relationship, it is imperative to know the historical and social factors that make that specific culture unique or different from others. After including a summary of communication and cultural differences, next, I focus my research in terms of Mexican culture. In the next section, I present a general perspective about the country, such as the role of men and women in the Mexican household, and the participation of Mexican men and women in the labor market.

México

Since this study focuses on México, it is important to offer a historical and social background about this country. Data for this section were gathered from the INEGI (National Institute of Statistics and Geography, 2004 and 2005), the National Census (2002), as well as from the published work of different historians, scholars and researchers.

At the beginning of the 1900s, Mexican women were submissive, illiterate, and marginalized (Franco, 1999).

[B]asically, women dedicated themselves to take care of the home, to raise children, to manage the home, and even though there were more schools to educate women, the natural career for women was housewife, or in any case, those who had to go out of their homes became elementary school teachers (Collado, 1999, p.196).

Until the 1960s, Mexican society embraced traditional values, with social functions assigned to each of the members of the couple, based on the rigid division of work. The culture was founded on rigid and unquestionable values, with authoritarian and patriarchal ideological assumptions from which the roles that men and women could perform were established (Pozas Horcasitas, 1999). Starting in the 1960s, women in México were more active, not only in the work arena, but in attending universities as well. In this regard, for married women, secondary and postsecondary education increased the chances to enter the salaried sector when compared to self-employment. Research findings suggest "education is positively related to the propensity of being in a salaried occupation, perhaps as a result of the existence of less labor market discrimination for more experienced, more educated Mexican women" (Pagán & Sánchez, 2001, p. 219).

After the 1960s, there was a worldwide change in society. In México in particular, there was a cultural shift that supported greater equality between the sexes within society and the marriage. Since then, women have achieved great advances in

México's social and political life, reinforcing and holding the spaces traditionally reserved for males, perhaps as a result of less labor market discrimination as well as a greater availability of more experienced, and educated Mexican women (Pagán & Sánchez, 2001). Nationally, in three out of 10 couples, either both men and women have equal education, or women have higher levels than their partners (INEGI, Census 2000).

The Mexican Household

According to Bernard and Gruzinski (1996), the Spanish chroniclers of the sixteenth century did not use the word "family" at all, but instead used the words "kin" or "household" (*los de casa*) in their narratives, because these expressions reflected more accurately what they reported in regard to the Mexican (Aztec) way of living.

In ancient México, the concept of family in *nahua* (Aztec language) included in its vocabulary: *cencalli* (whole house), *cencaltin* (people of the same house), *cemithualtin* (people of the same house, of the same courtyard), *cenyeliztli* (people who are together), and *techan tlaca* (household). However, it basically implied a production and consumer group possessing a common residence. Today, in México the National Census, in general terms, defines household or domestic unit as:

> [A] group of people who share the same house and have a common income, mainly destined to feed them, with or without a kinship relation among them. Conventionally, one of the members is the head of the house, recognized by all the members as the head (*el jefe*). In our country, the responsibility and authority within the group is given above all, to the eldest person and from the masculine sex, who traditionally is the father and who becomes the head of the household.

This person, as a representative of the house, gives, along with the participation of the other members, specific traits to the group] (Mujeres y Hombres de México, 2004).

The fact that patriarchal culture prevails is because men become the "head" when they marry or cohabitate and women are seen as "head" only when there is no adult male present, generally due to separation, divorce or widowhood. This is due in part, to traditional female and male roles characteristic of a *machista* society, in which "within the family unit, the father is the undisputed authority figure" (Kras, 1995, p. 23).

Indeed, México has witnessed major demographic, social, and economic changes throughout the second half of the twentieth century, especially in the increased participation of the female labor force, which has transformed the roles that men and women have traditionally played (Katz & Correia, 2001). In 1970, 17 out of 100 women 12 years old and older participated in the market labor, and in 2004, 35 of every 100 women did (INEGI, 2004). According to INEGI (2005), in México, from the 25.4 millions of women who are mothers, 11.4 million (41.2 % of the total of Mexican mothers) work outside the home. However, although 37.5% of them are married or cohabitate, of every 100 working mothers, 99 of them do household tasks for the members of their family. The responsibility for household tasks, even today, almost exclusively belongs to women.

Why do women work?

In their research, Levee and Katz (2002) noted that in the past decade there has been a growing interest in the causes and consequences of the way in which household

labor is allocated. They conclude that "[a] large volume of research has focused on predictors of the allocation of household tasks, demonstrating its association with a host of factors including employment and relative earnings of husbands and wives, as well as cultural norms and beliefs" (p. 27). Women may work for economic reasons and against their personal convictions of the proper role of women. They also may do so because they want to express their egalitarian conviction (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1980). In either case, these new work-family arrangements, according to Edwards (2001), are defensive adjustments to a rapidly changing and unpredictable economy, which encourages families to adopt new postures related to work and family issues.

During economic downturns, the probability of loosing the job increases and real wages decrease. Since México does not offer labor income safety nets, the household must pull from its own resources to compensate for income losses. In México, since the primary caregiver is the woman, the type of work she chooses outside the home will depend on the income needs of the household and the role she plays in it.

> [I]f earnings needs are high, a primary caregiver may sacrifice some of her home responsibilities to enter a formal sector job that pays more but has very inflexible hours. On the other hand, if home care needs exceed earning needs, the caregiver would choose the more time-flexible informal wage or contract/piecework jobs (Cunningham, 2001, p. 88).

In this regard, according to Cunningham, Mexican wives seem to take into consideration household constraints when selecting a job. It seems that although large numbers of Mexican women are entering the labor force, they continue to face constraints on their

economic activities: "Constraints that are largely related to their household roles and responsibilities" (Katz & Correia, 2000, p. 1). Cunningham's (2001) research shows that women with young children are more likely to be informal entrepreneurs (i.e., owner of a firm with fewer than six employees), and according to Moon (2001), in México women's preference for part-time jobs, in contrast to full-time work, will persist as long as the burden of housework and child care continues to be laid on women.

Personal sensitivity of Mexican

To conclude this section about México, some personal characteristics and cultural traits of the Mexican people will be presented. Kras' (1995) research on the culture gives some understanding of how Mexicans think and feel. Her books are an effort to get a clearer picture of cultural differences, based on concepts accepted by anthropologists and cross-cultural communication specialists. The cultural trait that will be covered in this last section of the literature review is confrontation and loss of face. This specific trait was chosen given the topic of this study, which deals with face-to-face communicative interactions aimed to reach a response in a negotiating situation that, by no means, may be colored by its cultural nature.

According to Kras (1995), "Mexicans are extremely sensitive to the world around them and have a marked capacity to empathize with the people with whom they interact" (p. 30). Kras' research suggests that Mexicans tend to be skilled at avoiding confrontation and loss of face. "In potentially confrontational situations they strive to reach a consensus, where there are no outright winners or losers. They are also highly sensitive to criticism because of a deep emotional response to everything which affects them

personally…" (p. 30). This is a reason why Mexicans try to avoid situations that involve them in conflict or show them in a negative light. "The personal sensitivity of Mexicans is well-known… they need to resist saying outright, "You are wrong." Mexicans know perfectly well when they have made a mistake, but verbalizing it puts them to shame and is liable to make them withdraw." (p. 63). Like other cultures of the world, saving face is important for Mexicans. "Every response is conditioned by the need to avoid hurt feelings -one's own and other people. This frequently leads to evasive replies, half answers, and "white lies" (p. 63).

Research Questions

In summary, this literature review reveals that in most married Mexican couples with children, women still do the primary household and child-rearing chores even while working outside of the home. Although this pattern of work may be changing, the household task arrangements couples have requires an understanding of role theory and more particularly gender identity. Communication, and especially influence strategies, is vital for understanding how couples negotiate their household tasks and child-care arrangements. All of these variables—role theory, gender identity, communication, and influence—are affected by people's culture.

In this dissertation, I look at the assignment of household tasks in dual income couples in the Mexican culture. México is facing major changes in how families are organized. More and more women are working both outside and within the home. That change means that couples with children often must negotiate the roles each parent plays when it comes to housework. Where once the responsibility for household tasks and

33

child-rearing was mostly the province of women, now, with more women working outside the home men may be expected to play a more significant role within the home. In this dissertation, I probe how dual career Mexican couples negotiate their division of labor. I am interested in how each partner attempts to influence the other in regard to household tasks issues and how decisions about the division of labor reflect the gender role ideologies of México. While research has examined these sorts of issues in the United States and elsewhere, no research has looked at Mexican couples.

To organize this research I ask three research questions:

R1: What are the influence strategies Mexican men and women report using to negotiate with their partners in regard to household tasks in double- income households?

R2: What are the influence strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use to negotiate with them in regard to household tasks in double-income households?

R3: Are there differences between the responses of Mexican husbands and wives in regard to what they consider an effective influence strategy used by them and what they consider an effective influence strategy used by their partner?

Chapter 3: *Methodology*

This study focused on the influence strategies used by double-income couples to negotiate household labor. I am interested in how dual-income Mexican couples negotiate their division of labor tasks, and more specifically, in examining (a) the influence strategies Mexican men and women report using when negotiating tasks about household work with their partners, (b) the influence strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use when negotiating household tasks with them, and (c) the perceived effectiveness of the strategies people use to get their partner to do what they need/want, and to make them do what their partners need/want. To probe these concerns, this dissertation consisted of two inter-related studies. Both received IRB approval from the University of Texas at Austin.

Participants and Procedures

The first study was an interview project. The study population consisted of married dual-income Mexicans with at least one child. The subjects were questioned about how they influence and are influenced by their partners in regards to participating in household tasks. The sampling frame was generated via referrals from friends, family, and colleagues, and direct invitation from the researcher to participate in a study related to couples' communication about division of household labor. Once contacted, the invitation to participate consisted of informing the potential participants about the study goals, eligibility, and procedures, as well as the benefits of participating. Complete confidentiality and anonymity were assured, no names were required, and the data did not

contain identifying information that could be associated with the participants. Additionally, the audio-tapes were coded with no personal information. If interested, individuals were encouraged to set an interview appointment with the researcher. Over the period of a month, twenty- four individuals were interviewed.

Study I

I interviewed eleven males and thirteen females ($N = 24$) in person, in audio-taped sessions that lasted between 20 and 25 minutes. To qualify for this first study, people had to be married, live in a double-income household, and have children. My first goal was to know whether all individuals shared the definition of the term *household tasks*, and to identify the different strategies people use to encourage the contribution of the spouses in household tasks. The age of the participants ranged from 23 to 53 years old. The years of marriage ranged from 2 to 29 years, and the number of children ranged from one to four. All were born and raised in México, have a double-income married relationship, and have at least one child living at home.

The interview questions included asking the participants to define the concept of "household tasks," to describe the strategies they use the most to make their partners contribute to house work and their effectiveness, and to describe the main strategies they perceive their partner uses to make them participate in the house work and their effectiveness. To accomplish this, the interviews consisted of predefined questions that focused on the division of labor. After asking the participants to define household tasks (e.g., *"Please define the concept "household tasks." What do you think it includes?"*), they were instructed to place themselves in a household setting (e.g., *Do you ever talk about*

household tasks with your husband/wife? Remember the last time this topic was raised? What happened? What was your mood? Now think that you want your husband/wife to participate in household tasks. Tell me an influence strategy you use to make him/her contribute. What do you tell him/her in order to participate? Does this strategy always work? Do you think it is effective to get what you want/need? Why? Do you use other strategies? Now think that your husband/wife want you to participate in household tasks. What strategies does he/she use to make you contribute? What does he/she tell you to participate? Do you think this is effective to get what your partner wants/needs? Why? What other strategies does he/she use?)

These questions were used as prompts and I followed-up on the participants' responses to probe for further information. Additionally, demographic data were included, such as age, work schedule, years married, and number of children.

Results of Study I

The audiotaped interviews were transcribed word-for-word. The transcripts confirmed that all the participants agreed on the definition of household labor and that males and females understand the term. Within the responses, "household tasks" was conceptualized as: *All the everyday activities that happen within a home, related to the development, maintenance and the life of a group of people: general cleaning, cooking, doing laundry, paying bills, ironing, grocery shopping, plants and yard care, pet and child care.*

The process of getting the results from the qualitative data gathered from the interviews, started with coding the data. I highlighted the various influence strategies

37

individuals reported using, the ones they perceived their partners use to make them participate in household tasks, and their perceived effectiveness in both cases. Most of the participants themselves labeled their strategies or the strategies their partner uses, and provided examples of them. I tried to develop typologies, or classification schemes that could be useful in identifying themes (Taylor & Bogdan, 1998), looking for underlying similarities between them by relating different pieces of data to each other. Finally, the literature provided concepts and propositions that helped me interpret and classify the data.

I found that influence strategies reported by males typically included using direct and specific language (e.g., *You know what? We need to clean up this; What are we going to eat today? Help me with this while I'm doing that; Check if the baby has a dirty diaper, Tell the maid to do it*); indirect statements (e.g., *Look, this is full of dust. What can we do?*); joking/using sarcasm (e.g., *Hey, I don't have clean clothes. I'll wear the same as yesterday*), and showing affection (e.g., kissing, being especially nice when requesting, using love nicknames). Additionally, males reported that their wives' influence strategies used direct and specific language (e.g., *Help me clean the shower. When you have time, it would be nice if you would paint the fence.*); Indirect statements (e.g., *There are things that need to be ordered. I have been doing X for a long time so)*; joking/using sarcasm (e.g., *I almost fell because of the mess);* complaints (e.g., *I'm tired!*), and showing affection (e.g., *Chubby, let's pick up this mess.*).

In the same way, wives reported using, among other influence strategies to make their husbands contribute to the house work, direct and specific language (e.g., *Please*

help me out; I'm taking care of the baby and I have to fix supper; Because I work just like you, you have to participate in the house labor equally; The house is two-story. You clean up downstairs, I clean up upstairs, and do it as you want); indirect nonverbal statements (e.g., *I get mad. He sees my face and I say it all. I start doing things, and he starts doing other things.*); threats (e.g., *If you don't get involved, I quit my job*), and complaints (e.g., *I got up at seven to do the laundry, so it is your turn to fix breakfast and do the dishes.*). Also, females reported that they perceived that the strategies their husbands use to make them do house work included direct and specific language (e.g., *What are you doing for dinner?*); indirect statements (e.g., *The light bulb needs to be changed … look, there is no light; It would be delicious if you'd cook this*); being friendly (e.g., *I'm craving for X, but if you have time … if you want to cook it*), and playing the victim (e.g., *Sure, I always eat on the street … food that is not homemade … I want you, my wife, to cook for me*).

To determine which type of influence strategies are most commonly used, based on my own classification schemes, the influence literature and early models and typologies of influence and compliance-gaining strategies (i.e., Falbo and Peplau, 1980), seven of the strategies reported in the interviews, by males and females participants, were categorized and defined as shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Categorization and definition of influence strategies found in Study I based on early models and typologies of influence and compliance-gaining strategies.

Strategy	Definition
Direct request	The actor simply asks the target to comply. The actor makes a direct statement of desired outcome, or makes a simple request.
Reciprocation	The actor does something for the target if target will reciprocate.
Threat	The actor's proposed actions will have negative consequences. The actor will punish target if target does not comply.
Guilt/blame	Target's failure to comply results in automatic decreases of self-worth. The actor plays the victim/blames the target for how s/he feels.
Positive affect	The actor is friendly and helpful to get target in "good frame of mind" so that he will comply with request.
Suggesting	The actor makes suggestions or hints (verbally or nonverbally.)
Indirect request	The actor says or does something indirectly (verbally or nonverbally) to make target comply.

Seven additional strategies were identified in the interviews that are not typically found in typologies of influence. They were categorized and defined based on what Jacobs and Jackson (1983) argue regarding requests as speech act types, which have as a final goal to achieve compliance to satisfy a need or desire. The cultural setting in which this study was performed helped to label the strategies used by the participants, based on

the examples and explanations they provided, which guided the author to understand and organize complex communicative strategies into a categorization. This decision considered O'Keefe and Delia's (1990) arguments about how language is deeply interconnected with cultural practices and how an individual learns the distinctions that the language encodes "and through his/her social perception capacities, is able to construct and organize goal-directed strategies in communication" (p. 36).

The seven strategies found in the interviews, used by the males and females participants, were categorized and defined as shown in Table 3.2. These seven strategies, along with the seven shown in Table 3.1 will be used in the second study.

Table 3.2

Categorization and definition of influence strategies based on examples and explanations provided by participants.

Strategy	Definition
Delegate	The actor asks or assigns other target than husband/wife to comply with the request (e.g., Tell the maid/son/daughter to do it.)
Avoidance	The actor avoids doing/performing household tasks (e.g., I bought disposable china because without a maid washing dishes gets harder.)
Ignore	The actor does not say/do anything and lets things get bad (e.g., My spouse doesn't say a word and lets the mess pile up. My spouse just ignores the mess and does nothing.)
Role	The actor performs/assigns duties according to what is expected from the gender of the partner (e.g., I do what a man/woman is expected to do. You are my wife/husband. That's your job.)
Humor	The actor makes jokes about a household situation (e.g., I can write my name on the table because of the dust.).
Sarcasm	The actor uses irony or cynicism regarding a household situation (e.g., I almost fell because of all the mess on the floor.)
Modeling	The actor educates/guides target to do something (e.g., I start picking up the mess and my spouse knows it is clean up time.)

Results of Study II

The second study used the results of Study I to probe, via questionnaire, how couples influence and are influenced by their partners in regard to participating in household tasks, the relative frequency of use of the different strategies, and their perceived effectiveness. The study population consisted of married dual-income Mexican

couples who had at least two children and at least one attending daycare/childcare services. The sampling frame was generated through snowball sampling method, which refers to "the process of accumulation as each located subject suggests other subjects" (Babbie, 2001, p. 180) and it is used primarily for exploratory studies. The first participants were recruited by contacting them within the researcher's daycare network. A list of mothers were contacted via e-mail and asked if they would be willing to participate in a study related to couple's communication about division of labor. The e-mail informed the potential participants about the study goals, eligibility, and procedures, as well as the benefits of participating. If interested, they were encouraged to disclose their address in order to receive an envelope with two self-administered questionnaires: one to be answer by the wife and the other by the husband. They were also asked to refer in their response message other mothers who fit the participant profile and their contact e-mail address. This procedure was repeated and 170 questionnaires were distributed.

The three-page questionnaire (Appendix A) included a brief introductory letter (Appendix B) explaining the purpose of the study, contact information, and instructions for participating. The letter also urged them to complete the survey immediately if possible. Confidentiality and anonymity were assured to the participants, given that no personal information was required, and the questionnaires were collected via a third person or were sent directly to the researcher's office with no identifiable sender data.

After a four-week period, a second electronic message was sent as a reminder to all the individuals who agreed to participate, even to those who could have already returned their complete questionnaires. The deadline was extended for several days.

Within a nine-week period, of the 170 questionnaires that were distributed, 104 were returned for a response rate of 61 percent. Of the 104 returned, 92 questionnaires (88%) were acceptable and complete for analysis. It is worth noting that the sample goal was 100 participants (50 couples). With the response rate, the sample was reduced to 46 couples (92%). The reasons for the attrition rate were due to the absence of the husband's response, or not answering one of the pages of the questionnaire.

Design and Instrumentation

Since the study focused on individuals' reports, and perceptions of influence strategies used by them and their spouses to negotiate household tasks, it was appropriate to use self-reports instrument. The questionnaire was constructed to measure the following variables: equity of distribution of household tasks; happiness about how household tasks are distributed; marital satisfaction; self-reported influence strategies; partner's perceived influence strategies; perceived effectiveness of each influence strategy on the partner; and perceived effectiveness of each influence move on the participant. Additional data consisted of demographic information including gender, age, academic level, years married, number of children, their ages, number of children attending daycare, and work schedule (*full time, part time, or other*). With the exception of the demographic data, the question about equity in the distribution of household tasks, and the effectiveness of the strategies, items were measured on Likert-type scales. The questionnaire was designed as follows:

Equity in the distribution of household task

The first question after the demographics, asks participants if they think household tasks are equally distributed in their homes, using 1 = *yes,* 2 = *no.*

Happiness about the contribution their partner makes to household tasks

This variable was measured using a 5-point Likert-type scale (1= *very happy* to 5= *not happy at all*).

Marital Satisfaction

The marital opinion questionnaire by Huston, McHale, and Crouter (1986) followed the first two questions. This measure of relational satisfaction is used to obtain spouses overall evaluations of their marriage. Participants evaluate their marital life over the last two months, using a set of 11 items to describe it, using 7-point Likert-type scales. For example, if they think that their marital relationship has been very miserable, they put an X in the spaced right next to the word "miserable." If they think it has been very enjoyable, they place an X in the space right next to "enjoyable." Finally, if they think it has been somewhere in between, they place an X where they think it belongs in the continuum. A final question asks participants to place an X in the space that best describes how satisfied they have been with their marriage over the last two months, all things considered (*completely satisfied, neutral, completely dissatisfied*). To calculate the score for the marital satisfaction measure, two of the items, in line with Huston, et al., were dropped. The negative valenced items were recorded. Then responses to the eight items were averaged. The average score of those eight items (Cronbach´s alpha=.92) was then added to responses to the final item to create a measure of satisfaction.

45

Self-report influence strategies

On page number two, participants were asked to rate, using the 14 influence strategies (derived from Study I), how often they use each one (1 = *never*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *very often*, 5 = *always*). Participants read both a label for each strategy and an example.

Perceived partners' influence strategies

In page number three, participants were asked to rate, using the 14 influence strategies offered (again derived from Study I), how often their partner uses each one (1 = *never*, 2 = *rarely*, 3 = *sometimes*, 4 = *very often*, 5 = *always*)

Effectiveness of each self-report and perceived partner's strategies

Participants were asked to evaluate, after scoring the frequency of use of each self-report influence strategy, whether they considered the reported strategies as being effective or ineffective to make their partners do what they need/want by selecting 1 = *effective, or* 2 = *ineffective*. In the same way, in the last page, after scoring the frequency of each influence strategy they perceive their partners use, participants were asked whether they perceived these strategies were effective in making them contribute to household tasks by selecting 1 = *effective, or* 2 = *ineffective*.

An initial version of the questionnaire was pre-tested with a small convenience sample (*N* = 10) that did not participate in the study. This pre-test was performed with the purpose of identifying possible wording or translation problems, or difficulties understanding instructions. Once the necessary adjustments were made to the original questionnaire, it was distributed for actual data collection.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was developed computing means, frequencies, and standard deviations for each of the variables of interest for each research question. Additionally, analysis included Pearson product moment correlations for parametric variables, and Pearson chi-square for non-parametric variables to examine the interrelationships of variables, and t tests to examine whether mean differences were statistically significant.

Chapter 4: *Results*

The variables used in this study were measured with a total of 69 questions regarding self-reported and perceived partner's influence strategies, as well as perceived effectiveness and perceived partner's effectiveness of each influence strategy used to negotiate household tasks (see Appendix A). This study examined, in the Mexican cultural context: (a) the influence strategies Mexican men and women report using when negotiating roles about household work with their partners; (b) the influence strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use when negotiating roles with them; (c) whether spouses consider the reported strategies as being effective to make their partners do what they need/want; and (d) whether spouses perceive that the influence strategies used by their partners to make them do what they need/want are effective.

46 males and 46 females answered the questionnaire, representing 46 couples. The age range of the sample was from 25 to 46 years old ($M = 34.5$; $Mdn = 34$). In regard to their level of education only 1% of the sample holds a middle-high school degree; 8.7% holds a high school degree; 45.7% a college degree, and 44.6% a master's or Ph.D. degree. Years married range from 2 to 22 ($M = 7.23$; $Mdn = 7$); the number of children per marriage was one child, 43.5%; two children, 41.3%, and three children, 15.2%, and the age of the children ranged from two months to 17 years old. In regard to job status, in 92.4% of the cases both husband and wife work full time, and 7.6% part time. In relation to daycare use, 87% of the couples have one child attending daycare, 10.9% have two of their children attending daycare, and 2.2% have three of their children attending daycare.

Equity in the distribution of household tasks

To the question regarding whether household tasks are distributed equally within the home, 54.3% of women and 65.1% of men answered *yes*, there is equity in the distribution of household tasks in their home, while 45.7% of women and 34.9% of men answered *no*, there is no equity in the distribution of household tasks. In order to determine if the difference in proportions was significant, a chi-square test was performed. Results show that there is no significant difference in the responses both wives and husbands reported in regard to their perception of equity of the distribution of household tasks. Results are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1

Perception of equity of distribution of household tasks

Equity	Yes	No	X^2	df	p
Female, *n=46*	54.3%	45.7%			
			1.070	1	.301
Male, *n= 43*	65.1%	34.9%			

Happiness about partner's contribution to household tasks

This variable measured the degree of happiness that the participants feel in regard to their husband/wife's contribution to household tasks. The individuals scored their answers on a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*very* happy) to 5 (*not happy at* all). The lower they score, the happier they are. As the results indicate, in general, couples are very happy about the contribution each partner makes to the household (48%); happy

(33%), and somewhat happy (12%). Additionally none reported being *not happy at all* about the contribution of their partners to household tasks. Although the responses in general show that husbands (*M*= 1.51) are happier than wives (*M*= 1.85), in order to compare the answers of each of the two groups, and determine whether the mean differences were significant, an independent samples *t* test was computed. Results revealed that there are significant differences between male and female responses in the degree of happiness about the contribution each partner makes to the household: (*t* (87) = 1.96, *p* <.05). Table 4.2 presents the test of independent samples results.

Table 4.2

Happiness about partner's contribution to household tasks

	Males		Females		Total		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*t*	*p*
Happiness	1.51	.768	1.85	.842	1.69	1.96	.053

Participants scored their answers on a scale from 1 = *very happy* to 5 = *not happy at all*.

Marital Satisfaction

As I stated earlier, this measure of relational satisfaction is used to obtain spouses' overall evaluations of their marriage. The higher they score, the more satisfied they are. The individuals score their answer on a Likert-type scale that ranged from 1 (*very dissatisfied*) to 7 (*very satisfied*). As the results indicate, in general, participants in this study are very satisfied couples. Results reveal that their scores are high, as shown in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Marital Satisfaction mean scores

N	M	SD	Missing Values	Minimum	Maximum
88	6.46	.646	4	5	7

Participants evaluated their marital life over the last two months, using a 7-point Likert-type Scale where 1 = *very dissatisfied* and 7 = *very satisfied*.

Research Questions

Three research questions are posed in this study. Question one asked: *What are the influence strategies Mexican men and women report using to negotiate with their partners in regard to household tasks in double-income households?* Data for this question was collected from the questionnaire section that asked the participants to indicate, from the list of 14 different types of strategies, how frequently they use each one of them to make their partners participate in household tasks. Respondents rated their answers using a scale where 1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4= very often, and 5= always. Results show that in general, among the strategies men and women use, the one that is used more often is *Positive affect* (*M* = 3.38), and the least used strategy is *Threat* (*M* = 1.32). However, in order to compare the answers of each of the two groups, and determine whether the mean differences were significant in regard to the strategy they use, a series of independent sample *t* test was computed. The test of independent samples results revealed that there are significant differences between male and female responses in the use of the following influence strategies: *Reciprocation* (*t* (90) =2.01, *p*<.05); *Direct request* (*t* (90) =3.55, *p*<.05); *Role* (*t* (90) =-2.23, *p*<.05); *Suggest* (*t* (90) = 3.03,

51

p<.05), and *Guilt* (*t* (90) =2.35, *p*<.05). These results show that females report using these strategies more than males do, probably because they consider them more effective; males, on the other hand, use the *Role* strategy. Table 4.4 presents the test of independent samples results of self-reported frequency of use of influence strategies to make partner contribute to household tasks.

Table 4.4
Gender differences in frequency of use of influence communication strategies

| Strategy | Male | | Female | | Total | | |
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*t*	*p*
Positive affect	3.30	1.07	3.45	1.09	3.38	.675	.501
Modeling	2.96	1.38	3.39	1.22	3.17	1.60	.435
Reciprocation	2.78	1.09	3.26	1.18	3.02	2.01	.021
Direct Request	2.59	1.13	3.41	1.11	3.00	3.55	.001
Role	2.96	1.53	2.30	1.26	2.63	-2.23	.029
Indirect request	2.33	1.06	2.59	1.10	2.45	1.16	.250
Suggest	2.02	1.11	2.76	1.23	2.39	3.03	.003
Avoid	2.13	1.10	2.30	1.07	2.21	.750	.455
Delegate	2.22	1.29	2.02	1.10	2.11	-.778	.438
Guilt	1.76	.970	2.28	1.15	2.02	2.35	.021
Humor	1.78	.892	1.74	.801	1.76	-.246	.806
Sarcasm	1.57	.719	1.76	.873	1.66	1.17	.244
Ignore	1.50	.782	1.58	.892	1.53	.443	.659
Threat	1.28	.750	1.37	.771	1.32	.548	.585

Participants scored frequency of use on a scale from 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some times, 4 = very often, to 5 = always.

Question two asked: *What are the influence strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use to negotiate with them in regard to household tasks in double-*

income households? Data for this question was collected from the questionnaire section that asked the participants to indicate, from the list of 14 different types of strategies, how frequently they perceive their partners use each one of them to make them contribute to household tasks. Respondents rated their answers using a scale where 1= never, 2= rarely, 3= sometimes, 4= very often, and 5= always.

Results show that in overall, the strategy that men and women perceive their partners use most frequently to make them contribute to housework is *Positive affect* (*M* = 3.21), and the least used of the strategies is *Threat* (*M* = 1.40). However, in order to compare the answers of each of the two groups, and determine whether there are significant differences in their responses in regard to their perceived strategies, a series of independent sample *t* tests were computed. The test of independent samples results revealed significant differences between male and female responses regarding what they perceive as the influence strategies their partner uses more often to make the other contribute to house work in the following strategies: *Reciprocation* (*t* (90) =-2.17, *p*<.05), *Suggest* (*t* (89) =-2.25, *p*<.05), *Guilt* (*t* (90) =-2.07, *p*<.05); *Ignore* (*t* (90) =3.01, *p*<.01), and *Threat* (*t* (90) =-2.35, *p*<.05).

Table 4.5 shows the mean scores for partners' perceived frequency of use of influence strategies to make husband/wife contribute to household tasks.

Table 4.5

Gender differences in perceived partner's frequency of use of influence communication strategies to make husband/wife contribute to household task

Strategy	Male		Female		Total		
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*t*	*P*
Positive affect	3.21	1.17	3.17	1.08	3.21	-.186	.854
Modeling	3.26	1.37	2.93	1.34	3.09	-1.15	.252
Reciprocation	3.11	1.26	2.59	1.02	2.85	-2.17	.033
Role	2.84	1.46	2.78	1.56	2.81	-.196	.846
Direct request	2.95	1.28	2.54	1.12	2.75	-1.00	.319
Indirect request	2.61	1.12	2.37	1.02	2.49	-1.64	.105
Suggest	2.50	1.18	2.00	1.08	2.25	-2.09	.039
Delegate	2.28	1.25	2.45	1.37	2.36	.632	.529
Avoid	2.15	1.07	2.45	1.24	2.30	1.26	.212
Guilt	2.26	1.25	1.74	1.16	2.00	-2.07	.041
Humor	1.65	.794	1.78	.964	1.71	.708	.481
Ignore	1.39	.613	2.00	1.22	1.69	3.01	.003
Sarcasm	1.73	.854	1.58	.908	1.66	-.827	.410
Threat	1.60	1.06	1.19	.542	1.40	-2.35	.021

Participants scored frequency of use on a scale from 1 = never, 2 = rarely, 3 = some times, 4 = very often, to 5 = always.

The third and final research question asked: *Are there differences between the responses of husbands and wives in regard to what they consider an effective influence strategy used by them and what they consider an effective influence strategy used by their partners?*

To answer this question, after scoring the frequency of use of each influence strategy, participants were asked to evaluate whether they considered each strategy as effective to make their partners do what they need/want. In order to determine whether males and females are different on whether they consider a strategy effective, a Chi-Square analysis was computed.

Although this research question had several missing values, given that some participants failed to rate the effectiveness of the strategies, results show that from the 14 influence strategies couples use to make partner contribute to household tasks *Positive affect* was viewed as most effective (91%), and the least effective strategy was *Ignore* (17%). There are no significant differences between females and males in regard to the self-reported effectiveness of each influence communication strategy used to make the partner contribute to household tasks. However, the *Direct request* and *Avoid* strategies could be considered significant in this exploratory study with a less conservative criterion. Table 4.6 presents the results that show the self-reported effectiveness of each influence strategy used to make partner contribute to household tasks.

Table 4.6

Self-reported effectiveness of each influence communication strategy used to make partner contribute to household tasks

Strategy	Effectiveness					
	Male	Female	Total %	X_2	*df*	p
Positive affect, n=88	93	89	91	0.455	1	.500
Reciprocation, n=88	84	87	85	0.152	1	.697
Direct request, n=88	73	87	81	3.572	1	.059
Modeling, n=88	77	75	76	0.063	1	.803
Indirect request, n=88	58	60	59	0.031	1	.859
Role, n=82	57	58	57	0.010	1	.922
Delegate, n=82	54	59	56	0.198	1	.656
Suggest, n=85	42	60	51	2.652	1	.103
Avoid, n=85	36	56	46	3.457	1	.063
Humor, n=79	38	46	42	0.498	1	.480
Guilt, n=84	24	38	31	2.005	1	.157
Sarcasm, n=81	17	23	20	0.524	1	.469
Threat, n=76	18	22	20	.267	1	.606
Ignore, n=77	17	17	17	0.002	1	.962

Overall estimate of effectiveness obtained from the opinion of those participants who rated the strategy as effective.

Additionally, after rating the degree to which each strategy was perceived to be

effective, participants were asked whether they perceived these strategies were effective

in making them contribute to household tasks, when used by their partners. Again, in order to determine whether males and females are different on whether they consider a strategy used by their partners as effective, another Chi-Square analysis was computed. Although this research question also had several missing values, given that some participants failed to rate the effectiveness of the strategies, results show that from the 14 influence strategies couples perceive their partners use to make them contribute to household tasks, in general, participants agreed that *Positive affect* (83%) was the most perceived effective strategy and *Threat* (13%) was the least perceived effective strategy. Results also show that the strategies where males and females were significantly different at *p*<.05 in perceived effectiveness were *Avoid* and *Humor*. Wives rated avoiding or using humor to be more effective when their husbands use them in comparison to what husbands thought were effective when used on them by their wives.

Table 4.6 presents the results that show the self-reported effectiveness of each influence strategy used to make partner contribute to household tasks.

Table 4.7

Perceived effectiveness of each influence strategy used by partner to make husband/wife contribute to household tasks

	Effectiveness					
Strategy	Male	Female	Total %	$X2$	*Df*	p
Positive affect, n= 88	84	87	83	.386	1	.534
Reciprocation, n=87	79	91	80	2.398	1	.121
Direct request, n=86	75	86	75	1.555	1	.212
Modeling, n=86	73	83	73	1.404	1	.236
Indirect request, n=87	55	72	60	2.880	1	.090
Role, n=84	61	51	51	.728	1	.394
Delegate, n=83	54	60	51	.291	1	.590
Avoid, n=83	38	63	46	5.321	1	.021
Suggest, n=81	52	46	44	.322	1	.570
Humor, n=77	32	56	36	4.452	1	.035
Guilt, n=82	36	40	34	0.084	1	.772
Sarcasm, n=75	28	37	26	.798	1	.372
Ignore, n= 80	23	25	21	.069	1	.793
Threat, n=77	15	17	13	.060	1	.806

Overall estimate of effectiveness obtained from the opinion of those participants who rated the strategies as effective.

Supplemental Analysis

Next, a correlation analysis was performed to find the relationship between what men say they do and what women think men do. Results from the correlation showed a significant and positive relationship between the strategies used by husbands and the ones perceived by their wives in the following strategies: *Positive affect r* (44) =.53, *p< .01; Modeling r* (44) =.38, *p< .01; Reciprocation: r* (44) =.47, *p< .01; Role: r* (44) =.40, *p< .01; Avoid: r* (43) =.47, *p< .01; Delegate: r* (44) =.58, *p< .01; Guilt: r* (44) =.30, *p< .01; Ignore: r* (44) =.51, *p< .01*, and *Threat: r* (44) =.46, *p< .01:* This suggests that there is some degree of agreement between husbands and wives about what men use. Results are shown in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8

Correlations of strategies used by husbands perceived by wives

Strategies used by husbands	Strategies perceived by wives	(*df*)
Positive affect	.53**	44
Modeling	.38**	44
Reciprocation	.47**	44
Direct Request	.09	44
Role	.40**	44
Indirect request	.17	44
Suggest	.24	43
Avoid	.47**	43
Delegate	.58**	44
Guilt	.30**	44
Humor	.28	44
Sarcasm	-.08	44
Ignore	.51**	44
Threat	.46**	44

** $p < .01$

Next, a second correlation analysis was performed to find the relationship between what women say they do and what men think women do. Results demonstrated a significant and positive relationship between the strategies used by wives and the ones perceived by their husbands in the following strategies: *Positive affect r* (44) =.50, *p<* .01; *Modeling r* (44) =.36, *p<* .05; *Reciprocation: r* (44) =.54, *p<* .01; *Direct request: r* (44) = .29, *p < .05; Role: r* (44) =.40, *p<* .05; *Suggest: r* (44) =.66, *p<* .01; *Avoid: r* (44) =.62, *p<* .01; *Delegate: r* (44) =.38, *p<* .01; *Guilt: r* (44) =.52, *p<* .01; *Humor: r* (44) =.45, *p<* .01, and *Threat: r* (44) =.42, *p<* .01. This suggests that there was some

agreement between husbands and wives about the relative use of the different strategies

by. Table 4.9 presents the results.

Table 4.9

Correlations of strategies used by wives perceived by husbands

Strategies used by wives	Strategies perceived by husbands	(*df*)
Positive affect	.50**	44
Modeling	.36*	44
Reciprocation	.54**	44
Direct Request	.29*	44
Role	.31*	43
Indirect request	.16	44
Suggest	.66**	44
Avoid	.62**	44
Delegate	.38**	44
Guilt	.52**	44
Humor	.45**	44
Sarcasm	.24	44
Ignore	.27	43
Threat	.42**	44

** $p < .01$

Finally, once the three research questions were answered, I proceeded to run an additional analysis examined the role of marital satisfaction (collected in the first page of the questionnaire) in the use of self-reported strategies for influencing partners and the role of marital satisfaction in the perceived partner's strategies for influencing. As explained in Chapter 3, this measure of relational satisfaction by Huston, McHale, and Crouter (1986) was used to obtain spouses overall evaluations of their marriage. It was

included considering Falbo and Peplau's (1980) findings that personal satisfaction in a relationship is significantly associated with the use of direct strategies.

A correlation analysis was run to test relationships between marital satisfaction and self-reported influence strategies to make partner contribute to household tasks. Results show that there were negative and significant relationships between marital satisfaction and the following strategies: *Ignore* (r (87) = -.39, $p<01$)*, Threat* (r (88) = -.35 $p<.01$)*, Guilt* (r (88) = -.39, $p<.01$)*, Role* (r (88) = -.25, $p<.05$), *and Indirect Request* (r (88)= -.24, $p<.05$)*.* These results indicate that the less this type of strategies is used by the participants of this study, the more satisfied in their relationship these couples are.

Table 4.10 shows correlation results between marital satisfaction and self-report influence strategies.

Table 4.10

Correlations between Marital Satisfaction and self-report Influence Strategies

Self-report Influence Strategy	Marital Satisfaction
Positive affect	.01
Modeling	-.12
Reciprocation	-.16
Direct Request	-.08
Role	-.25 *
Indirect Request	-.24 *
Suggest	-.03
Avoid	-.16
Delegate	-.04
Guilt	-.29**
Humor	-.19
Sarcasm	-.17
Ignore	-.39**
Threat	-.35 **

** p<.01 * p<.05

Finally, a correlation analysis was performed between marital satisfaction and perceived partner's influence strategies. The results show that there were negative and significant relationships between marital satisfaction and the following strategies: *Threat (r (88) = -.38, p<.01), Humor (r (88) = -.35, p<.01), Guilt (r (88) = -.34, p<.01), Indirect Request (r (88) = -.34, p<.01), and Sarcasm (r (88) = -.33, p<.01).* These results indicate

that the less the partners perceive the use of these strategies by the other, the more satisfied they are in their relationship. Table 4.11 presents the results.

Table 4.11
Correlations between Marital Satisfaction and perceived partner's Influence strategies

Variable	
Perceived Influence Strategy	Marital Satisfaction
Positive affect	.01
Modeling	-.11
Reciprocation	-.25*
Direct Request	-.09
Role	-.25*
Indirect Request	-.34 **
Suggest	-.31**
Avoid	-.14
Delegate	-.20
Guilt	-.34 **
Humor	-.35 **
Sarcasm	-.33 **
Ignore	-.15
Threat	-.38**

** p<.01 * p<.05

It is important to note that the magnitude of these correlations may be inflated. There is likely some dependency in the data since the respondents are married to one another. This dependency often increases the size of relationship. Thus, this supplemental analysis needs to be interpreted very cautiously.

Chapter 5: *Discussion*

Summary of findings

This exploratory study generated several interesting findings in regard to influence communication strategies in the Mexican household. As discussed in Chapter I, dual income couples are the result of an increase in the educational level of women, philosophical changes about the role of women, and the growth in women's employment (Edwards, 2001). These trends apply to the Mexican household, in which the change in gender roles started during the 1960s, and have had an impact on the traditional division of labor paradigm of breadwinners and housewives. In this study, the sample was composed of 92 participants. Nearly all of the men and women (90%) had an undergraduate, master's or Ph.D. degree.

Equity in the distribution of household tasks

Concerning equity in the distribution of household tasks, this study found, contrary to what it was expected, that most couples generally perceive that there is some degree of equity in regard to how household tasks are distributed within their homes. According to Artis and Pavalko (2002), the shift in work patterns initially led scholars to predict a parallel decrease in women's household labor in order to move to a more equitable division of labor within and outside the household. In this study, results show that although more men than women reported perceived equity, in reality there is not a difference of perceptions about this issue. Our roles are socially constructed patterns of behavior and sets of expectations (Turner & West, 2000), and we need to consider the contextual differences to understand the division of household processes (Davis &

Greenstein, 2004). In this sense, the concept of equity can be taken in different ways, since the sample of this study is double-income couples with children, and both husbands and wives may take care of different household tasks resulting in a sense of equity.

Mexican society traditionally embraced conservative roles that dictated the functions of each member of the couple. These conservative gender roles were based on rigid and unquestionable values with presumptions about the proper roles of men and women. However, since the 1960s México has experienced profound social changes that support equality between the sexes, not only within civil society, but also within the marriage (Pagán & Sánchez, 2001). These changes have clearly had an impact in the social, economic, political, and educational spheres, and the information gathered in this sample, although not representative of the entire Mexican population, leads us to think that men and women have reached perceived household equity given the tendencies toward greater sharing of household work in families.

This social phenomenon of gender symmetries within this specific population has economic implications, since the biological and relational constraints of the past are not limiting, but efficiently allowing couples to participate fully within the labor market, and advance in their professional careers.

The results in this sample portray the idea that dual income Mexican couples may not maintain traditional gender-oriented when it comes to the division of household labor, perhaps because of their level of education. The level of education this sample reported may influence how they perceive division of labor: well educated people may have a better appreciation of changing roles and the sense of perceived equity is probably quite

important in helping couples successfully maintain their roles as parents and professionals.

Happiness about partner's contribution to household tasks

In the same vein, the degree of happiness the participants report feeling in regard to their partner's contribution to household work is high. Results show that in general, the couples participating in this study feel happy about the contribution of husbands and wives to household tasks. One explanation could be that since they have a sense of equity within their household, each one is happy about each other's contributions, no matter what kind of contribution they make (e.g., cooking, taking care of the children, paying the bills). Even when social norms and customs determine the roles that women and men have in the family and the community, and they dictate the type of work considered appropriate for women and men (The World Bank, 2001), these systems of gender norms vary across and within cultures; across and within households. In this sample, social norms may create powerful guidelines for people's behavior as spouses, parents, citizens, and workers. However, given the changes in their society, their level of education, and their working situation, the contribution of each spouse within the household may result in this feeling of happiness about what each other does regardless of their partners' actual contribution to household work.

Marital Satisfaction

A high marital satisfaction mean was reported. Couples in this sample are very satisfied with their relationship, which can give some light into the reasons why they

agree there is equity in the distributions of household tasks and are very happy about the contributions their partners do in this regard.

Self- report strategies to make partner contribute to household tasks

In this study, both males and females reported *positive affect* as their most likely way to influencing their partners. According to research literature on influence, in this type of strategy the actor is friendly and helpful to get the target in "good frame of mind" so that he or she will comply with requests.

Contrary to what Zvonkovic, Schmiege, & Hall (1994) found in regard to the couple's gender role ideology (i.e. the extent to which partners have "traditional" versus "liberal" attitudes about the role of women in society), in this study 41% of women used *direct request* (e.g., asking, telling) compared to 25% of men; and a sizeable number of women used forms of asking *indirectly* (e.g., using positive affect 42%; suggesting 26%, using guilt 21%, or modeling 45%). This also suggests that Beckman et al.'s (1999) findings in their study is present in today's society: that even when traditional gender roles of Mexican couples seem to be accepted, they may be idealized in the larger social and cultural context, and both men and women feel free to use any type of influence strategy that is not tied to the traditional gender role of the couple, socially assigned, at least in this kind of well educated sample.

Additionally, there were gender differences in the use of influence strategies. Males prefer using *role* as their strategy more than women, probably because they think it is useful, and it yields expected results. Females, on the other hand, reported using a

variety of strategies, different than their husbands'. The strategies that were significantly different were *Reciprocation*, *Direct request*, *Role, Suggest*, and *Guilt*.

However, both men and women rated *threat,* the strategy in which the actor's proposed actions will have negative consequences or target will be punished if it does not comply, as the least preferred method for influencing. This could set them in a "bad frame or mind" and a negative attitude to comply. This explanation is consistent with the findings that point out *threat* as the strategy both husbands and wives perceived as the least likely influence strategy they would use with each other.

Strategies Mexican men and women perceive their partners use more frequently to make them contribute to housework

Zwahr-Castro, Strenth, McDaniel and Speed (2004) study found that Hispanic (and non-Hispanic) women reported that their partner's strategies involved doing what they wanted regardless of the woman's wishes; on the other hand, men perceived their partner's influence strategy as withdrawing. Contrary to these findings, results of this study point out that the strategy perceived as the most common used by partners is *positive affect.* A possible explanation for this could be demographics. The sample used in the current study lives in highly industrialized Monterrey, México, has a higher level of education, and probably is more communicatively competent than the samples used in other studies. The sample was also composed of couples who are very satisfied in their relationships.

In this study, women highlight the use of more than one strategy, and their husbands perceive it. Overall, partners perceive *positive affect* as the main influence

strategy from each other, but differ in their perceptions about the use each one does of *Reciprocation, Suggest, Guilt, Ignore*, and *Threat*. On the other hand, wives did report using more often *Modeling, Reciprocation,* and *Direct request,* and husbands only perceive a difference in how often they use *Reciprocation.* It is interesting to see how women as well as men highlighted differences in perception of more strategies than the ones they think they actually use.

Neither *Sarcasm* nor *Threat* was reported as being used by either gender as a strategy of influence. Considering what researchers have found as "Mexican" traits, if Mexicans are extremely sensitive to the world around them, empathize with the people with whom they interact, and tend to be skilled at avoiding confrontation and loss of face, it is most likely that they will avoid sarcasm or threats. Moreover, if their marital satisfaction is high, they will strive to reach a consensus, since they are also highly sensitive to criticism because of a deep emotional response to everything that affects them personally (Kras, 1995). They will try to avoid situations that involve them in conflict or show them in a negative light, since saving face is important for Mexicans.

Differences between the responses of husbands and wives to what is used and what are perceived to be effective

Most of the participants agreed that *Positive affect* is the most effective influence communication strategy. The most ineffective strategy to make partners contribute to household tasks is *Ignore* (i.e., the actor does not say/do anything and lets things get bad, for example, *My spouse doesn't say a word and lets the mess pile up. My spouse just ignores the mess and does nothing*). Results suggest that for Mexican couples, showing

71

affection rather than ignoring each other would yield better results not only to make the other comply, but for the sake of the relationship. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) support this idea when affirming that many people do not use strategies like ignoring, among other reasons, like ignoring are not explicit ways for requesting. In other words, although *ignoring* is included in the repertoire of strategies, participants understand that it is a strategy that is not effective and therefore it is seldom used with caution.

Relationship between strategies used by husbands and perceived by wives and vice versa

As it was shown, the analysis of the relationship between strategies husbands reported using and perceived by wives had only moderate to low associations. One explanation can be attributed to the sample size. There may not be enough statistical power to do a more precise analysis of the relationship between the variables; this also could attenuate the relationship between variables.

Of course, husbands and wives may use all the strategies at specific moments. This does not mean that all of the strategies are effective, however. For example, the most aggressive, or negative strategies, such as *threat, ignore* or *sarcasm* are the ones they seldom report using, nor do they perceive their partners use against them perhaps, because they may be the worse way to influence each other. In fact, the literature does not offer studies in which partners within a satisfied intimate relationship use them.

Marital satisfaction and self-report influence strategies

Based on Falbo and Peplau's (1980) taxonomy of influence strategies used in intimate relationships, most strategies used by Mexican males and females fall into the *interactive* dimension within the *bilateral strategies.* This is the use of interaction

between partners (e.g., positive affect, modeling, reciprocation). Thus, while the authors affirm that the directness dimension (i.e., use of direct ways of influence such as talking, asking, or telling) is most strongly associated with satisfaction in the relationship, in this high satisfied sample the *interactive* dimension (i.e., *positive affect* strategy) was the more common choice of people. However, as noted in the Results chapter, even when the only positive relationship between marital satisfaction and self-reported influence strategy was *positive affect* it was not statistically significant. But, this study shows that there is a negative and significant relationship between marital satisfaction and the following strategies: *Guilt, Indirect Request, Threat, Role, and Ignore*, suggesting that the more satisfied these couples are in their relationship, the less likely each one of these strategies are used as means to make partners contribute to household tasks. One possible explanation could be that these influence communication strategies are considered negative, or in some way, aggressive strategies that may lead to discomfort, dissatisfaction, or harm.

Marital satisfaction and perceived partner's influence strategies

The results show that there is a negative and significant relationship between marital satisfaction and the perception that one's partner was using *Threat*, *Humor*, *Guilt*, *Indirect Request*, *and Sarcasm*. The more satisfied with the relationship, the less likely husbands and wives perceive their partners use any of the strategies mentioned above to make them contribute to household tasks.

Conclusions

The findings of this research hold important and interesting implications for the study of communication in intimate relationships and the study of the Mexican culture in regard to household division of labor. This study explored the range of influence communication strategies involved in the enactment of behaviors related to negotiating roles in the division of household labor in Mexican double-income couples.

First, the results provided evidence that differences in self-report and perceived influence communication strategies do not exist between Mexican males and females in a double-income marriage in a similar or equal level of education and work schedule.

Second, this study did not find significant gender differences in regard to used and perceived *Positive affect* as an influence strategy. Although some conditions may explain these findings, such as educational level or job status, it is worth noting that all participants understood today's conceptualization of household labor.

Limitations of the study

One of the main limitations of this exploratory study is the relatively high level of education of participants in the sample. Most of them hold a Master's or Ph.D. degrees. Another limitation was the sample size. Also, generalization cannot be assumed for all Mexican dual income couples, since the sample for this study was drawn from the Northwestern part of México. As a complex culture, people from México may have different traits depending on their state and particular town of origin. For example, Nuevo León and Monterrey are industrial and prosperous states, where dual income professional

class couples are prevalent. In other regions of México, dual career couples may have other cultural factors to negotiate.

This study examined couples in general, without considering life-cycle variables related to age (i.e. as people get older what is their tendency to make use of different influence strategies); time in the relationship (i.e., years of marriage); characteristics of the family composition (i.e., young, married individuals, with pre-school children may use different strategies than those used by couples with longer marriages), or general financial and social resources.

Another limitation of the study worth examining in future scholarship is the dynamic of socioeconomic variables, which can help to identify not only the type of influence strategies, but also the intensity and combination of influence strategies couples use and perceive from each other. Data collected from this sample of husbands and wives did not consider a socioeconomic determinant, which could have given some light into how people from different economic strata use communication as an influence mean to negotiate household tasks. Moreover, the percentage of income contributed by the wife and by the husband was not asked. Situational and attitude determinants were also not considered. The use of influence communication strategies may depend on the situation the individual is experiencing at the moment (e.g., being tired, feed up, desperate, sick), or the feelings towards the task (e.g., she/he hates to do it; she/he does it all the time).

Methodologically, there are of potential limitations. For instance, there is a strong likelihood of some degree of social desirability in people´s responses both in *Study I* as well as *Study II*. People who were willing to complete this questionnaire may be much

75

happier than people who were unwilling. I have a difficult time believing that all Mexican couples are as happy as those in this sample. These results may actually not be representative of the entire Mexican population. A second limitation is the measure equity. It might have been wiser to have people respond on a continuum ranging from "very equitable" to "very inequitable" rather than offering them a simple "yes" or "no". Additionally, the assumption that men and women would interpret the words used in the study the same way may be questioned. For example, what a woman may see as "ignoring" could simply be irrelevant to the male. Finally, the correlational analysis of the relationship between marital satisfaction of choice of influence tactics needs to be carefully interpreted because of the potential dependencies in the data. The appropriate procedures (e.g., analyzing males and females separately) were not done because of challenges I faced in the software I used for data analysis.

Future studies

The direction for future studies in Mexican families about communication within the household may turn to the consideration of issues related to socioeconomic factors, age, education, and how these influence couple communication in regard to division of labor. Studies focusing on communication of wives' perception of confidence in husband's ability to care for children or to take care of household tasks, as well as studies related to how communication within family members is affected when both parents work could be useful. Another factor that is worth additional attention is the question of power in the relationship. Although the results show that in this sample of Mexican couples the influence strategies used and perceived were found to be similar, the study

does not explore the assertion that men and women use different influence strategies because of power imbalances in their relationships. Also, if men and women have ways to make partner contribute to household tasks and they are satisfied with their relationship, what are other ways to ask for help than being nice to their partners? Assuming that asking for something in a positive manner will lead to an affirmative response and knowing that household tasks usually represent an effort, husbands and wives know that in order to get them done that strategy seems to be the most effective to use.

I believe that since women have increasingly moved into the paid labor force resulting in more dual-income families replacing the traditional pattern of breadwinner and housewife, another direction for future studies could be how these changes have affected communication about the relationship itself, for example: How do feelings about role competency, role ideology, and role efficacy are communicated within a double-income marriage? This study also opens the door to different types of research about message interpretation, specifically those related to support and control within an intimate relationship. Finally, another line of research could focus on gender and communication, since gender role identity probably is more important than biological sex.

Appendix A

Questionnaires (English and Spanish)

Gender: F ___ M ___	Age: _____	Years married: _____	**Code:**

Number of children: _____   Age of children: _____   Number of children in daycare center: _____
Employment status: Full time____ Part Time ____ Hours_____ Other   Education: High School___ College ___ Master's ___ Ph.D____

Communication and the Division of Household tasks

1. Do you think that household tasks at you home are fairly distributed?   Yes   No

2. How happy are you with the contribution your partner makes to household tasks?   Very Happy   Not at all

We would like you to think about your marital life over the last two months, and use the following words and phrases to describe it. For example, if you think that your marital relationship during the last two months has been very miserable, put an X in the space right next to the word "miserable."
If you think it has been very enjoyable, put an x in the space right next to "enjoyable." If you think it has been somewhere in between, put an X where you think it belongs. PUT AN X IN ONE SPACE ON EVERY LINE.

In the last two months my marital life has been:

Miserable	Enjoyable
Hopeful	Discouraging
Free	Tied down
Empty	Full
Interesting	Boring
Rewarding	Disappointing
Doesn't give me much chance	Brings out the best of me
Lonely	Friendly
Hard	Easy
Worthwhile	Useless

All things considered, how satisfied or dissatisfied have you been with your marriage over the last two months?
PLACE AN X IN THE SPACE THAT BEST DESCRIBES HOW SATISFIED YOU HAVE BEEN.

Completely satisfied   Completely dissatisfied
Neutral

Down below you will find a list of different ways (strategies) people might seek the help of their spouses in household work. For each, please indicate HOW OFTEN YOU USE EACH STRATEGY AND HOW EFFECTIVE YOU BELIEVE EACH IS FOR GETTING YOUR SPOUSE TO CONTRIBUTE TO HOUSEHOLD TASKS.

STRATEGY	DEFINITION AND EXAMPLE	HOW OFTEN YOU DO YOU USE IT? Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	How effective you believe it is for getting your spouse to contribute to HH tasks? EFFECTIVE INEFFECTIVE
Guilt	**Plays the victim/blames on the other how bad s/he feels** *"The house is a mess because nobody helps me"*		
Indirect Request	**Says or does something indirectly, so the other does it** *"Don't you think it would be good to get the kitchen cleaned up?"*		
Reciprocation	**Does something if the other does something else** *"I'll sweep and mop while you take care of the kids"*		
Threat	**Warns to do something negative if what is requested is not done** *"If you don't help me, I quit my job."*		
Delegate	**Asks or assigns others to do it.** *"Tell the maid/son/daughter to do it."*		
Role	**Does something according to what is expected from the gender.** *"I do what a man/woman is expected to do."*		
Avoidance	**Avoids doing household tasks** *"I bought disposable ware because without a made washing dishes gets harder"*		
Direct Request	**Asks, demands or orders** *"Help me picking up the trash."*		
Humor	**Makes jokes about a household situation** ***"I can write my name on the table (because of the dust)"***		
Sarcasm	**Uses irony or cynicism.** *"The house is so clean, we could have guests."*		
Hint	**Verbal/Nonverbally raises the issue indirectly** *"I get mad and with my face I say it all to my spouse"*		
Ignore	**Doesn't say anything and let it get bad** *"My spouse doesn't say a word and lets the mess to pile up."*		
Positive Affect	**Is especially nice** (hugs, kisses, tone of voice) **when requesting** *"Honey, could you help me with this?"*		
Modeling	**Educates/ guides, so others do something** *"I Start picking up the mess and my spouse knows it is clean up time."*		

Down below you will find a list of different ways (strategies) people might seek the help of their spouses in household work. For each, please indicate HOW OFTEN <u>YOUR SPOUSE USES EACH STRATEGY</u> AND <u>HOW EFFECTIVE YOU BELIEVE EACH IS FOR GETTING YOU</u> TO CONTRIBUTE TO HOUSEHOLD TASKS.

STRATEGY	DEFINITION AND EXAMPLE	HOW OFTEN YOU DO YOU USE IT? Never Rarely Sometimes Often Always	How effective you believe it is for getting your spouse to contribute to HH tasks? EFFECTIVE INEFFECTIVE
Guilt	**Plays the victim/blames on the other how bad s/he feels** *"The house is a mess because nobody helps me"*		
Indirect Request	**Says or does something indirectly, so the other does it** *"Don't you think it would be good to get the kitchen cleaned up?"*		
Reciprocati on	**Does something if the other does something else** *"I'll sweep and mop while you take care of the kids"*		
Threat	**Warns to do something negative if what is requested is not done** *"If you don't help me, I quit my job."*		
Delegate	**Asks or assigns others to do it.** *"Tell the maid/son/daughter to do it."*		
Role	**Does something according to what is expected from the gender.** *"I do what a man/woman is expected to do."*		
Avoidance	**Avoids doing household tasks** *"I bought disposable ware because without a made washing dishes gets harder"*		
Direct Request	**Asks, demands or orders** *"Help me picking up the trash."*		
Humor	**Makes jokes about a household situation** *"I can write my name on the table (because of the dust)"*		
Sarcasm	**Uses irony or cynicism.** *"The house is so clean, we could have guests."*		
Hint	**Verbal/Nonverbally raises the issue indirectly** *"I get mad and with my face I say it all to my spouse"*		
Ignore	**Doesn't say anything and let it get bad** *"My spouse doesn't say a word and lets the mess to pile up."*		
Positive Affect	**Is especially nice** (hugs, kisses, tone of voice) when requesting *"Honey, could you help me with this?"*		
Modeling	**Educates/ guides, so others do something** *"I Start picking up the mess and my spouse knows it is clean up time."*		

Sexo: F ___ M ___   Edad: _____   **Código:**

Años de casado: _____   Número de hijos: _____ Edades de los hijos: _____No. de hijos en guardería: _____ Tipo de empleo: Tiempo completo___½ tiempo___ otro: _____ Educación: Preparatoria ___ Profesional___ Maestría___ Ph.D__

Comunicación y División de las labores del hogar

1. ¿Cree usted que las labores domésticas en su hogar están distribuidas de forma equitativa?   Sí   No

2. ¿Qué tan feliz está usted con la contribución que su pareja hace a las labores domésticas?   Muy feliz   Nada feliz

Nos gustaría que pensara en su vida matrimonial de los últimos dos meses y que usara las siguientes palabras y frases para describirla. Por ejemplo, si usted piensa que su vida matrimonial durante los últimos dos meses ha sido muy miserable, marque con una X en el espacio enseguida de la palabra "miserable". Si piensa que ha sido muy placentera, marque con una X en el espacio enseguida de la palabra "placentera". Si piensa que no ha sido ni tan miserable ni tan placentera, marque con una X donde crea que corresponda.

Marque con una X en un espacio en cada línea.

En los últimos dos meses mi vida matrimonial ha sido:

	Placentera
Miserable	
Prometedora	Desalentadora
Con libertad	Sin libertad
Vacía	Plena
Interesante	Aburrida
Satisfactoria	Decepcionante
No me permite dar lo major de mí	Me permite dar lo major de mí
Solitaria	Amigable
Difícil	Fácil
Valiosa/provechosa	Vana/Improductiva

Considerando todo lo anterior, marque con una X en el espacio que mejor describa qué tan satisfecho ha estado con su matrimonio en los últimos dos mese

Completamente satisfecho   Completamente insatisfecho

Neutral

Abajo encontrará una lista de las diferentes formas (estrategias) y posibles ejemplos con los que las personas pueden buscar la ayuda de su pareja para las labores domésticas. Para cada una: *INDIQUE QUÉ TAN SEGUIDO* <u>USA USTED</u> *CADA UNA y QUÉ TAN EFECTIVA ES LA ESTRATEGIA PARA* <u>HACER QUE SU PAREJA</u> *PARTICIPE..*

Estrategia	Definición y Ejemplo	¿Qué tan seguido la usa? Nunca Rara A veces A menudo Siempre vez	¿Es o no es efectiva para hacer que su pareja contribuya a las labores del hogar? EFECTIVA INEFECTIVA
Culpa	**Responsabiliza o atribuye a otro lo mal que se siente.** "*La casa está tirada porque nadie ayuda*"		
Petición indirecta	**Dice o hace algo de forma indirecta para que el otro lo haga.** "*¿No crees que sería bueno recoger la cocina?*"		
Intercambio	**Dice que hará algo si la otra persona hace otra cosa.** "*¿Por qué no cuida al bebé mientras yo barro y trapeo?*"		
Amenaza	**Le advierte con algo negativo si no hace lo que pide.** "*Si no me ayudas me salgo de trabajar.*"		
Delegar	**Pide o encomienda a otro que haga algo.** "*Dile a la criada/ hijo/ hijo que lo haga.*"		
Rol	**Hace lo que le corresponda de acuerdo a su género.** "*Yo hago lo que se espera que un hombre/ mujer haga.*"		
Eludir	**Evade o evita hacer el trabajo de la casa.** "*Compré desechables porque sin muchacha está difícil la lavada de platos.*"		
Petición directa	**Solicita, demanda u ordena que se haga algo en la casa** "*Ayúdame a tender la ropa.*"		
Humor	**Hace bromas sobre algún evento o situación de la casa** "*Puedo escribir mi nombre sobre esta mesa (por el polvo encima)*"		
Sarcasmo	**Dice con ironía o cinismo algo sobre la casa.** "*La casa está como para recibir visitas.*"		
Indicio	**Sugiere algo verbal o no verbalmente de forma indirecta.** "*Me enojo, mi pareja ve mi cara y con eso digo todo.*"		
Ignorar	**Se desentiende de lo que sucede en casa** "*Mi pareja no dice nada y deja que las cosas empeoren.*"		
Afecto	Uso de señales afectivas o palabras cariñosas cuando pide algo. "*Corazón ¿me ayudas con la cena?*"		
Modelaje	**Educa/ guía para que otros hagan algo.** "*Empiezo a recoger la casa y mi pareja ya sabe que es hora de hacer limpieza.*"		

**Abajo encontrará una lista de las diferentes formas (estrategias) y posibles ejemplos con los que las personas pueden buscar la ayuda de su pareja para las labores domésticas. Para cada una: *INDIQUE QUÉ TAN SEGUIDO* USA SU PAREJA *CADA UNA y QUÉ TAN EFECTIVA ES LA ESTRATEGIA PARA* HACER QUE USTED *PARTICIPE.*

Estrategia	Definición y Ejemplo	¿Qué tan seguido la usa?	¿Es o no es efectiva para hacer que USTED contribuya a las labores del hogar?
		Nunca Rara A veces A menudo Siempre vez	EFECTIVA INEFECTIVA
Culpa	**Responsabiliza o atribuye a otro lo mal que se siente.** *"La casa está tirada porque nadie ayuda"*		
Petición indirecta	**Dice o hace algo de forma indirecta para que el otro lo haga.** *"¿No crees que sería bueno recoger la cocina?"*		
Intercambio	**Dice que hará algo si la otra persona hace otra cosa.** *"¿Por qué no cuida al bebé mientras yo barro y trapeo?"*		
Amenaza	**Le advierte con algo negativo si no hace lo que pide.** *"Si no me ayudas me salgo de trabajar."*		
Delegar	**Pide o encomienda a otro que haga algo.** *"Dile a la criada/ hijo/ hijo que lo haga."*		
Rol	**Hace lo que le corresponda de acuerdo a su género.** *"Yo hago lo que se espera que un hombre/ mujer haga."*		
Eludir	**Evade o evita hacer el trabajo de la casa.** *"Compré desechables porque sin muchacha está difícil la lavada de platos."*		
Petición directa	**Solicita, demanda u ordena que se haga algo en la casa** *"Ayúdame a tender la ropa."*		
Humor	**Hace bromas sobre algún evento o situación de la casa** *"Puedo escribir mi nombre sobre esta mesa (por el polvo encima)"*		
Sarcasmo	**Dice con ironía o cinismo algo sobre la casa.** *"La casa está como para recibir visitas."*		
Indicio	**Sugiere algo verbal o no verbalmente de forma indirecta.** *"Me enojo, mi pareja ve mi cara y con eso digo todo."*		
Ignorar	**Se desentiende de lo que sucede en casa** *"Mi pareja no dice nada y deja que las cosas empeoren."*		
Afecto	Uso de señales afectivas o palabras cariñosas cuando pide algo. *"Corazón ¿me ayudas con la cena?"*		
Modelaje	**Educa/ guía para que otros hagan algo.** *"Empiezo a recoger la casa y mi pareja ya sabe que es hora de hacer limpieza."*		

Appendix B

Presentation of the study and consent letter (English and Spanish)

Communication and the Division of Household Labor

Thank you for participating in this research project about spouses communication and division of household labor.

The purpose of this study is to identify what are the influence strategies married Mexican men and women report using to negotiate roles with their spouses in regard to household tasks in double-income households; what are the influence strategies you perceive your spouse uses to negotiate roles with you, and what are the differences between Mexican men and women to make their partners do what they need/want.

YOUR PARTICIPATION IS TOTALLY AND COMPLETELY VOLUNTARY, ANONIMOUS, AND CONFIDENTIAL
Data contained in the answers will contain no identifying information that could associate you with, or with your participation in any study.

The questionnaire enclosed includes questions that evaluate the influence strategies you use with your spouse to negotiate household tasks and your perception about the strategies your spouse uses with you. Additionally, the questionnaire includes questions in regard to life together as a marriage, as well as demographic information.
It will take you 20 to 23 minutes to answer it.

* PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONNAIRE _INDIVIDUALLY._

When you are done, please keep the questionnaire in the envelope provided and seal it to the address below.

Should you have any question about this research project contact:
Ma. Eugenia González Alafita mega@itesm.mx
Centro de Investigación en Comunicación
Departamento de Comunicación y Periodismo
ITESM Campus Monterrey CIAP 304- D Tel. 8358-2000 ext. 4553

Comunicación y División de las labores del hogar

Usted ha sido invitado a participar en un proyecto de investigación sobre la comunicación de pareja y la división de las labores del hogar.

El propósito de este estudio es identificar cuáles son las estrategias que los hombres y las mujeres mexicanas reportan para negociar roles con sus parejas en cuanto a las labores domésticas en matrimonios de doble ingreso y cuáles estrategias percibe que su pareja utiliza para negociar con usted.

SU PARTICIPACIÓN ES TOTAL Y COMPLETAMENTE ANÓNIMA Y CONFIDENCIAL
Los datos recolectados no tendrán ninguna información de identificación que lo pueda asociar con usted o con su participación en este estudio.

El cuestionario anexo incluye preguntas que evalúan las estrategias de influencia que usa con su pareja para negociar las labores domésticas y su percepción de las estrategias que su pareja utiliza con usted.
Adicionalmente, el cuestionario incluye preguntas referentes a la vida de pareja e información demográfica.
Contestarlo le tomará quince minutos aproximadamente.

POR FAVOR CONTESTE EL CUESTIONARIO DE FORMA _INDIVIDUAL._

AL TERMINAR, INTRODUZCA EL CUESTIONARIO EN EL SOBRE CORRESPONDIENTE Y CIÉRRELO.

Si tiene alguna duda, favor de comunicarse con:
Ma. Eugenia González Alafita
Centro de Investigación en Comunicación
Departamento de Comunicación y Periodismo
ITESM Campus Monterrey CIAP 304- D Tel. 8358-2000 ext. 4553

References

Artis, J. E. & Pavalko, E. K. (2002). Explaining the decline in women's household labor: Individual change and cohort differences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 65,* 746-761.

Babbie, E.R. (2001). *The practice of social research.* 9th. Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Beckman, L. J., Harvey, S. M., Satre, S. J., & Walker, M. A. (1999). Cultural beliefs about social influence strategies of Mexican immigrant women and their heterosexual partners. *Sex Roles, 40,* 871-892.

Bernand, C., & Gruzinski, S. (1996). Children of the apocalypse: The family in Meso-Zonabend. In *A History of the Family. Volume Two. The Impact of Modernity* (pp. 161-215). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bernardo, D., Shenan, C., & Leslie, G. (1987). Determinants of fathers' participation in family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*

Bianchi, S. M., Milkie, M.A., Sayer, L. C., & Robinson, J., P. (2000). Is anyone doing the housework? Trends in the gender division of household labor. *Social Forces, 79,* 191.228.

Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. (1960). *Husbands and wives.* New York: Free Press.

Bonney, J. F., Kelley, M. L., & Levant, R. F. (1999). A model of fathers' behavioral involvement in child care in dual-earner families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 13,* 401-415.

Brines, J. (1993). The exchange value of housework. *Rationality & Society, 5,* 302- 341.

Cano, N. (2006). Es un homenaje a las amas de casa: Ortiz. *El Universal.*Mexico City. Retrieved: 17/04/2007 http://0proquest.umi.com.millenium.itesm.mx:80/pqdweb?did=974314861&sid=1&Fmt=3&clienteld=23693&RQT=309&VName=PQD.

Cataldi, A.E. & Rardon, R. (1996). Gender, interpersonal orientation, and manipulation tactic use in close relationships. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research.* Retrieved August 15, 2005, from: http://www.parentsurf.com/p/articles/mi_m2294/is_n3-4_v35/ai_19027736

Cialdini, R., B. (2001). *Influence. Science and Practice.* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage and the Family,62,* 1208-1233.

Collado, M. C. (1999). Usos y costumbres. In J. Gutiérrez Vivó (Coord.). *El mexicano y su siglo. Las transformaciones de un país y sus habitantes a lo largo de cien años* (pp. 195-216). México, D. F.: Océano.

Cunninghan, V. (2001). Breadwinner versus caregiver. Labor force participation and sectorial choice over the Mexican business cycle. In E. G. Katz & M. C. Correia (Eds.). *The economics of gender in México. Work, family, and market* (pp. 85-129).

Daly, J. A. (2002). Personality and interpersonal communication. In M.L. Knapp and Daly, J. A. (Eds.) *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication.* 3rd. ed. (pp.133-180). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Davis, S., N., & Greenstein, T., N. (2004). Cross-National variations in the division of household labor. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 66,* 1260-1271.

Dillard, J. P., Segrin, C., & Harden, J. M. (1989). Primary and secondary goals in the production of interpersonal influence messages. *Communication Monographs, 56,*19-37.

Dillard, J. P., Kinney, T.A., & Cruz, M. G. (1996). Influence, appraisal, and emotions in close relationships. *Communication Monographs, 63,* 105-130.

Dillard, J. P., Anderson, J. W., & Knobloch, L. K. (2002). Interpersonal Influence. In M.L. Knapp & Daly, J.A. Eds. *Handbook of Interpersonal Communication (pp. 425-474).* 3rd. Ed. Thousand Oaks:Sage.

Duxbury, L., & Higgins, C. (1994). Work-family conflict: A comparison by gender, family type, and perceived control. *Journal of Family Issues, 15,* 449-467.

Edwards, M. E. (2001). Uncertainty and the rise of the work-family dilemma. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63,* 183-196.

Edwards, R. (1998). The effects of gender, gender role, and values on the interpretation of messages. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 17.* 52-71.

Falbo, T., & Peplau, L., A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38,* 618-628.

Franco, P. (1999). Development-Mexico. Women conquer important social spaces. Interpress Service. December 30. *Global Information Network*.

Frank, R. A., Kromlow, S., Helford, M. C., & Harding, C. (2004). Primary caregiving father families: Do they differ in division of child care and housework? Retrieved January 2004 from http://www.slowlane.com/research/FAMJOU.html

Friedman, S. D., & Greenhaus, J. H. (2000). Work and Family. Allies or enemies? What happens when business professionals confront life choices. Oxford, NY: Oxford University Press.

Galinsky, E., Bond, J. T., & Friedman, D. E. (1993). *The changing workforce: Highlights of the national study.* New York: Morrow.

Gentry, J. W., Suraj, C., & Sunkyu, J. (2003). *Review of literature on gender in the family.* Academy of Marketing Science. Available on line: http//0-gateway.proquest.com.millennium.itesm.mx

Gerstel, N., & Gallagher, S. K. (2001). Men's care-giving: Gender and the contingent character of care. *Gender and Society, 15,* 197-217.

Glosario de Términos Básicos sobre Género. (1999). CONMUJER

Greenhaus, J. H., & Parasunaman, S. (1999). Research on work, family, and gender. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work,* pp. 391-426.

Googins, B. K. (1989). *Work/family conflicts. Private lives-public responses.* New York, NY: Auburn House.

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift.* New York, NT: Viking Press.

Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Cultures consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations.* 2nd. Ed. Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Holder, D. P., & Anderson, C. M. (1989). Women, work, and the family. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and the work* (pp.3-16). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hook, J. (2003). *Reconsidering the division of household labor: Incorporating volunteer work and informal support.* Retrieved, February, 12, 2004, from http://depts.washington.edu/crfam/WorkingPapers/Hook.pdf

Houston, T. L., McHale, S. M., & Crouter, A. C. (1968). Changes in the marital relationship during the first year of marriage. In R. Gilmour & S. Duck (Eds.). *The emerging field of personal relationships* (pp. 109-132). Hillsdale, NJ:Eribaum.

Hundley , G. (2001). Division of labor and self/organizationally employed differences in job attitudes and earnings. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues, 22,* 121-139.

INEGI (2004). *Mujeres y hombres en Mexico 2004* (8ª edicion). Aguascalientes, Ags. Mexico, 2004.

INM- Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres (2004). *Reporte de Labores 2003-2004.* México.

INM- Instituto Nacional de las Mujeres (2000). *Programa nacional para la igualdad de oportunidades y no-discriminación contra las mujeres 2000-2006,* México, D. F.

INEGI-STPS. *Encuesta Nacional de Empleo, 2002.* Aguascalientes, Ags. México, 2003.

Jacobs, S., & Jackson, S. (1983). Strategy and structure in conversational influence attempts. *Communication Monographs, 50,* 285-304.

Katz, E. G. & Correia, M. C. (2001). *The economics of gender in México. Work, family, and market.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

King, E., M. & Mason, Andrew, D. (2001). *Engendering development. Through gender equality in rights, recourses, and voice.* The World Bank policy research report: Oxford University Press.

Kluwer, E. S., Heesink, J. A. M., & Van de Vliert, E. (2002). The division of labor across the transition to parenthood: A justice perspective. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 64,* 930- 944.

Kras, E.S. (1995).*Management in two cultures: Bridging the gap between U.S. and Mexican managers.* Yarmouth, Me. Intercultural Press.

Kromlow,S., Touris, M., & Harding, C. (1990). The role of the father in the development of stranger sociability during the second year. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 60.*

Lavee, Y., & Katz, R. (2002). Division of labor, perceived fariness and marital quality: The effect of gender ideology. *Journal of Marriage and Family,64,* 27-40.

Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). *Gender roles and power.* Englewood Cliffs, NL: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Lord, W. A. (2002). *Household dynamics. Economic growth and policy.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Maier, M. (1999). On the gendered substructure of organization. Dimensions and

dilemmas of corporate masculinity. In G. N. Powell (Ed.), *Handbook of gender and work,* (pp. 69-93). Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Maldonado Martínez, I. (1993). Como a través de la bruma (notas acerca del género masculino). In I. Maldonado Martínez, I. (Coord.) *Familias: Una historia siempre nueva (pp. 47-59).* México: Porrúa.

Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D., R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. *Sociometry*, *31*, 350-364.

Milkie, M. A., Bianchi, S., M., Mattingly, M. J., & Robinson, J. P. (2002). Gendered division of childrearing: Ideals, realities, and the relationship to parental well-being. *Sex Roles, 47,* 21-38.

Moon, Y. J. (2001). Women's employment policies in OECD countries. *Women's Studies Forum, 17.*

O'Keefe, B. J., & Delia, J. G. (1990). Language and Communication. In G.L. Dahnke, C. Fernandez-Collado, & G.W. Clatterbuck (Eds.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., (pp. 23-49).

Pagán, J. A. y Sánchez, S. M. (2001). Gender issues in workforce participation and self-employment in rural México. In E. G. Katz, & M.C. Correia (Eds.), *The economics of gender in México. Work, family, and marker (pp. 204-224).* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Paulson, G. D., & Roloff, M. E. (1997). The effect of request form and content on constructing obstacles to compliance. *Communication Research, 24,* 261-290.

Pozas Horcasitas, R. (1999). La familia en el nuevo entorno. In J. Gutiérrez Vivó (Coord.) *El mexicano y su siglo. Las transformaciones de un país y sus habitantes a lo largo de cien años* México, D.F: Océano, (pp.185-216). México, D. F.: Instituto Federal Electoral: Instituto de Investigaciones Sociales, UNAM.

Rapoport, D. & Rapoport D. (1977). *Dual-career families re-examined. New integration of work and family.* New York: Harper & Row.

Rhoads, K. (1997). Working Psychology. Introduction to influence. Retrieved: August 2, 2005 from: http://www.workingpsychology.com/definit.html

Robinson, W., C. (1987). The time cost of children and other household production. *Population Studies, 41,* 313-323.

Shelton, B.A., & John, D. (1996). The division of household labor. *Annual Review of Sociology, 22,* 299-322.

Shellenberger, S. & Hoffman, S. S. (1995). The changing family-work system. In R. H. Mikesell & D. Lusterman (Eds.), *Integrating Family Therapy: Handbook of family psychology and systems theory.* (pp. 461-478). Washington, DC: APA.

Schenk-Hamlin, W., J., Wiseman, R. L., & Georgacarakos, G., N. (1982). A model of properties of compliance-gaining strategies. *Communication Quarterly, 30*, 92-100.

Schorr, M. (2004). *Division of Household Chores Affects Marital Bliss.* (Reuters, Health) Retrieved January, 18, 2004, from http://preventdisease.com/news/articles/household_chores_affect_marital_bliss.shtml1

Segalen, M. (1992). *Antropología histórica de la familia.* España: Taurus Universitaria.

Shimanoff, S. (1987). Types of emotional disclosure and request compliance between spouses. *Communication Monographs, 54,* 85-100.

Snell, W. E. (2001). Chapter 9: Stereotypes about male sexuality and the use of social influence strategies in intimate relationships. In W.E. Snell, Jr. (Ed.), *New Directions in the psychology of human sexuality: Research and theory.* Cape Girardeau, MO: Snell Publications.

Stewart, L. P., Stewart, A. D., Friedley, S. A., & Cooper, P. J. (1990). *Communication between the sexes. Sex differences and sex-role stereotypes.* (2nd Ed.). Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand. Women and men in conversation.* New York: Ballantine.

Thompson, L., & Walker, A. G. (1989). Gender of attachment and stranger sociability in infancy. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51.*

Thornburn Bird, S. (2004). Getting your partner to use condoms: Interviews with men and women at risk of HIV/STDs. Retrieved August 12, 2005 from: http://www.sextherapy.co.uk/article/Getting-your-partner-to-use-condoms: interviews-with-men-and-women-at-Risk-of-HI_352.html

Turner, & West (2000). *Perspectives on Family Communication.* 2nd ed. Boston: McGraw Hill.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1998). *Introduction to qualitative research methods. A guidebook and resource.* 3rd. Ed. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Van Knippenberg, B., & Steensma, H. 2003. Future Interaction expectation and the use of soft and hard influence tactics. *Applied Psychology, 52,* 55-67.

Voydanoff, P. (1989). Work and family: A review and expanded conceptualization. In E. B. Goldsmith (Ed.), *Work and family. Theory, research, and applications* (pp.1-17).

Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
Weiss, R. L., Birchler, G. R., & Vincent, J. P. (1974). Contractual models for negotiation training in marital dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 321-330.

Wood, J. T. (1999). *Gendered lives. Communication, gender and culture.* 3rd. Ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Zvonkovic, A., M., Schmiege, C., J., & Hall, L. D. (1994). Influence strategies used when couples make work-family decisions and their importance for marital satisfaction. *Family Relations, 24,* 182-188.

Zwarh-Castro, J. R., Strenth, C. T., McDaniel, M.J., & Speed, J. (2004). The influence of gender and ethnicity in close romantic relationships. Paper presented at the 50th Annual Convention of the Southern Psychological Association. Retrieved August 12, 2005 from https://www.swpsych.org/programs.heitm1?ref=926%year2004

VITA

Ma. Eugenia González Alafita received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Tecnológico de Monterrey, Querétaro, México, in 1985. In 1988 she received the degree of Master of Arts from Western Illinois University, Macomb, IL. During 1990 and 1997 she was a professor in the Communication and Journalism Department at Tecnológico de Monterrey, Campus Monterrey. In August 2000, she entered the Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent home address: Plaza San Marcos 5600, Jardines del Paseo, Monterrey, N.L. México. 648920

Mail address: 2365- J, Monterrey, N.L. México. 64841

This manuscript was typed by the author.