

379
N81d
no. 3958

WOMEN AND MEN IN CENTRAL APPALACHIA: A QUALITATIVE STUDY
OF MARITAL POWER

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Jennifer Mae Burns Dabbs, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1994

379
N81d
no. 3958

WOMEN AND MEN IN CENTRAL APPALACHIA: A QUALITATIVE STUDY
OF MARITAL POWER

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
University of North Texas in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Jennifer Mae Burns Dabbs, B.A., M.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1994

ca

Dabbs, Jennifer Mae Burns, Women and Men in Central Appalachia: A Qualitative Study of Marital Power. Doctor of Philosophy (Sociology), August 1994, 345 pp., 26 tables, 1 appendix, bibliography, 78 titles.

Semi-structured interviews were administered to 16 married couples in Central Appalachia. Questions addressed power relations and division of labor in marriage.

The review of the literature detailed Appalachia's transition from a coal-based to a service-based economy. Related transformations of the Appalachian family away from a patriarchal system were also discussed.

The primary question addressed was "What factors affect the balance of power in Appalachian marriages?" The analysis was guided by Rae Lesser Blumberg's theory of gender stratification, which examines the relationship between economic power and women's leverage relative to men's. It was predicted that Appalachian women who earned a relatively high income compared to their spouses would have greater influence in their families than women who earned smaller incomes or no income at all. In addition, power gained from earning an income would be discounted by macro-level discount factors: male domination of the political-economy, societal ideology, birth cohort, social class, or ethnicity; and micro-level discount factors:

commitment to marriage, relative attractiveness of spouses, personal ideology, husband's perception of need for wife's income, individual personality, and stability variables.

The results confirmed the prediction that women who earned a large income in comparison to their spouses wielded more power in their households than women who earned a smaller income. Personal ideology as it pertains to gender role ideology was the biggest discount to women's power in the marital relationship. Some non-income-earning women wielded more power in their marriages than predicted by Blumberg's theory. These women benefitted from higher educational attainments relative to their spouses, their husbands' low potential for future earnings, and their own high potential for future earnings.

Copyright by
Jennifer Mae Burns Dabbs
1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	
I. GENDER RELATIONS AND THE SOCIAL ECONOMY OF CENTRAL APPALACHIA	1
Historical Background	
Statement of the Research Problem	
II. GENDER AND THE APPALACHIAN FAMILY	9
The Appalachian Family	
Factors Shaping the Appalachian Family	
Characteristics of the Appalachian Family	
Appalachian Women	
Lower-Status Appalachian Women	
Appalachian Women and Change	
Appalachian Men	
Conceptual Framework: Rae Lesser Blumberg's Theory of Gender Stratification	
III. METHODOLOGY	53
Research Site	
Sample Selection	
Data Gathering	
Variables	
Data Analysis	
IV. WOMEN'S OVERALL ECONOMIC POWER	74
Men's and Women's Workforce Participation	
Women's Earnings Relative to Men's	
Income-Earning Women	
Non-Income-Earning Women	

Discount Factors

Macro-Level Discounts to Women's Power in the Household

Political Arena
Economic Arena
Social Ideology
Birth Cohort

Discount Factors at the Micro-Level

Commitment and Principle of Least Interest
Attractiveness
Personal Ideology
Perception of Need for Wife's Income

Intervening Variables

Stability Versus Transition
Class Differentials

V. WOMEN'S LEVERAGE IN HOUSEHOLD POWER 122

Leverage in Say-So

Say-So in Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women
Say-So in Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Decision-Making: Economic

Economic Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women
Economic Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Decision-Making: Domestic

Domestic Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women
Domestic Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Decision-Making: Fertility

Sexuality

Parity in Household and Child Care Labor

Household Labor: Income-Earning Women
Household Labor: Non-Income-Earning Women
Child Care Labor

Conflict Resolution Strategies

Conflict Resolution Strategies: Income-Earning Women
Conflict Resolution Strategies: Non-Income-Earning Women

VI. Conclusion: The Applicability of Blumberg's Theory 272

APPENDIX 305

BIBLIOGRAPHY 339

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Identifying Characteristics of Couples	61
2. Current Labor Force Participation of Centerville Sample	75
3. Labor Force Participation of Men and Women Over the Age of Sixteen for Two Tennessee Counties	78
4. Summary of Couples' Economic Characteristics . .	97
5. Women's Rankings Based on Overall Economic Power	103
6. Level of Commitment to Marriage	111
7. Expectations Regarding Decision-Making	114
8. Personal Ideology Regarding Breadwinner Responsibilities	115
9. Income-Earning Wives and Final Say-So Over Decision-Making	130
10. Non-Income-Earning Wives and Final Say-So Over Decision-Making	134
11. Income-Earning Wives and Economic Decision- Making	146
12. Non-Income-Earning Wives and Economic Decision- Making	155
13. Income-Earning Wives and Domestic Decision- Making	175
14. Non-Income-Earning Wives and Domestic Decision- Making	190
15. Unplanned First Births and Women's Marital and Employment Status	198
16. Fertility Decisions at First (Planned) and Subsequent Births	201

17.	Responses to Story Question on Sexuality	208
18.	Attitudes Regarding Sexuality211
19.	Satisfaction With Sex Life	214
20.	Income-Earning Women and Division of Household Labor230
21.	Non-Income-Earning Women and Division of Household Labor237
22.	Conflict Resolution Strategies of Income-Earning Women257
23.	Conflict Resolution Strategies of Non-Income- Earning Women269
24.	Women's Rankings Based on Overall Economic Power277
25.	Income-Earning Women's Rankings Based on Leverage in the Household	291
26.	Women's Rankings Based on Leverage in the Household296

CHAPTER ONE

GENDER RELATIONS AND THE SOCIAL ECONOMY OF CENTRAL APPALACHIA

Amid the mountain ranges and highland plateaus of Central Appalachia an extended economic and social transformation is unfolding. As of the late 1800s, the economy of central Appalachia--consisting of specific areas within West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee--has been based principally on the extractive industry of coal mining (Gaventa, 1980, p. 142; Eller, 1979, p. 39; Lewis & Knipe, 1978, p. 10). At its peak, this industry profoundly affected the social patterns of the region. In the late 1950s, however, coal mining entered a period of decline, creating economic and personal hardships for those employed by the coal companies and coal's supportive industries. (Gaventa, 1980, p. 126; Lewis & Knipe, 1978, p. 11). These developments seriously disrupted social patterns established during coal's period of ascendancy. Currently, the region is struggling to regain its economic footing but has yet to find an adequate substitute for the coal industry. Substantial changes in the region's social structure continue to unfold as the economic transformation develops.

This study asks the question "What factors affect women's power in Appalachian marriages?" The configuration gender relations take as the region makes the transition from a coal-based, industrialized society to a service-based post-industrial society is a primary focus of this discussion. The analysis is guided by Rae Lesser Blumberg's (1978, 1983, 1984, 1989, 1991) theory of gender stratification, which examines the relationship between economic power and women's power relative to men's in the marital relationship. Special attention is paid to the micro-level of this theory which was developed by Rae Lesser Blumberg and Marion Tolbert Coleman (1989) for the analysis of couples in the United States. It is found that women's increasingly significant role in the changing Appalachian economy interacts with cultural elements unique to Appalachia, creating a variety of configurations in women's power relative to men's among married couples.

Historical Background

European immigrants migrated into Central Appalachia via the Cumberland Gap shortly after the settling of the original thirteen colonies (Powell, 1966, pp. 22-24). Isolated from the rest of the country by rugged mountain ranges, these settlers carved out their livelihoods by farming, hunting and some trade. The agrarian society the early settlers established was radically altered when railroads pushed into the area in the late 1800s. Soon

thereafter, large mining companies entered the region attracted by large seams of bituminous coal which existed throughout the Cumberland, Blue Ridge, and Allegheny mountain ranges (Gaventa, 1984, p. 142; Lewis & Knipe, 1978, p. 10).

As coal companies entered the region, they quickly purchased the mineral and land rights to vast acreages. Many Appalachian land owners sold out to the companies, forming a surplus labor supply in the region. These dislocated farmers constituted the primary source of labor for the mining companies. Even those farmers who retained the rights to their land often found it far more profitable to work for a coal company than to continue to rely on farming. These indigenous workers, augmented by a large onslaught of migrants, met the company's labor needs as the coal industry expanded its control over the region (Shifflet, 1991).

The transformation of Appalachia from an agrarian economy to one based largely on coal extraction resulted in a radical upheaval of the existing social structure. Towns and their accompanying signs of modernization developed within the rural mountains. Roads, movie theaters, restaurants, stores, sewage systems and many other modern conveniences proliferated in the coal camps and surrounding towns.

As is typical of extractive industries, coal mining involves placing industrial plants in rural areas.

And, as with other extractive industries in the past, this typically involved the construction of company towns and the recruitment of a labor force dependent on the one industry. This has fostered the development of occupational communities, culture, and personality traits (Yarrow, 1991, p. 288).

The Appalachian social order quickly began to be rearranged around the new industrial milieu (Shifflet, 1991). The result was a unique sub-cultural blend of the larger industrial social structure found elsewhere in the country with elements of the traditional Appalachian heritage.

The economic transformation of Central Appalachia led to alterations in even the most intimate social institution--the family. Traditionally, distinctions between men's, women's and children's spheres were minimal due to the interdependent and isolated nature of rural life. Family members had worked side by side on the farm to provide everyone with a sufficient living. With the advent of mining, distinctly separate spheres of work for men and women were created. When men took jobs as miners, they would leave home before light and work until after dark, deep in the bowels of the mine. Working long hours, six days a week, miners would spend the majority of their week separated from their wives and children. In addition, the extremely dangerous and heavy nature of the work was used as a reason to exclude women from the mines, further segregating men and women in the community. Men were attracted to the hard, risky work because mining provided

the highest wage available in the region for men with limited educations. The relatively high pay meant sons frequently followed their fathers into the mines as soon as they were considered old enough to do the work. Women stayed at home to manage the household, either on the farm or in the coal camp. Some women continued working the family farm with only the help of the children. Other women contributed to the family's income by maintaining some type of cottage industry. The overall result was a strict division of labor with men primarily responsible for the economic support of the family and women almost exclusively responsible for the home (Shifflet, 1991).

Not until the late 1960s did this pattern of existence begin to break down. After WWII, machines made their way into the mines, replacing much of the labor force. In addition, there was a shift in the industry from reliance on deep mining to strip mining. Strip mining required far fewer workers than deep mining, causing hundreds more miners to be laid off from their jobs. The mining companies had never spawned the growth of connected industries in the region such as briquette plants or truck manufacturers which could have provided alternative employment after the mining industry collapsed. Thus, persons laid off from the mines found themselves with few prospects for alternative employment. The loss of jobs lead to mass migration out of

the region and a persistently high unemployment rate for those who remained (Gaventa, 1980).

In the wake of coal's decline, other industries have grown in importance. Since the 1970s, the fastest growing industries in the region have been service related industries and textiles. These industries have historically employed high numbers of women rather than men. In much of the region, this has resulted in a transformation from a predominantly male work force to a predominantly female work force (Hennon & Photiadis, 1979; Collins & Finn, 1976). Increasingly, men in the region are faced with the realization that they may no longer be able to continue to maintain their customary role as primary breadwinner for their families. Even when men can find jobs with coal companies, employment is sporadic and unreliable due to strikes, closings, and cutbacks in the work force. Women's paid labor and government subsidies are fast becoming the surest forms of income in the region. Families are forced to adapt to these new realities. At times, the transformation is difficult. Both men and women are discovering their normative expectations regarding gender roles cannot be met in the new economic climate. Thus, there is a restructuring of Appalachian familial and gender relations which provide opportunities for new research in the region (Hennon & Photiadis, 1979; Collins & Finn, 1976).

Statement of the Research Problem

The purpose of this study is twofold. The first objective of this study is to examine gender relations in Appalachia against the backdrop of a changing community. A small East Tennessee community undergoing major economic restructuring provides the site for the investigation into gender relationships inside marriage and the family. Evidence is presented regarding current marital roles, parental roles, spousal power, and gender ideology. Of primary concern is the way in which Appalachian gender roles and spousal power are linked to economic activity and economic change.

The second objective is to use the Appalachian community as a test case for Rae Lesser Blumberg's theory of gender stratification. This research tests Blumberg's propositions regarding the importance of women's economic power in determining gender stratification at the micro-level. She contends that the greater a woman's economic resources the greater leverage she will have in the marital relationship vis-a-vis her husband. Of particular importance is women's production and control over surplus income for their families rather than mere subsistence earnings. In addition, the degree to which women's relative power at the macro-level mitigates their power at the micro-level is assessed. This study continues a process of theory testing already begun by Blumberg (1970, 1989, 1991).

This study adds to the existing literature in several important ways. First, there are few theoretically guided analyses of gender relations in Appalachia (Tickameyer & Tickamyer, 1987; Fiene, 1988). Therefore, many projects make assumptions regarding Appalachian women's power in the home which are not grounded in clearly conceptualized terms or a coherent theoretical framework for comparison with other social systems. Second, the Appalachian case allows for a test of Blumberg's theory at the micro-level using a subcultural group which is distinctive in both its socio-economic position and ethnic heritage relative to the rest of the United States. Third, early studies of the area rarely analyze the position of both men and women in the Appalachian community. Since 1970, some studies have focused on samples composed of men or women, but rarely both (Collins & Finn, 1979). Fourth, this project continues the work begun by theorists such as Collins and Finn (1979), Perry (1987), and others in assessing the degree to which Appalachian gender roles and gender based power positions might be in flux due to changes in other social institutions.

CHAPTER TWO

GENDER AND THE APPALACHIAN FAMILY

The Appalachian Family

The earliest accounts of Appalachian family life come from nineteenth century novelists and public health care workers. Most of these early writings vacillate between two unrealistic poles. At one end of the spectrum, descriptions portray the original settlers of Appalachia as bigger than life characters engaged in a mythical battle with the wilderness. In contrast are the many accounts which relate the "primitive" conditions under which the mountaineers lived, accompanied by appeals for humanitarian aid for these "backward families" who are said to suffer from all types of retardation and need (Thomas, 1942; Bryant, 1981, pp. 5-6).

In the 1900s academicians became interested in the Appalachian region. Two major approaches to studying the Appalachian family developed. The first approach involves a discussion of factors which are believed to have shaped the development of the kin system. The second approach is to discuss characteristics of the Appalachian family which distinguish it from mainstream America. These two approaches are frequently intertwined. First we will

consider those factors which have shaped the Appalachian family.

Factors Shaping the Appalachian Family

Many early scholars claimed the Appalachian family's unique form was the result of geographic isolation. In the late 1600s frontiersmen came to Appalachia in search of land on which to settle. They crossed the mountains to build their cabins, scratching out a living through subsistence farming far from civilization. Powell (1966) suggested the Anglo-Saxons who settled in the mountains were a unique race who epitomized the true American frontier spirit. The mountains acted as a barrier, isolating these proud settlers and their prodigy. Deep in the mountains this "pure race" of Anglo-Saxons intermarried, yielding men, women, and children with unusual intelligence, "...courage, endurance, and sturdiness to battle with the difficulties with which the pioneers of any country must contend" (Powell, 1966, p. 24).

Like Powell, Sherman and Henry (1933) believed the Anglo-Saxon culture was uniquely preserved in Appalachia due to the geographic isolation of the people. However, Sherman and Henry formed the opposite pole of theorists concerned with geographic isolation. They believed isolation perpetuated an unenlightened lifestyle in Appalachia more worthy of pity than laudatory acclaim. They complained of women worn down by hard work and extensive childbearing,

lack of companionship in marriage, a lack of interest in parenting, poverty and dismal living conditions, lack of education, lack of industry, loose morals, and a superstitious mentality. A wide range of isolationist perspectives were written; however geography was considered to be the main explanatory variable needed to understand the Appalachian family (Kephart, 1922; Campbell, 1921; Weatherford & Brewer, 1962; Weller, 1965; Brown, 1988).

A second group of researchers emphasized the importance of the economy as a determinant of Appalachian family form. Subsistence farming composed the economic base in most parts of Appalachia for the majority of its recent history. From the 17th to 19th centuries farming practices changed little; the mule-drawn plow and the family farm remained the norm (Campbell, 1921; Eller, 1979). In farming communities, families were relatively self-sufficient. Men worked in the fields with their sons. Women and their daughters worked in the home, barnyard, and garden. Traditional segregation of men's and women's roles was broken occasionally when extra labor was needed in the fields. Childhood was short-lived, with children beginning farm chores by the age of five. In peak work periods and times of scarcity, families depended on kin and neighbors for aid. This led to an interdependence among kin and neighbors which came to permeate the culture (Campbell, 1921; Eller, 1979; Brown, 1988).

The advent of large industry, after 1850, yielded changes in the Appalachian family. Weller (1965), Lewis (1970), Schwarzweller (1971) and Shifflet (1991) studied areas where factories, timber, and mining were introduced. They discover the same nuclear family form with strong kin ties as had been found in rural Appalachia. However, a greater separation of men's and women's spheres was found in many industrialized areas. The timber and mining industries traditionally utilized a male labor force. Work in the timber industry, though seasonal, often required laborers to spend long periods away from farm and family. Laborers had the option of bringing their families to the work camps, but not all families did this. Even when families moved to the camps, the long hours of work kept miners away from home for the majority of their waking hours. Thus, women became solely responsible for the domestic realm and men were frequently the sole breadwinner. Women's frequent inability to find paid work in the coalcamps resulted in an even greater dependence of women upon their husbands and working sons (Shifflet, 1991).

Other studies paint a more complex picture of the mining industry's impact on the Appalachian family. For instance, in a 1970 study of the effect of the father's occupation on Appalachian family structure, Lewis found that patterns of male dominance and segregation of husband and wife roles were relatively uniform throughout the region.

Based on the social network theory of Bott (1957) and resource theory of Blood and Wolfe (1960), Lewis hypothesized that miners' greater economic resources relative to that of their wives, combined with a closed occupational community, would yield higher rates of male dominance and gender role segregation in miners' families than in other Appalachian families. However, in her sample, she found higher levels of gender role segregation only in the area of childrearing and found no difference in male dominance when miners' families were compared with other Appalachian families. She concluded that miners' greater relative economic resources allowed them to allocate power to their wives while maintaining ultimate authority in the family. Lewis speculated that broader regional and occupational influences were the primary shapers of the Appalachian family during the industrial era (Lewis, 1970). However, Caudill (1962) and Gaventa (1980) reinforce the notion that mining had a markedly negative impact on the stability of the Appalachian family. These authors have suggested the practice of paternalism among the mining and timber industries impoverished the majority of Appalachian families economically and emotionally, setting the stage for many of the social problems found in the area today.

A number of studies reveal that during the expansion of mining in Appalachia some regionally based industries did employ women. According to Beaver (1986), textile mills had

come to some areas of Appalachia as early as the turn of the century. The mills employed large numbers of women. Although the factories offered only low-paying and low-skilled jobs, Beaver found employment to have marginally increased women's power in the home vis-a-vis their husbands. Concomitantly, men's domestic and child care activities increased, as did the divorce rate, both indicators of women's increased power (Blumberg, 1989). These mill towns were one instance in which Appalachian women broke out of the strictly drawn domestic role found in most rural and mining areas of Appalachia.

More recently, it has been suggested that a transition from an industrial base to a service sector economy will also affect the Appalachian family. Collins and Finn (1976) found among East Tennessee couples perceptions of a decrease in male authority due to women's greater employability in the new economy. Families from declining mining communities believe children are less respectful of their fathers since men's employment has dropped. Stephenson (1965) found slow changes in the family since the decline of the mining industry in Central Appalachia. He listed a continuum of family types roughly corresponding to social classes which have been found in Appalachia since the 1950s. At one end of this continuum were fully employed white-collar families who approximate the typical, American, middle-class family with less emphasis on the community than was traditionally

found in Appalachia. As his analysis moved across the spectrum to blue-collar, then to seasonally employed workers, and ultimately to the unemployed, Stephenson observed an increasing likelihood for families to resemble more closely the traditional, rural Appalachian family. Stephenson's study thus suggested that recent changes in Appalachian family roles are class-linked.

Persistent poverty is also believed to have contributed to the creation of a unique family form in Appalachia. Weller (1965) found poverty to be responsible for a turning inward of the Appalachian family. Kin networks are a response to economic crisis. Feelings of fatalism, an emphasis on family loyalty rather than success, and parent centered childrearing (in which the parents desires are placed before the child's needs) are all believed to be part of the culture of poverty found among many lower-status Appalachian families (Pearsall, 1959; Coles, 1971).

Characteristics of the Appalachian Family

Appalachian family size must be evaluated along three axes: rural-urban, rich-poor, and historical-contemporary. Appalachian family size in the past was larger than the national average. In addition, family size is larger for contemporary Appalachians living below the poverty line and in rural areas than for Appalachians whose median income is above the poverty line and live in urban settings. Arcury and Porter (1985) report that in pre-industrial, rural

Kentucky, over 90% of households were nuclear with an average family size of 6.5 compared to 4.5 in urban areas. The current average for the state is roughly the national average, 1.7 children. Fitchen's (1981) study of poor, rural families finds a higher family size--3.5 children on average.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the Appalachian family is its unique form. Appalachian families have always been predominantly nuclear in structure with a neolocal residence and a bilineal inheritance pattern (Schwarzweiler, 1971). "What made the mountain family pattern distinctive, however, was the emphasis placed upon maintaining close ties with an extended network of kin" (Eller, 1979). Adult children tend to settle near the brides's or groom's parental home and maintain strong economic and emotional ties with their parents and siblings. Any pressure to change this form is strongly resisted, particularly by lower status Appalachians (Stephenson, 1983).

Some researchers note the frequent inclusion of grown children, particularly divorced or unmarried women and their children, in the elder parent's home (Arcury & Porter, 1985; Beaver, 1986). Relatives in need are taken in for a time, thereby expanding the family circle. When the crisis is over, these extra persons move out possibly to return at another time. Fitchen (1983) describes this ability to

temporarily absorb family members in need as "elasticity". Beaver (1986) finds that friends may also be incorporated into the kin structure for periods of time. This unique family form is known as the "modified extended family" and persists today primarily among lower status Appalachians (Schwarzweiler, 1971; Fetterman, 1970; Haraven, 1976).

One of the most important characteristics distinguishing Appalachians has been "familism". According to most researchers, isolated living conditions led to the establishment of the family as the center of all social life. Campbell indicated that over time the hollows filled with the extended kin of original settlers so that in many communities a majority of residents had the same family name (Campbell, 1921). Most friendships and business dealings took place between family members. Eller stated, "Kinship set the matrix within which politics and government as well as organizations for religion, education, and sociability developed" (Eller, 1979, p. 99). Loyalty to the family was a primary value in rural Appalachia. It was expected that kin obligations would come before personal goals (Schwarzweiler, 1971; Eller, 1979; Beaver, 1986). According to Matthews (1966), the practice of endogamy and norm of equal inheritance of "family land" by children reinforced strong kin networks in which homogeneity and mutual dependence was maintained.

More recently Bryant (1981) has suggested that kinship is so pervasive in Appalachia as to become virtually meaningless in terms of sharing of blood or surname. Rather, persons make their own subjective distinctions as to who is or is not included as "close kin" on the basis of not only blood relations or shared name, but also shared personal characteristics, loyalty to family members, and a feeling of interdependence or community.

Another theme frequently discussed in the literature of the Appalachian family has been patriarchy. Several authors have suggested Appalachian families became frozen in time with a traditional patriarchal family structure. Beaver (1986) and Schwarzweller (1971) found that Appalachian women accepted their husbands' authority without question and children were in turn obedient to their parents. In 1966, Matthews found that 92% of couples maintained segregated but complementary work roles (pp. 61-62). Sherman (1933) and Eller (1979) found that, in rural Appalachia, men were in charge of heavy farm labor and performed most family dealings with the outside world. Women's roles were clearly confined to the home, but in the domestic sphere the wife maintained full authority. Shifflet (1991) suggested the strict division of labor was enhanced in the coal towns, where men spent the majority of their time away from the family in the breadwinning role. Only recently has it been suggested that patriarchy may be on the decline in

Appalachia due to the loss of mining jobs and women's increased economic prowess (Collins & Finn, 1976).

Troubled homes is the final factor said to distinguish Appalachian families. Fitchen (1981) finds among low-income adult Appalachians a high incidence of unstable families of origin despite cultural goals putting a high premium on marriage and family life. Fitchen finds arguing, abuse, repeated separations, and infidelity to be frequent. Cultural norms stating that children are more important than personal happiness of the spouses, financial dependence of women on their husbands, and a lack of divorced role models keep many of these families intact. Marital problems for Fitchen's sample were frequently caused by stress due to economic need, emotional problems rooted in childhood upbringing, difficulty in fulfilling culturally expected family roles, lack of fulfilling roles outside the home, and a tendency to discharge frustrations on other family members. Fitchen's findings are consistent with a long history of writings on rural, lower-status Appalachian families which describe insurmountable problems which take their toll in the form of family dysfunction (Campbell, 1921; Sherman & Henry, 1933; Coles, 1971).

The literature on the Appalachian family suggests several important variables associated with the Appalachian family. The two most important variables affecting the shape of the family are the techno-economic base of the

region and the socio-economic status of the head of the family. The specific region within Appalachia under examination is also important in understanding the form the family takes. Characteristics distinguishing the Appalachian family, from the prototypes described in the literature on the American family, are its size, modified-extended family form, neolocal residence, bilineal inheritance, familism, patriarchal form, and troubled home life.

Appalachian Women

A mythology has developed around the Appalachian woman. This mythical woman is portrayed in literature, the media, and early community studies as the quintessential pioneer woman. She is envisioned on the homestead taking care of home, children, husband, livestock, and garden. She stands by her husband through thick and thin, accompanying him to the fields, or waiting for him to return from the mines. When young she is portrayed as being naive of the world and often sensual. She is a bearer of babies. When old she is haggard, worn down early by hard work and care. She is thought to cling to a centuries old lifestyle that keeps a woman in the kitchen attending to her husband's and children's every whim. She is described as quiescent, isolated by her environment (Campbell, 1921; Sherman, 1933). This mythical Appalachian woman has some basis in fact. However, it is far from fair to describe all Appalachian

women in this light. Until recently there were few attempts to look at Appalachian women's roles in any depth. This section will examine the most current research on women's status and gender roles in Appalachia. The current literature specifically analyzing women in Appalachia is divided into two categories: Lower-status Appalachian women and Appalachian women and change.

Lower-status Appalachian Women

Judith Fiene (1988, 1990, 1991) found few differences between modern, low-status Appalachian women in Cocke County, Tennessee, and the descriptions of women found in literature and older community studies. Her interviews with 18 lower-status mothers about women's roles revealed that respondents took for granted their participation in traditional family roles. The women viewed their primary roles in life as bearing, raising, and protecting children. Fiene's sample defined "good mothers" as women who accepted all children born to them. Abortions were never considered. Younger women had begun to limit their families to 3 or 4 due to economic considerations; however, childbearing still began soon after marriage if not before. The "good mother" was expected to provide for her children's needs before her own. If the husband left, the wife always took custody of the children or she was believed to have "abandoned" her children.

Fiene (1988) found that most women in the sample wanted a traditional family with the male as breadwinner and a strict division between men's and women's spheres. Wives were expected to submit to their husband's will in all areas (Beaver, 1986; Fiene, 1988). They were expected to be virgins at marriage and sexually available to their husbands thereafter. Wives took care of the home and the children for their husbands. The woman's primary goal in life was to make her husband happy (Fiene, 1988).

Fiene (1988) found that kin formed the primary social network for Appalachian women. Visits with kin were frequent. The daughter role required women in the region care for their parents and siblings whenever they were in need. The ties to mothers were much stronger than to fathers. Fiene hypothesized that the maternal attachment was due to high rates of paternal abandonment and abuse.

Fiene's women occasionally engaged in paid work and took pleasure in it. However, their work roles were always contingent upon the wishes of the family. Local norms required that the woman's income only supplement her husband's and was always put into the family fund. Most women in the sample gained self-esteem by enmeshing themselves in their family roles and taking pride in their domestic accomplishments (Fiene, 1988, 1990).

Fiene (1988) discovered that local norms allowed women to divorce but only "for a higher good" or "the welfare of

the children". Most of the women had traumatic experiences with husbands, mothers, and/or fathers who had failed them. They frequently listed grandparents as role models of how families should be run. Failing this, the norms were so well known in the community that a lack of role models did not keep women from having a clear image of husband and wife, parent and child, or kin roles. Fiene concluded that these norms persisted among lower status Appalachians in the face of media images which did not appear to affect the community. However, among middle and upper class Appalachians, gender roles had changed in accordance with mainstream norms (Fiene, 1988).

Christine Medlin's (1987) analysis of a longitudinal study of Appalachian youth, spanning the years 1969 to 1985, finds strong support for women engaged in paid labor. Medlin's sample includes 46 low-income, Central Appalachian women between 27 and 29 years of age, over a third of whom were married at least once and had children. Medlin reports that over 90% of her sample agreed that women should be able to work if they want to. However, this affirmation is qualified by a strong cultural imperative for mothers of young children to remain at home if possible. Unlike Fiene's study, young lower-class women who came of age in the eighties showed high rates of employment in Medlin's sample: fifty-eight percent full-time employees, five percent part-time, and four percent full-time students. The

vast majority of these women remain in secondary sector positions which according to dual-labor market theory are characterized by low wages, job instability and little opportunity for advancement. Only twelve percent held professional jobs. Professional positions are part of the primary sector of the dual-labor market. Primary sector jobs are characterized by high wages, job security, and many opportunities for advancement (see Piore, 1977 for further discussion). The women's educational attainment is relatively low, with eleven years of school being the average. However, this is an improvement over their mothers' generation, which received on average only 9.5 years of schooling. The vast majority of women report receiving encouragement from their parents to complete their schooling. However, specific advice regarding jobs was rarely forthcoming. Having children influenced the majority of the women's job decisions (83%) in a variety of ways. Forty-three percent increased their emphasis on the provider role. Thirty percent deliberately selected jobs compatible with their child care roles. Thirteen and a half percent postponed working due to role overload or child development needs. The reality for these women is that many provide the main source of income for their families. Despite increased role strain and value conflicts, even women with small children work and find general community support for their decision.

Tickamyer's and Tickamyer's (1986) county level statistical analysis of 1980 U.S. Census summary tape files examined gender and poverty in a five state region of Central Appalachia. Their results, which were examined through a feminist framework, indicated that Appalachia continued to have a higher poverty rate than any other region in the U.S., a rate which was compounded for women in the region. Female-headed households with children had higher rates of poverty than total female-headed households, female-headed households without children, or non-female-headed households. A full 52% of female headed households with children fell below the poverty line. Multivariate analysis found a strong correlation between economic base variables and poverty rates for both men and women. An agricultural base was strongly associated with poverty rates for all social groups. However, a mining base was strongly correlated with poverty in female headed households. The authors posited that in mining communities employment opportunities remained limited for women. Even where secondary labor markets with low wages were the only jobs available, women fared better than in mining communities which provided virtually no employment opportunities for women.

Appalachian Women and Change

Margaret Perry's (1987) panel study of 67 rural Appalachian women found evidence of some change in gender

roles, but also identified many similarities between young adult women and older adult women. Perry found that among her sample early marriage was still the norm with little thought given to alternatives. Reasons for marrying had changed somewhat from pragmatic reasons to a greater emphasis on love. Yet divorced women of all ages frequently reported having married for external reasons such as a desire for independence from parents or pregnancy.

Perry (1987) found a traditional division of labor in her sample. As with Fiene's sample, women defined marriage and motherhood as their primary roles. Women received no help from husbands in child care, such that many women with young children felt isolated. However, the women reported a great deal of personal freedom and parity in household decision making. Education and work experiences of these women remained limited. Older women frequently had curtailed their educations. Among all respondents, the tendency was to live at home until marriage. They were unlikely to hold a job before or after marriage. If they did hold a job it was typically part-time and almost always a secondary sector job.

The most striking change Perry found was an increase in the divorce rate. Aiding women's decisions to leave their marriages was the growing acceptance of divorce by the fundamentalist churches which played an important role in the women's lives. Reasons for divorce acceptable to the

community were mainly adultery and abuse. However, the women reported a great deal of stigma and role strain accompanying their divorced status due to the ambiguous role of divorced persons in the community. Families were not seen as being as supportive of the women after the divorce as when they were married even though the families gave a great deal of material support. Community norms limited women's activities outside of the kin group, making it hard for women to make friends outside the family. Divorced women who had made friends perceived them as being their main source of emotional and financial support. Divorced women did report in many cases that they had gained a sense of independence which they perceived as being positive. They scored high in the area of self-orientation in clinical tests given to the respondents.

Thomas Collins's and Clata Finn's (1976) field research of a former mining community in northern Tennessee suggested radical changes in Appalachian gender roles brought about by economic pressures. Traditionally, women in the region worked on the family farm and cared for the household. Women worked outside the home only as a temporary supplement to male income, bartering of craft and food items being women's main economic activity. Men were economic heads of the household with absolute power over children, wife, and home.

With the decline of the region's mining industry in the 1950s, community leaders tried to attract new jobs to the area to combat unemployment. Agreements were negotiated with a shirt factory and a chicken processing plant. The plants, typical of the secondary labor market, offered low pay scales, frequent layoffs, no management jobs for locals, no labor organization and mainly jobs for women only. The women, who had rarely held paying jobs before, came to work for the plants to provide their families with an income (Collins & Finn, 1976).

The result was a significant disruption of traditional gender roles. Men, accustomed to being the sole breadwinner for the family, tried to control their wives' paychecks until the women revolted against this. Some of the men took over the women's traditional domestic duties, but many more used their days for traditional male leisure pursuits. The women on the other hand found they no longer needed to submit to the absolute authority of their husbands and for the first time found their own identities separate from the males in their lives. As they took jobs, women also became active in community organizations which were previously off-limits for women (Collins & Finn, 1976).

The women's new position did lead to some regrets. Almost half of the women employees were married with children under 6 years of age. Many disliked leaving their children in the care of others. Making women's loads even

more difficult, many husbands relinquished their traditional disciplinary role of the children to their wives. The women were uncomfortable with this. Many indicated they would quit work if only they could find another source of health insurance. Using a feminist framework, Thomas and Finn concluded that the changes in the economic structure of the community gave women greater parity with their husbands and to some extent with other men in the community. However, the women remained locked into the secondary sector with no bargaining power for better working conditions or income at more macro-levels (Collins & Finn, 1976).

Jacquelyn Dowd Hall (1986) and Sally Ward Maggard (1990, 1992) revealed a different picture of the Appalachian woman. In her social history "Disorderly Women: Gender and Labor Militancy in the Appalachian South," Hall examined the union activity of women in the rayon industry in eastern Tennessee's Elizabethton in the 1920s (Hall, 1986, p. 330). Hall found that Carter county was a center for the rayon industry in the 1920s. Women in the area had a long history of working for pay. Prior to 1920, 20% of town women worked for pay compared to 5% of rural women. Women took jobs as domestics, cotton and garment mill employees, clerks, teachers, and boardinghouse keepers (Hall, 1986, p. 335). In the mills women comprised 30% to 44% of the employees. Eighty-five percent of the employed women were 16 to 21 years old and single. Women were attracted to the rayon

plants as a way to meet family needs (Hall, 1986, pp. 333-335). Work brought the women independence, allowing traditional Appalachian gender roles to change. The women became avid consumers and exercised their increased opportunities for courtship. On the negative side, working conditions for the women were poor, pay scales were low, working conditions dangerous, and production quotas high. In 1929 there were several strikes in which women played essential organizational and public roles, with women walking off the job before the men. Not until the women had effected some concessions from the companies regarding working conditions were the women strikers stopped, many being blackballed from working in the factories. Despite this setback, women in the area continued to maintain their labor force participation at original levels in more traditional paid labor if they could not obtain a job in the factories. In the long run these strikes led to the development of a labor movement across the south (Hall, 1986, pp. 348-349).

Hall (1986) and Maggard (1990, 1992) found that a tradition of female protest and activism is part of the Appalachian heritage. In mining communities where division of labor was strict, women fought alongside their men in strikes to insure the income on which the whole family depended, thus reinforcing their traditional roles as housewives. Maggard (1990) found that the process of

participating in the strike transformed many of the women who participated in the 1973 miner's strike in Harlan county. Their participation built up the women's self-esteem, leading some to negotiate changes in the traditional division of labor found in their own households. Women's union participation was also found in female dominated industries. Hall (1986, p. 348) found that, in the tobacco and textile industries, married and single women spearheaded the organization of successful efforts for the unions. Maggard (1992) reports on a female hospital workers strike in the 1970s. Maggard found Kentucky women's union activities grew out of a community history which supported unions. However, Maggard found that the women's status in a female dominated industry posed unique problems for women strikers who found less community support and union support for the women. Although the strike provided the women with a new sense of self-esteem it did not have much effect on traditional roles in the household or status in the community.

Political activism among Appalachian women is continues today. The United Mine Workers Journal (1976) article "We Stood by our Men but We Stood Up for Ourselves, Too" emphasizes the active role of women on behalf of the unions. Women use their skills in maintaining their families while their men are on strike, boycott coal owned stores, stand in picket lines, organize strikes and have even died for the

union cause. Miners' widows have organized groups such as the "Miners Wives & Widows Association of Southern West Virginia", "Widow's Mine Disaster Committee" and "Black Lung Relief" organizations (Justice, 1976). In recent years women's activism has been associated with their entry into the mines. As of the late 1970s there were over 2,500 women miners in the country ("Women Rally," 1979, p. 5). Women, pressed by economic circumstances to take mining jobs, have had to fight not only the traditional battles of miners but also gender discrimination. Women have brought class action suits against mines which discriminated against them in hiring practices, created support networks and conferences, joined the United Mine Workers Association (UMWA), started pilot training programs, and are concurrently trying to get day care facilities instituted. ("Women Rally," 1979).

In communities all over Appalachia, women have been recognized for their efforts to improve working conditions and community life (Kahn, 1973; Appalachia, 1978). This indicates that under certain circumstances Appalachian women are far from quiescent, household drudges. Rather, they are powerful forces in their communities and beyond. Possibly the ways in which the women exhibit their power has not been recognized by researchers applying middle class standards to the region.

In summary, there are many variables affecting Appalachian women. Women's roles and position in Appalachia

appear to vary widely depending upon region of residence, techno-economic base of the region, employment opportunities available to women in the region, economic class of the family, marital status, and community norms. Simple portrayals of Appalachian women do not begin to approach the real life complexity of women in the region. It does appear that women's roles and status are changing most quickly for wives of blue-collar men. This research will explore changes in women's roles and statuses as they relate to the above economic variables as exhibited in a declining mining community that has traditionally offered few opportunities of employment to women.

Appalachian Men

Research on the Appalachian family, Appalachian culture, and Appalachian economy deals indirectly with issues of men's status and roles in Appalachian culture for years. However, focused research on men's gender roles and status as part of a regional gender stratification system is virtually non-existent. This section will review the existing literature.

Traditionally, Appalachian gender roles have been embedded in a patriarchal belief system. Men in rural Appalachia were the family's primary breadwinner, the family's decision maker, the family's money handler, the family's protector, and the family's link to the community. Few restrictions were put on their behavior, whereas

Appalachian women's behavior was traditionally constrained by a strict double-standard (Farr, 1981; Yarrow, 1991; Perry, 1987). According to Yarrow's (1991) review of the literature on mining communities the patriarchal pattern of gender relations emerged in Appalachia's rural past as a way to organize economic production units on the farm. Later the mining culture and religious organizations reinforced this patriarchal system. Yarrow suggests that miners' class consciousness had become tightly interwoven with their gender consciousness. Miners and mining management came to define mining as "men's work" characterized by a need for strength, skill, and bravery. Involvement in the unions furthered the emphasis on courage and toughness by defining a good union man as one who could stand up to his employer. These definitions of men's position and roles have found continued support by many in the Appalachian community, particularly among lower status men and women (Hennon & Photiadis, 1979; Fiene, 1988, 1990, 1991).

Recent research indicates some change in men's roles and status in Appalachia. Collins and Finn (1976) trace this change to current economic upheavals. As men's unemployment rates have risen and women's job opportunities have increased, men's traditional authority over household decisions and money management has diminished. Some men have taken up some domestic duties formerly performed by women,

but more frequently, they spend their time in traditional male leisure pursuits such as hunting and fishing.

Hennon and Photiadis' (1979) ten year study of Appalachian men reveals that the provider role is radically changing, which in turn affects all other male roles. In addition, women's entry into the labor force, the family's exposure to the media, and an increasingly heterogeneous community have led women and children to challenge the existing system.

According to Hennon and Photiadis (1979), the degree of change in men's roles is dependent upon the residence of the respondent. In county seats, which have the closest contact to the mainstream culture and most stable economic base, men are taking white-collar jobs, which is leading to the adoption of less strictly differentiated gender roles, which the authors associate with current middle-class norms. In more geographically remote towns, changes have been less marked. Employed, younger women are challenging male dominance and sexual double-standards, but older cohorts are making only moderate changes in traditional gender expectations and behavior. In the most remote communities, isolation has preserved much of the folk culture. Males in these communities retain many traditional characteristics: they lack confidence outside their own world, they value physical and emotional toughness, they value a rugged individualism. Hennon and Photiadis suggest that these

personality characteristics have largely precluded transition to the white collar work force. To survive, many men turn to government assistance even though it goes against local norms. The result is inner turmoil for the male which he alleviates by retreating into the security of the family and traditional roles and preoccupations. The retreat is actually an adaptation to the negative situation in which the men find themselves.

Gas, Nichols, and Rutledge (1970) suggest socialization patterns in Appalachia keep men from learning negotiation and bargaining skills needed to participate in white-collar, middle-class society. Their study of families with children in Head Start programs in a rural Appalachian county reports that mothers and fathers in the region strongly repress sons' aggressive behavior toward peers. The end result is the perpetuation of norms of "toughness" for males, but only with their equals. In the face of perceived authority Appalachian men are passive and unable to initiate change. This pattern cuts young men off from effective participation in the white-collar work world, which requires properly channeled aggressive and independent behavior on the job. This may be one explanation for the less productive changes found in men at the lower economic statuses.

In summary, research on Appalachian men's roles and status has found that a significant change is occurring.

The nature of change appears to be linked to several variables, including social class, women's employment, men's job opportunities, age, socialization, and community values. Unfortunately, the current research has spent little time examining the current configuration of men's roles and status inside the family compared to women's roles and status. In light of recent macro-level changes in the economy, it is expected that the family has been profoundly affected. In addition, previous research on men's gender roles has been exploratory in nature. Hennon and Photiadis (1979) have developed an interesting typology of men's roles in Appalachia based on socio-economic status and Collins and Finn (1976) have commented on the importance of the dual labor market in determining both men's and women's roles in industrialized Appalachian society. However, little other work has been done employing specific theories of gender stratification to men's and women's roles in Appalachia. This study will use Blumberg's theory of gender stratification to bridge that gap.

Conceptual Framework: Rae Lesser Blumberg's

Theory of Gender Stratification

Rae Lesser Blumberg (1978, 1983, 1984, 1989, 1991) has developed a multi-causal theory of gender stratification which is adapted for use at both the macro- and micro-levels. At the macro-level, Blumberg has incorporated many of Gerhard Lenski's, Max Weber's and Karl Marx's basic

assumptions about social stratification. The micro-level of her theory of American gender stratification, constructed with Marion Tolbert Coleman (1989, 1991), is grounded in many of the propositions found in Blumberg's macro theory. Additional insights for the micro theory are taken from gender researchers such as Blumstein and Schwartz (1983), who analyze marital power in terms of who has the final say-so in the family; Huber and Spitz (1983) who underscore the economic base of power in gender relations; and Hood (1983), who stresses the importance of bargaining in marital decision making. Blumberg has tested much of her theory of gender stratification using anthropological data regarding men's and women's relative social status across time and cultures (Blumberg, 1978, 1988, 1991). The result is a complex theory of gender stratification which is well grounded in human reality. The basic tenets of her theories are described below.

Blumberg's general theory of gender stratification hinges on her understanding of the purpose of social stratification theory. Following Gerhard Lenski she states, "Stratification theories may be viewed as attempts to explain differential power and privilege, and how the former begets the latter" (Blumberg, 1984, p. 23). For Blumberg, the goal of gender stratification theory is the analysis of women's power and privilege relative to men's and how that

privilege is obtained through the use of power (Blumberg, 1984).

Using Weber's definition, Blumberg conceptualizes power as "the probability of persons or groups carrying out their will even when opposed by others (Blumberg, 1978, p. 121)." Those persons or groups with the most secure power bases will not experience opposition. Rather, the authority vested in the positions they hold or the charismatic qualities of the individuals' personalities compels others to submit to their wishes readily. Those persons or groups with the least secure power base will be more likely to experience opposition. As a last resort force can be utilized to eliminate any such resistance.

Blumberg's analysis of cross-cultural anthropological data indicate that women's power in four realms--coercion, economic power, political power, and ideational power--is highly limited except in one key area: the economy. In the economic realm women show the widest variations in degree of power held. Blumberg (1991, p. 21) states that worldwide, the degree to which families put their economic resources into a "common pot" or "separate purses" approximates a continuum. This is also true of the degree to which women are able to control their own economic resources and have provider responsibilities for their own children.

Anthropological research shows women in traditional Iroquois societies had control of the economy. In contrast, women in

some contemporary Muslim societies have no access to paid work roles (Blumberg, 1984, p. 26-29). Typically, the degree to which women have control of the economy falls somewhere between these two extremes. Blumberg contends that women's access to power in the economic sphere conditions women's power in the other three realms. This leads Blumberg to conclude that economic power is the key variable affecting women's access to all other forms of power and ultimately women's position in the gender stratification system (Blumberg, 1978, 1984, 1991).

In her general theory of gender stratification, Blumberg follows Marx in defining economic power as the "degree of control over the means of production and...(the) degree of control over allocation of surplus or of surplus value" (Blumberg, 1984, p. 47). Generally, the term "means of production" includes labor, capital and land. Although income and property ownership are important, control over the means of production is paramount to the acquisition of power in other social spheres. In addition, the degree to which women control surplus production and surplus value is of great significance. Blumberg has found that in many societies women's production tends to be geared more toward subsistence needs, which contributes little to economic power (Blumberg, 1988, pp. 54-58).

Blumberg asserts that women's control over the means of production and surplus production is affected by the degree

to which women hold power at both the micro- and macro-levels of society. The micro- and macro-levels of power are independent to an extent. However, as Blumberg states:

...(T)he more macro-levels--which historically have been more male-dominated--will generally function as a "discount rate" affecting the exercise of women's relative economic power at more micro-levels. (What I mean by discount rate is that women will not receive full face value for their micro-level economic power; rather, it will be reduced in proportion to the level of male dominance of the macro-levels.) This is because macro-levels influence micro-levels more than vice versa (Blumberg, 1984, p. 49).

Power at the macro-level forms an environment in which the more micro-levels operate creating a "nesting" effect. Blumberg's field research indicates that in stratified societies, men invariably control the macro-levels of the political economy although the degree to which women are excluded from this arena differs (Blumberg, 1991, p. 100). Therefore, economic variables at both the micro- and macro-levels structure women's and men's opportunities in other areas of social life and the degree to which they are able to control their own lives (Blumberg, 1978, 1984, 1991).

Blumberg asserts that women's economic power is conditioned by the degree to which they participate in the labor force. Using the anthropological data available on various societies, she links women's labor force participation with the degree to which the techno-economic

base of a society is compatible with women's child care responsibilities. In hunting and gathering societies, horticultural, and wet-rice agricultural societies, women's work is highly compatible with child care responsibilities, allowing women to maximize their labor force participation. It is in these societies that women enjoy their highest levels of economic and all other forms of social power. In agricultural societies there is a reversal in women's status relative to men's. Women's labor force participation is minimal. Work with heavy plows in widely dispersed fields is distinctly incompatible with child care responsibilities, thereby minimizing women's labor force participation. As a result, women in these societies hold the lowest levels of power relative to men in all realms of social life. In modern industrialized societies women experience once again higher work force participation rates and correspondingly higher rates of power in other social spheres (Blumberg, 1978).

Blumberg (1978) is quick to point out that compatibility of child care responsibilities with economic activity is not the only variable affecting women's labor force participation. In addition, the available male labor supply is a second independent variable affecting women's labor force participation. Whenever there is a high demand for labor that only women could supply there is a corresponding increase in women's labor force participation,

regardless of the degree of compatibility between the techno-economic base and child care responsibilities. This is particularly true of more stratified societies where demand for labor is hypothesized to be the most critical variable affecting women's labor force participation. Blumberg further notes that the complexity of stratified societies requires that other forms of social stratification--such as the strength, composition and nature of the labor movement, and the position of the country in the world economy--be added into an analysis of the likelihood of demand for women's labor and their subsequent participation.

Blumberg does add a caveat to this series of propositions regarding women's labor force participation and subsequent accrual of power. She notes that in most societies there is an inverse relationship between social class and women's economic contributions relative to men's. Poor women have high levels of economic activity, but this does not automatically translate into greater household power. This is due to the fact that their contributions are frequently geared more toward subsistence needs which provide less leverage in marital relations than contributions to and control over surplus production (Blumberg, 1991, p. 22).

In summary, when conditions allow women to have high rates of labor force participation, there is a corresponding

probability of their having greater access to the means of production and control over distribution of the surpluses produced. This access ultimately determines the levels of power women enjoy relative to men in all areas of the society, which in turn directly impacts women's status in the social structure (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 51-56).

Blumberg proposes three additional variables to "labor force participation" which are believed to determine women's access to the means of production. These variables are the "strategic indispensability of women's work", the "societal means of production" and the "kinship system" (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 56-57). Each variable's importance is described below.

"Strategic indispensability of women's work" is measured by seven indicators of the degree to which women are able to "...convert their labor in production to some degree of control over the means of production..."

(Blumberg, 1984, p. 56). They are as follows:

(1) The importance of women's productive activities to societal survival as measured by (a) "the proportion or value of total output/diet produced and (b) the short-run substitution costs at the margin" (Blumberg, 1984, p. 57). Women are awarded economic power in accordance with the degree to which the activities they perform are valuable to the society's survival and their labor is difficult to replace.

(2) The importance of the women laborers themselves, or their substitutability as measured by (a) and (b) above. Where women must compete with other groups forming reserve labor supplies or their skills are minimal, they will suffer in the economic realm due to the ease with which they can be replaced by others.

(3) The extent to which women control technical expertise not possessed by men. The possession of technical expertise should increase women's bargaining power in the economic realm.

(4) The extent to which women work autonomously from the supervision of other superordinate groups. Supervision is associated with a reduction in women's control over how, when and where they work as well as the degree of control they have over the surplus.

(5) "The size, nature and cohesiveness of women's work groups (including their suitability for economies of scale)" (Blumberg, 1984, p. 57). When women are able to work in large, non-competitive, interconnected groups they will have more power than women working alone.

(6) The degree to which women workers organize for their own benefit. The legal capability as well as situational facilitation of women's organization can yield considerable power for working women.

(7) The extent and type of external competition affecting women's output or the women's work force itself.

When women's labor is in high demand, any competing, powerful groups may award concessions to women in order to gain women's support, lending women greater bargaining power in the work place (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 57-62).

A second set of determinants of women's access to the means of production is the society's dominant "social relations of production". This refers to "who controls the society's means of production and allocates its surplus (if any)" (Blumberg, 1984, p. 65). Women are said to fare best in those societies having communal relations of production rather than individual or private relations of production. Communal relations occur most frequently in hunting and gathering societies. However, communal relations of production do not necessarily mean communal control of the means of production. Blumberg's cross-cultural analysis indicates that many of these societies have a sub-group who maintain control in the economic arena. Most frequently it is men who compose this elite group (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 62-67).

A third set of variables which affect women's control over the means of production and surplus production relates to the kinship system. Blumberg notes that women tend to benefit from family systems with flexible sharing networks. These are found primarily among the poor and are generally maintained by women's cultivation of exchange networks with other kin (1991, p. 23). In addition, Blumberg suggests

women fare better in matri-centered societies and worst in patri-centered societies. In matri-centered societies descent rules, residence patterns, and inheritance rules favor women, giving them greater control over the means of production and surplus production. Inheritance is believed to be the most important kinship variable because it provides a direct line to economic power. However, matri-local residence patterns can increase women's economic power indirectly by allowing for the formation of alliances and the garnering of support among women's own kin against husbands when there is a disagreement. The specific nature of descent patterns also plays a role. Although women fare better in matri-lineal societies, in reality fathers and brothers may be the ones holding effective power in these societies. These kinship variables work together with rates of women's labor force participation, the societal means of production and strategic indispensability of women's work to determine women's access to the means of production. Together they form a complex whole which must be analyzed carefully in accordance with the specific rules of each individual group before making judgments about the position of women in the society (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 62-66).

The above variables are essential in determining women's status in the social stratification system. When women gain greater economic power relative to men there is a corresponding rise in women's control over various life

options. By "life options," Blumberg refers to "(a)n individual's degree of control over basic life situations occurring in all human groups (Blumberg, 1978, p. 121)". The freedom, or privilege, to make decisions about marriage and divorce, the ability to control one's own sexuality and fertility, and the opportunity to exercise household authority and decision making are all examples of life options. The connection between economic power and life options occurs at both the macro- and micro-levels. Blumberg believes these life options are the outward manifestation of women's status position in a given society (Blumberg, 1984, pp. 40-44). When women as a group gain greater economic power, they will have fewer negative experiences in other power realms and will experience an increase in "self-confidence and sense of self" (Blumberg, 1991, p. 101).

The last element in Blumberg's general theory of gender stratification is a discussion of social change. She states that societies can be characterized as being stable or transitory. In periods of social transition women's gains in economic power may result in acts of retaliation by men. Blumberg's data indicate that this is a common phenomena because men perceive women's growing power as a threat to their own power base and are likely to respond in a repressive manner (Blumberg, 1984, p. 51). On the down side, women's economic power tends to fall more quickly and

more completely than it rises. A fall in women's economic power is quickly manifested in a decrease in household decision-making and, interestingly, family well-being because women tend to devote more of their resources to children's nutrition and family welfare than men do (Blumberg, 1988, 1991). In addition, Blumberg (1991) states that change need not be at the national level for gender relations to be affected. As the economic position of various racial and ethnic groups shifts, the gender relations of families within these groups will also change. Therefore, economic change at all levels of the social structure can result in tangible changes in gender relations at the micro-level.

From this general theory of gender stratification Blumberg and Coleman (1989) have developed a theory of the gender balance of power which relates specifically to the American family and has been incorporated into Blumberg's latest work, Gender, Family and Economy: The Triple Overlap (1991). This effort allows for a more specific analysis of gender relations at the micro-level than Blumberg's general theory of gender stratification.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) assert that American women's position defined in terms of household power is composed of three different components: "Overall Economic Power" (OEP), micro- and macro-level discount factors which can adversely affect women's OEP; and "Net Economic Power"

(NEP). These fit together in an equation describing household power which is formulated as follows: $OEP - (\text{micro} + \text{macro discounts}) = NEP \rightarrow \text{Household Power}$ (Blumberg, 1989, pp. 231-233).

At the micro-level women's "overall economic power" is measured by her absolute earnings, the husband/wife earning ratio, and the wife's independent control over earnings, with control over surplus production being more important than control over subsistence needs (Blumberg, 1989, p. 233).

This power is mitigated in several important ways. At the macro-level, male domination of the highest levels of the political economy, societal ideology, birth cohort, and class and ethnicity effects diffuse power gained at the micro-level. At the micro-level "discounts on women's economic power" are as follows: (1) First, the relative commitment of husband and wife to the relationship. The partner who is most committed to the marital relationship weakens his or her power base in the relationship by being more willing to accede to the will of the less committed partner in order to preserve the relationship. (2) Attractiveness is a source of power at the micro-level. A less attractive partner may forfeit power gained in the economic realm in order to preserve a relationship with a partner whom they consider to be highly attractive. In American society, an attractive mate is frequently a status

symbol. (3) A traditional personal ideology of one or both of the partners can mitigate power gained in other realms. Traditional conceptions of men's and women's roles will cause husbands' and wives' to negate women's economic gains. (4) The perception by the husband of the family's need for the wife's income acts as a discount factor at the micro-level. A husband who does not perceive the need for his wife's income will be less swayed by her demands even when her own economic power is high. These discounts must be accounted for before the wife's net economic power can be understood (Blumberg, 1989, pp. 235-236).

Women's economic power is in turn mitigated by whether the social system is in a state of transition or stability. Transitional systems are less sympathetic to women because men who feel their relative power to be in a state of decline may use retaliatory actions against their wives (Blumberg, 1989, pp. 231-238).

Net Economic Power is the level of power women hold relative to men when these discount factors are taken away from the women's Overall Economic Power. Blumberg and Coleman (1989, 1991) contend that Net Economic Power is directly related to women's self esteem and her leverage in the household.

Greater household power is measured by (1) the wife having greater say-so in the relationship; (2) the wife's ability to make decisions regarding her own fertility,

economic decisions and domestic decisions; (3) the wife's ability to control her own sexuality; (4) greater parity in household and child care labor (where equal time spent does not equal parity if the woman must do all of the "dirty work" while the husband gets the nicer jobs. For example: scrubbing the bathtub versus straightening up the living room.); and (5) the use of direct conflict resolution strategies by the wife rather than manipulation (Blumberg, 1989, pp. 239-244).

Blumberg provides a coherent analytical framework with which to analyze gender stratification at both the micro- and macro-levels using a materialist perspective. Her theory transcends cultural boundaries and variables relating to cultural change making this a uniquely suitable framework in which to analyze the Appalachian system as it makes the transition from a mining based economy to a primarily service-oriented economy.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

This project examines a variety of gender-related issues as they pertain to married couples in the context of a changing community. Respondents were asked about the following gender issues in their marriages: marital roles; individual attitudes regarding gender roles; division of household labor; division of child care responsibilities; marital decision-making; marital satisfaction; marital communication; attitudes regarding sex roles; sexual satisfaction; fertility; and marital commitment. In addition, factors outside the marriage which impact gender roles in the marriage were also discussed with the respondents: perceptions of community attitudes regarding gender roles; employment; spousal attitudes regarding employment; community roles; socio-economic status; leisure activities; and the kinship system.

The material on gender relations is interpreted in the context of Blumberg's theory of gender stratification. Emphasis is given to Blumberg's assertion that at the micro-level, women who have greater economic power enjoy greater control over life options such as fertility, marriage,

divorce, sexuality, household decision-making, education, and community roles.

Research Site

The study site was a grouping of Central Appalachian towns in northeast Tennessee located near the state line. The town of Centerville lies in the center of a number of small communities found within a 30 mile radius. This grouping of communities is situated in and around the same valley which covers a two county area. As of 1990 there were 2,447 persons in Centerville and several hundred in the surrounding communities (Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/1993, p. 40). The communities share Centerville as a business center. Persons in all of these communities were included in the study due to their extensive interactions and common economic base.

Centerville and the surrounding communities are located primarily in Campbell county which is included in the southernmost portion of Central Appalachia as it is defined by the Appalachian Regional Commission. The remaining small communities are just across the county-line in Claiborne county. The closest large metropolitan area lies 60 miles to the south. The first settlements in Campbell county date back to 1795. Early settlers farmed or were involved in the smelting of iron ore. Coal was discovered in the county in 1853. Production was halted during the Civil War and did

not begin again until a rail system was laid in 1883 (The Historical News, April, 1991).

The town of Centerville was settled in 1795. In the early years the town was primarily a farming community with a trading post. Centerville became dependent upon mining and timber when it became a rail center for the Louisville & Nashville railroad in 1880 (The Historical News, April, 1991). The rails ran North and South through the valley. There were five large mines in the Centerville area during its boom years between 1880 and the 1940s. During that period the thriving town bustled with people staying at the local hotels, visiting movie theaters, or milling through the substantial shopping district.

By 1950 the first indications of a decline in mining and industry was observable in the area (Page, 1986). Deep mining began to subside in importance and a shift was made to less labor-intensive strip mining. By 1965, Centerville's unemployment rate was at 14%. During this time period a major highway was constructed through the area; nevertheless the town remained isolated from major metropolitan areas. Many of the town's men migrated north in search of jobs, some taking their families with them, others leaving their families behind to manage the homestead. The men who remained in the town found it difficult to support their families. Local businesses went into a period of decline, with many closing their doors

permanently. In the sixties, the Centerville Municipal Planning Commission made the first of several unsuccessful attempts to stimulate Centerville's declining economy. A more organized attempt to bring the town out of its economic decline began in the mid-1960s. Development efforts made only limited progress at that time (Appalachia, May, 1968). A County Census Summary (1972) declared in the early 1970s that Campbell county as a whole was:

the victim of a vicious circle of decline. A lack of jobs and the resulting low incomes have caused much of the better trained and educated population to move elsewhere to look for jobs. The lack of education and training of the remaining population has not been attractive to industry and few new industries have settled in the area. Of those industries that have settled most have been in the needle trades which offer employment opportunities for women and so the men still had to look elsewhere for employment. (County Census Summary, November 1972, p. 7).

Throughout the eighties and nineties Centerville was supported primarily by several small factories (Page, 1986; Tennessee Community Data Sheet, 1993). There were two apparel plants in the area. The largest employed 250 women and 38 men when at full operation. The smaller employed 63 women and 2 men (Tennessee Community Data Sheet, 1992). Employment numbers at these plants fluctuated throughout 1993 with layoffs occurring periodically. Local owners of the larger plant announced plans in 1993 to expand the plant by 165 more employees (Personal interview with J. Leach July 20, 1993). A bronze casting plant employed 37 men and 3 women. A limestone company employed 8 men and 1 woman

(Tennessee Community Data Sheet, 1992). There were also a number of small businesses in the town.

The Centerville per capita income in 1989 was \$10,325 (Tennessee Community Data Sheet, 1992), slightly higher than the Campbell and Claiborne county averages of \$8,098 and \$8,371, respectively, but lagging behind the state per capita income of \$12,255 (Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/93, pp. 93-94) which was approximately 83% of the national average (Current Population Reports, 1988). In 1990 the county unemployment rate was 10.8%. In addition, the men working in the last remaining deep mine in the Centerville area have been on strike since 1990, causing much economic distress for many families in the area.

The Centerville population has been declining since the 1980 census report of 2,798. The 1990 population according to the Tennessee Community Data Sheet (1991) was 2,447. Development remains the main goal of people in the valley who have not already given up hope. A deteriorating main street has several empty buildings. The downtown section of Centerville is in the form of a "T" with buildings dating back to the turn of the century. These buildings face the railroad track. The main street area is approximately two blocks long with newer businesses and government buildings stretching out in the second blocks of the "T". A small combination library, fire department, and city government

building is on one leg of the "T". A 50 bed hospital is up a hill from Main Street. The town has its own high school.

Surrounding communities have a collection of homes, several small businesses and some mining and oil activity of their own. Much of the area is semi-rural, with homes frequently having at least some land connected with them for a garden and some outdoor buildings. Local residents say the general standard of living remains low because when anyone begins to make some money they move out of the valley. This depletes the tax base and accentuates the problems of the area for those who remain.

Centerville provides an interesting site for research on the impact of the economy on Appalachian marital relationships. Past research has characterized the Appalachian family as traditionalist, familistic and paternalistic. This research project examines what effect the economic environment has had on gender relationships within the context of marriage.

Sample Selection

The husband and wife relationship forms a microcosm in which to examine the power of women relative to their male partners. The sample includes 16 married women and 16 married men between the ages of 23 and 50. The average age of the women was 31.3 years, and the average of the men was 34.5 years. The majority of the couples were under forty years of age.

Each informant was married at the time of the interview. This requirement insured that the focus of the discussion was an on-going marriage rather than recollections of a past relationship, which is subject to biased reporting. Each participant was required to have been married for at least one year. This insured a history of information to draw upon when the participant responded to questions about marital behavior patterns. Fifteen of the men and women included in the sample were married to each other. Difficulty finding married couples willing to be interviewed required that one "simulated couple" be created. This was accomplished by finding a man and a woman not married to each other who had similar personal and social backgrounds and were willing to participate. The responses of the man and woman in the simulated couple pertain to their relationships with their own spouse. Due to this research project's focus on women's overall economic status and marital power, the responses of the female informant in the simulated couple are reported most frequently in the text. The male informant in the simulated couple is used primarily as a checkpoint from which to assess the degree to which the female informant's responses can be generalized to other persons in the community of her same status. It is recognized that this leads to a bias in the reporting, yet the information still yields important information on gender roles and status in marriage.

Couples with or without children were included in the sample. However, participants who were married for more than eighteen years were required to have at least one child under the age of 18 living at home to insure that all of the couples were in a similar stage of the life cycle. Couples who had launched their children or retired might have had different ways of dividing household labor than younger couples; therefore they were omitted from the sample. Persons over the age of fifty-five were also excluded from the sample for similar reasons.

A list of the couples is provided below. The couples have been divided into those with a non-income-earning wife and those with an income-earning wife to aid in the identification of couples in the results section. The income-earning women are listed from the highest earners relative to their spouses' incomes to the lowest earners relative to their spouses' incomes (see Table 1).

The sample was drawn using purposive sampling techniques. Using informants to identify interviewees was helpful because Appalachian communities have a reputation for being cautious with strangers. This tendency is accentuated due to past negative experiences with government investigators and social researchers who have portrayed Appalachian Highlanders in negative, stereotypical ways or taken advantage of local residents.

An entree was established at a rural education program which holds classes at a local women's organization. The researcher held a teaching position there for three years. The rural education program, local churches, schools, and community programs formed the primary source for locating

Table 1

Identifying Characteristics of Couples

Couples	Age		Number of Children	Occupation	
	Wife	Husband		Wife	Husband
Hope & Lyle	40	50	3	Medical Technician	Disabled Veteran
Emma & Lou	33	37	2	Nurse	Laid-Off Factory Worker
Carol & Al	31	39	2	Seamstress in Factory	Striking Miner
Sue & Joe	28	28	Pregnant	Social Worker	Substitute Teacher
Jan & Sam	38	32	1	Disabled Nurses' Aid	Disabled Miner
Opal & Hank	43	46	4	Cook	Disabled
Gail & Ernie	28	27	1	Secretary	Semi-Skilled Factory Worker
Peggy	33	--	2	Cashier	Truck Driver
Ralph	43	--	3	Substitute Teacher	Striking Miner
Kay & Tom	28	29	2	Housewife	Disabled

Table 1 (Continued)

Couples	Age		Number of Children	Occupation	
	Wife	Husband		Wife	Husband
Ann & Bill	33	37	2	Housewife	Striking Miner
Mary & Steve	28	37	1	Housewife	Striking Miner
Lynn & Mike	27	29	2	Housewife	Bus Driver/ Farmer
Meg & Dan	31	36	3	Housewife	Disabled Factory Worker
Bonnie & Kris	29	29	2	Housewife	Construction Worker
Donna & Greg	23	24	2	Housewife	Construction Worker
Fran & Keith	27	29	2	Housewife	Odds and Ends Jobs

participants for the study. A core group of informants (three in number) were students at the rural education program. These individuals were former students of the interviewer. The original informants and their spouses were asked to name any couples who they believed would be willing to participate in the study to yield additional contacts. The researcher proceeded by contacting acquaintances of the original informants and community leaders from churches, schools, and community programs to locate more participants.

Sixteen couples were included in the final sample. Five participants were students from the rural education program. Four were members of a local union of coal miners. The remainder were a conglomeration of members of various churches, social organizations, or acquaintances of other participants.

Originally twenty couples were expected to be included in the sample. Due to difficulty finding married couples willing to participate, interviewing was concluded four couples short of the goal. Criteria regarding the length of marriage, ages of participants, and length of local residence contributed to the natural difficulty in locating persons willing to participate in personal interviews for a research project. The extensive time required to find participants also contributed to the termination of the interviewing process. The problem of a smaller sample size is offset by the insurance that new socio-economic changes in the community did not create new variables to be considered in the analysis.

Prior to requesting an interview, community leaders and previous participants contacted potential interviewees or introduced the interviewer personally. This was done to insure individual's willingness to be approached about doing an interview. At initial contact, each person was informed of the interviewer's relationship with the rural education program, the nature of the research project, and who had

suggested their name as a potential participant. If the person agreed to an interview, a location, date, and time was arranged for an interview. Note that virtually everyone in the area is related to everyone else in some way; therefore, sample diversity was difficult to accomplish. Efforts were made first to select respondents who were non-kin or distant kin of the informants.

There are several biases in the sample. This community, although similar to other Appalachian communities, has many unique features. It lies near an interstate highway. A good sized town is within sixty miles of the community. Many institutions of higher education are within one hour's driving distance of the community. On the other hand, these factors are part of the modernization process which is occurring throughout Appalachia. It is the transitional character of the town which makes it an interesting area to study using Blumberg's theory. It is also acknowledged that the sample is biased by the use of volunteers who are connected in some way with community organizations and their participants. The degree to which volunteers in a purposive sample reflect the wider society must always be closely scrutinized. Participation in these programs indicates the possibility of unique personalities or life circumstances of the participant. To counteract this problem, a variety of questions about the broader community were included in the interview process. It is

also recognized that those suggested as possible informants often travel in the same circles as those already interviewed. To minimize this problem a broad variety of community organizations were contacted to find respondents. In addition, the sample includes only those persons inclined to participate in the interviewing process. The researcher contacted a large number of people who did not wish to participate. For this reason the sample is biased toward those who are more open to outsiders and have more time to spend participating in a research project.

Data Gathering

Structured interviews with many open-ended questions were used to gather information on gender relations and division of labor among married persons. Interviews were conducted face-to-face, lasting between an hour and a half to four hours. Husbands and wives were interviewed separately. The format of the interviews involved asking both specific and open-ended questions designed to provide information regarding variables in Blumberg's model. The interviews were conducted in respondents' homes and at a local community center. Efforts were made to insure that the interviews were conducted in private. The majority of interviews were carried out with only the interviewer and interviewee in the room. Due to the close quarters in some of the participants' homes it was difficult during some interviews to maintain complete privacy. In these cases,

personal questions were reserved until other members of the family left the area. The majority of respondents were willing to complete the interview once they had started the process. Only two men did not wish to complete the interview once they had started. One of these men was omitted from the final sample. The other man was included in the sample since he only left a few objective questions at the end of the interview in order to make a prior engagement. His wife was able to answer most of the questions he left unanswered.

The questions in the interview were semi-structured. Various questions provided a series of structured responses with opportunity to elaborate. Other questions were more open-ended. The degree to which certain structured questions did not provide sufficient variation in responses is a potential source of bias in the research. Informants may have felt that their true response was not included among those provided by the interviewer. To counteract this phenomena, individual's were encouraged to give responses not included in the prepared response set. In contrast, the subjective nature of the open-ended questions provided informants with many opportunities to provide their own interpretation to events in their lives. Repetition of questions in various formats and comparison of spouses responses were used to offset this problem.

Variables

The marital relationship was an important variable for analysis in this study. Marital satisfaction was addressed indirectly by most of the questions regarding the marital relationship. Specifically, questions 38-39 (see Appendix 1) asked if the respondent felt lucky that their spouse chose to marry them and what they liked about being married to their spouse. Question 32 specifically asked about satisfaction with the sexual relationship.

Marital commitment was assessed by asking, "Have you ever considered a separation from your spouse?" (question 29) and "How committed would you say you are to your marriage?" (question 39). Tied to this are two variables which Blumberg feels are important concerning who has the most power in the relationship. Blumberg believes the most attractive and the least interested partner in the marriage has the most leverage in the marital relationship. Therefore, respondents were asked questions regarding how attractive they find their partner and their level of interest in their partner (questions 8, 9, 37 and 38).

Marital roles and marital division of labor were assessed by asking directly and indirectly about the amount of time each spouse spends on household tasks, child care tasks, and regular activities of spouses (questions 11, 12, 16, 21, 50, 51, 54). These questions addressed the degree to which husbands and wives maintain separate spheres.

Marital communication was addressed by questions 23, 24, 26, 79, and 98. These questions asked respondents how frequently they express their feelings and talk to their spouse.

Expectations regarding marital roles was explored with a variety of direct questions, situational questions, and indirect questions which ask respondents what they expect in marital relationships. These questions were interspersed throughout the questionnaire and addressed many areas of marital life.

Child care responsibilities were addressed in questions 16, 21, 50, and 54. The division of labor among parents was assessed by asking about time spent at various child care tasks.

According to Blumberg, the kinship system is an essential variable contributing to women's status in the social system. Earlier studies of the Appalachian family found the modified extended kin system and familism to be unique and highly-valued characteristics of the culture. Each respondent was asked about the kin support systems in terms of whether kin can be relied upon for emotional, financial, and work help (questions 59, 60, 65, and 66). Residence patterns of kin were also addressed by asking if kin live with the family or nearby and the amount of visiting that occurs with kin in questions 55 through 66.

Labor force participation was addressed by asking husbands and wives if they were currently employed, if they have ever worked for pay, and if they planned on seeking paid employment in the future. They were asked what type of job they held currently and if they were satisfied with their job. If the respondent had not held a job or had stayed out of the labor force for a period of time, the respondent was asked about his or her reasons for not seeking paid employment. These questions are important in terms of Blumberg's theory because she believes that women's gender status does not simply depend upon their employment status. Whether the husband perceives that her work is needed for the family and whether he accepts this as an appropriate role for a woman is also important in understanding women's status. These issues were addressed in questions 75 through 97.

The relative economic power of husbands and wives was assessed by looking at the family's socio-economic status, the earnings ratio of husband and wife, the woman's total income, and the woman's control over income. Specific questions addressing these issues included family's socio-economic status, earning ratios of husbands and wives, and control of family economic resources.

The family's socio-economic status was assessed by asking each respondent to choose from a card which income bracket they fell into in the previous year and if this is

different from previous years. Although not a specific element in Blumberg's theory, the issue was addressed in order to help classify respondents. Participants were asked if they own any property and if they had ever received government subsidies. The respondent's occupation and own perception of his or her social status were assessed.

The earnings ratio of the husband and wife was measured by asking the respondent what percent of the family income he or she contributed in the past year. Subjective perceptions were used. Although it is recognized that the use of memory forms a bias, the couples' responses were checked against one another. Perceptions are extremely important to Blumberg's theory due to her emphasis on the husband's perceived need for the wife's income.

According to Blumberg, the fact that a woman earns money does not directly translate into power in the marriage relationship. It is also important whether she has control over the family's economic resources. Therefore, respondents were asked who in the family controls the family purse, how decisions on spending are arrived at, how bank accounts are arranged, and who owns what. These issues were addressed in questions 20, and 87 through 111.

Impact of the economy on gender relationships is of special significance to this research project and Blumberg's theory. This issue was addressed indirectly through the entire interview schedule. The question was addressed

directly in question 110 by asking for the respondents' perceptions of how the changes in the Appalachian economy had affected their families, if at all.

Control over life options is an important dependent variable in Blumberg's model. She indicates that when women have power, their ability to control important life events increase. The following variables are examples of life options which are assessed.

(1) Participation in Community Roles was assessed in questions 67 through 74. Each respondent was asked, "What do ou do in your free time?" This led to questions regarding participation in organizations. These questions are significant for the assessment of gender differences in leisure activities and respondents' freedom to engage in such activities. More importantly, they form a way in which to look at how leadership roles and resources from other arenas can be brought into the marriage.

(2) Say-so in household decision-making is another important measure of a woman's control over her own life. These issues were addressed in the interview schedule in questions 17 through 20, which asked who makes various decisions in the family and each decision's relative importance to the family. Question 30 addressed an issue discussed by Blumberg, namely that a person in a relatively less powerful position is more likely to use manipulation to

resolve conflicts. This question relates to the ability to have a say in what happens in one's own life.

(3) Fertility patterns are another measure of a woman's relative control in the relationship. Respondents were asked about the number of children they have, spacing of their children, use of birth control methods, and if their reproduction patterns were consistent with their own wishes. These issues were addressed in questions 43, 47, 48, and 53.

(4) Educational attainment was addressed by asking each respondent, "How far did you go in school?". Participants were also asked if they ever received further education or training in questions 95 and 96. These questions addressed the degree to which respondents had been able to pursue their education to the extent they would like and follow through with a career that befits their education.

Data Analysis

With the respondents' consent, the interviews were tape recorded. If respondents preferred, brief notes were recorded during the interviews. At the first available opportunity, complete transcripts of the interviews were made and reviewed for their relevance to the aforementioned variables connected with Blumberg's theory. Because the interview process is highly personal, the answers to the questions reflect the subjective interpretations of the respondents. This is a limitation of the study in that it is impossible to draw an exact line between that which is

objective in the answers and that which is not. However, the subjective nature of the responses allows for a fuller understanding of each respondent's own sense of reality which forms a basis for his or her gender related behaviors.

CHAPTER FOUR

WOMEN'S OVERALL ECONOMIC POWER

The main question to be addressed in this analysis is "What factors affect the balance of power in Appalachian marriages?" According to Blumberg this question finds its most rudimentary answer in looking at the wife's earnings in comparison to her husband's and then examining the degree of control she exercises over her income once it is earned (Blumberg, 1989). As a starting point, I examine job participation by the men and women of Centerville. After describing labor force participation of the informants, the wife's absolute earnings, the husband/wife earnings ratio, the wife's independent control over earnings, and discounts to economic power are discussed. This portion is primarily a description of the sample's economic status as it applies to the wife's overall economic power.

Men's and Women's Work Force Participation

Six of the sixteen women in the sample held full-time jobs when interviewed, while one woman worked part-time (43.8% total). These women held traditionally female-dominated jobs such as secretary, nurse, and cook. Another woman was laid off from a factory job when interviewed, but was not actively pursuing other work opportunities or eager

to return to work. The remaining eight women were housewives, one of which is disabled (see Tables 2 and 5).

Table 2

Current Labor Force Participation of Centerville Sample

Gender	Employment Status			
	Full-time	Part-time	On Strike	Not In Labor Force*
Women	6	1	0	9
Men	4	2	4	6

* "Not In Labor Force" includes one man and one woman who were laid off from their jobs over six months, five men and one woman who were disabled, and seven women who were students or not seeking work. (For further information on labor force participation see Employment and Earnings, p. 230-231).

All of the women in the sample worked at some point in their lives as sales clerks, maids, child care staff members, seamstresses, nurses aides, and the like. The tendency among these women was either to go immediately into the work force after leaving high school or marry and begin raising children. After the children were "of a certain age," (normally corresponding to the child's entrance into school) the women re-entered the work force. County level statistics show that in the two county area, 43.9 percent and 68.3 percent, respectively, of women ages 20-24 years of age were in the labor force in 1990. The percentages rose to 53.7 percent and 78.4 percent for women between the ages

of 25 and 54, showing an increase in labor force participation as women moved out of prime childbearing years (1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee. Table 144. "Labor Force Characteristics: 1990", pp. 261-262).

Women's work histories were often sporadic due to job eliminations, layoffs, financial need, or family push and pull factors to quit or take work. For example, all but two of the housewives in the sample worked at some point within one year of the interview, either on a full-time or part-time basis. One woman did some sewing occasionally for a local shop for extra gift money. Several housewives took part-time jobs because their husbands' employers offered them opportunities for temporary employment. Another housewife worked part-time as a maid while her husband was laid off from his job. When he found work again she quit because there was no one to babysit their children. Two housewives had quit jobs in the past primarily because their husbands either did not like their work situations or did not cooperate with their desire to work. One of these women who had worked as a maid in a hotel told,

Well, he'd work days. That was whenever he was workin' and then he'd come home and I'd have to leave the kids with him. Then I'd go to work. Everybody, I guess about every hour one of the kids would be callin', 'Mom, Daddy's jumped on someone.' 'Daddy's jumpin' on [someone]. ...I come home one night and he had let [my son] ride his scooter out in the road...and a car had hit the back of his scooter. Luckily it didn't hurt

him and I just said, 'That's it.' and I never did go back [to work].

These accounts illustrate a life-time trend for many of the women in the sample to enter and withdraw from the work force as family, job opportunity, and financial needs dictated.

Only four of the sixteen male respondents were fully employed at the time of the interview, while two were employed part-time (37.5% total). Most of these men were employed in traditionally male-dominated, blue-collar jobs such as construction worker, factory worker, or bus driver. Only one man held a professional position. He was employed part-time as a substitute teacher. Since strip and deep mining began to play out in the region, area men frequently began to turn to odd jobs to support their families or compete for the few remaining factory jobs in nearby towns. Four of the men in the sample were on strike from a local mine. Of the six men who were not currently employed when interviewed, one was laid off from a factory job for over one year. The five remaining men were disabled laborers from traditionally male-dominated, blue-collar jobs (see Tables 2 and 5). Many of these men echoed the sentiment of one striking miner:

You can't raise a family on workin' for four dollars and a quarter an hour and I'm not goin' to do it. I'm not goin' to work for that. I'll stay at the house before I do that.

Centerville men grudgingly accepted that drawing a disability check, unemployment insurance, or strike pay was more profitable for them than going into the sewing factory or service industry which their wives populated. There was a strong feeling that accepting a "woman's job" was degrading to the man who possessed the skills to perform a high paying, blue-collar job. The trend of the women taking work whenever they can to help support their families as men struggle in a floundering job-market reflects the move toward a service economy in Centerville. As more women are employed and men have a harder time finding work, women's earnings relative to men's can be expected to increase.

Table 3

Labor Force Participation of Men and Women
Over the Age of Sixteen For Two Tennessee Counties

Year	% Women in Labor Force		% Men in Labor Force	
	Campbell	Claiborne	Campbell	Claiborne
1950	16.0	09.0	69.0	73.0
1960	27.0	19.0	60.0	65.0
1970	26.7	29.0	55.5	58.4
1980	35.1	38.2	65.0	64.0
1990	40.6	43.7	61.7	66.0

Source: From 1990, 1980, 1970, 1960 and 1950 Census of the Population; Tables 2, 176, 121, 83, and 43, respectively.

Statistics for the two county area in which the sample was taken show a consistent increase in women's employment relative to men's since 1950 (see Table 3). Men's labor force participation dipped to 55.5 percent and 58.4 percent

lows in 1970 and has fluctuated up and down since. This trend has allowed women to come ever closer to men in labor force participation. At the county level, Blumberg's theory predicts that women's increased labor force participation leads to increased power of women relative to their spouses. The percentage of women in the sample who were part of the labor force (43.8%) reflects the county percentages. The percentage of men in the sample who participated in the labor force (62.5%) approximates county percentages. Striking miners form a significant portion (40%) of the men who are part of the labor force. Due to difficulty encountered by the researcher in finding employed men who were willing to participate in the interview process, men who were employed full-time were under-sampled. However, this skewing of the sample allowed the investigator to focus on those couples involved in the trend toward women participating in the work force and how it affects the balance of power within the family.

Women's Earnings Relative to Men's

According to Blumberg, the important determinant of women's power at the micro-level is not women's employment but women's earnings relative to men's. First, it should be noted that the majority of Centerville couples struggle to get by. In 1989, in the two counties, 22.4 percent and 21.7 percent, respectively, of families lived below the poverty line. In Centerville 31.7 percent of individuals lived

below the poverty line. This was almost triple the state percentage of 12.4 percent. In 1989 per capita money income was also well below the state average of \$12,255, at \$8,098 and \$8,371 for Campbell and Claiborne counties, respectively. In Centerville the per capita income was \$7,274. (1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee. Table 9. "Income and Poverty Status in 1989: 1990", p. 90; Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/93. Table 2.17 "Per Capita Money Income, Median Family Income, Median Household Income, and Percent of Persons and Families Below Poverty, Municipalities and Census Designated Places, Tennessee, 1989", p. 111).

Thirteen couples in this sample had a combined income below \$19,000 for the years 1991 and 1992. Only one couple made above \$30,000 annually. The median income of the couples in the sample was between \$14,500 and \$16,000. These figures were congruent with local averages for yearly family income which were \$20,151, \$19,993, and \$16,427 for Campbell county, Claiborne county, and Centerville respectively (Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/93. Table 2.15. "Per Capita Money Income, Median Family Income and Median Household Income, Tennessee and Counties, 1989 [In dollars]", p. 93 and Table 2.17. "Per Capita Money Income, Median Family Income, Median Household Income, and Percent of Persons and Families Below Poverty, Municipalities and Census Designated Places, Tennessee, 1989", p. 111).

However, all of the women and over two-thirds of the men believed themselves to be in the middle-class compared with other members of their community. This echoes a common theme heard in the Centerville area that when people make any money, they move away.

Absolute earnings of women forms a starting place for understanding women's economic power in the community. Couples were asked to estimate their earnings for the past year. When couples estimated the working wives' absolute earnings for the past year, the men estimated that on average employed wives had earned \$7,829. Working wives estimated \$7,068. This is somewhat below the median income figures reported for year-round, full-time female workers in the two county area in 1989, \$12,600 and \$12,863 for Campbell and Claiborne counties, respectively (1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee. Table 3. "Summary of Occupation, Income, and Poverty Characteristics: 1990", p. 9). However, as Blumberg notes, the ratio of women's earnings compared to men's earnings is where the crux of marital power question is to be found.

Couples' earnings are expressed as a ratio of the wife's earnings to total family income to determine the women's contribution to their family's total economic pie for the year up to the time of the interview (see Table 4). The larger the wife's contribution, the greater her overall

economic power will be (Blumberg & Coleman, 1989). Five housewives showed earnings of zero percent. The remaining women in the sample furnished between 10 and 70 percent of the family income. A housewife who worked part-time as a maid for a portion of the year contributed 10 percent to her family's yearly income. A cashier, married to a truck driver, and a housewife who worked occasionally helping her husband in construction, earned approximately 20 percent of their family's yearly income compared to the 80 percent of total family income earned by their husband's. The cashier, who is part of the simulated couple, earned the same percentage of family income as the male informant's wife with whom she was matched for the purposes of this research. A secretary earned 30 percent of her family's yearly income; her husband (a factory worker) earned 70 percent. A food preparation employee earned 40 percent of her family's yearly earnings; the remainder of the family's income was derived from her husband's disability check. Another woman who worked as a maid in the previous year but had quit her job at the time of the interview estimated that she had earned 40 percent of her family's income compared to the 60 percent brought in by her husband, who was a farmer and bus driver. Two women in the sample approximately matched their husband's income. A disabled housewife and her husband (also disabled) had matching benefits, and a nurse whose husband was laid off from a factory position matched her

husband's income for the year prior to the interview. The nurse and her husband expected her income to out-pace his in the succeeding year. Two women in the sample earned more than their husbands in the previous year. A social worker earned 55 percent of her family's income compared to the 45 percent earned by her husband who is a substitute teacher. A seamstress in a factory earned 56 percent of her family's income compared to the 44 percent earned by her husband in strike pay.

Finally, it should be noted that two women stated that they had made more than their husbands but their husbands reported that their wives had made less than they did in the previous year. One woman said she earned 60 percent of her family's income in the past year before being laid off from a factory job. Her husband (a self-employed "jack-of-all-trades") said he had earned all the money that year. Another woman, newly employed as a medical technician, said he made 70 percent of the family's yearly income. Her husband, who was disabled, said he made 70 percent of the family's income in the past year. They both agreed she would be the primary breadwinner in the coming year. The husband's perception of his wife's earnings is as critical in Blumberg's theory as the real earnings. In conclusion, the earnings of full-time employed women in the sample barely top their husband's strike pay or part-time earnings.

This is because the work available to Centerville women rarely pays much above minimum wage.

Seventy-five percent of the women in the sample reported earning an income at some point within the year prior to the interview. Seven of these women earned a sizeable income compared to their husbands' income. In addition, the interviews revealed that two of the unemployed housewives in the sample occasionally earned a few dollars doing odd jobs, but they could not quantify the amount earned. They believed their earnings to be insignificant compared to their husbands'. In Campbell and Claiborne counties, census data indicated that all working women over age 16 earned 51 cents and 47 cents for every dollar a man earned in 1990 (1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee. Table 3. "Summary of Occupation, Income, and Poverty Characteristics: 1990", p. 9). The women in the Centerville sample earned more relative to their spouses than the county averages would lead one to expect. The high level of earnings for the women in the sample might lead one to believe these Centerville women would have more power than the stereotypical Appalachian woman relegated to a life of domestic servitude. However, Blumberg's theory states that earnings relative to one's spouse is only the beginning point by which to assess women's power relative to their husbands'. In order to understand the power dynamics in the

Appalachian marriage, we must take a deeper look into each of these couples' lives to examine women's leverage inside the household and potential discounts to women's economic power. The rest of the analysis compares women who earned an income to non-income-earning women in the sample.

Control of Earnings and Property

The degree to which women are able to control their own earnings is a significant indicator of overall economic power according to Blumberg and Coleman. Women's control of their own earnings and total family income is considered in this section. The seven women in the sample who earned an income are examined first to determine the degree of control they exercise over their individual earnings and family income. The non-income-earning women are also discussed in terms of past income and ability to control family income due to local norms which consider the "husband's" earnings to be "family" earnings. The discussion of women's control over earnings and property is limited to an analysis of the degree to which spouses maintain a common fund or separate purses, the degree to which each spouse contributes to those funds, and the amount of property owned by one or both spouses (Blumberg, 1989, p. 233). The Centerville sample suggests that while earnings are an important factor, other factors often serve to discount women's control over earnings (see Table 4).

Income-Earning Women

Sue, Carol, Emma, and Hope earned slightly more money than their husbands at the time of the interview. Sue was a social worker. Her husband Joe had recently quit his full-time job and was substitute teaching in the local school system until he could find a better paying job. Carol was a seamstress in a factory. Her husband, Al, was on strike from a local mine. He hoped to settle the strike soon and return to work. Emma employed as a nurse. Her husband, Lou, was recently laid off from a factory job. He had been looking for other job possibilities for a number of months. Lastly, Hope was newly employed as a medical technician at the local hospital. Her husband, Lyle, was disabled. All of these women took over the role of primary breadwinner in the year prior to the interview. Three of the four women viewed their top-earning position as temporary. On the basis of their earnings, these women should be relatively powerful in their homes. However, the women's relative control of their earnings and property must be examined (see Table 4).

Two of the top wage earners, Hope and Emma, had joint checking accounts with their husbands. The two couples had always pooled the entire family income into the same account. The arrangement continued as primary breadwinner responsibilities shifted to the women. Neither couple kept separate accounts. Emma and her husband Lou did keep back

from their paychecks between \$20 and \$10 for weekly expenses. Any additional earnings beyond subsistence needs were put into a joint savings account which the couple used for large expense items. Interestingly, both Hope and Emma had always assumed responsibility for taking care of the check writing and balancing of the checkbook for their families. Emma's husband Lou had a computer on which he entered their savings and checking accounts, but she was the one who handled most of the accounting responsibilities. Lou and Emma lived in a home owned by one of Lou's relatives. The only property of any significance which the couple owned were two cars which were in both of their names. Hope and her husband Lyle rented their home. Like many couples in the sample, their two cars were the largest assets they possessed. The cars were in both of their names. The women's greater contribution to the couples' income should result in greater leverage in the household for these two women relative to their counterparts. Emma's leverage could be mitigated somewhat by their house belonging to Lou's family. Whether or not these observations are borne out is discussed in chapter five.

The other two couples with high income-earning wives had differing methods for managing their finances. Sue and her husband Joe had joint checking and savings accounts. However, due to pre-existing bills when they married the couple had devised a system in the year prior to the

interview which resulted in Sue handling most of the finances. She explained,

Yeah, we split the bills so, um, I have the check book, but if he wants me to write [a] check for something, he gives me the money....I always put my money in the checking account and he always puts his money in the savings account. ...[H]e kept up with the bills that he was responsible for paying, the house payment. Which when we paid that off, we could just put that money into savings. ...I knows a lot of people that do that. They just, mostly live off one income and then save the other.

Sue added, "The only thing, I got stuck with the groceries which meant I never had any extra money." Although Sue maintained control of her paycheck, the couple's largest asset, their home, was in Joe's name. Joe owned the home prior to their marriage. The couple "just never bothered to change" the papers but this does reduce Sue's economic power.

In contrast, Carol and Al closed their joint checking account when Al went on strike from the mine. Like many people in the area with small incomes, Carol and Al used all their money as it came in to pay bills and other expenses. The couple had joint ownership of their home. Al had primary responsibility for how the money was budgeted. Prior to the strike, Al would have put all of the family income into the bank account and given Carol any money she needed. As of the time of the interview, he used his strike benefits to pay the big bills. Carol, like Sue, used her income for routine household expenses. Both Carol and Sue

maintained control over their own income as a means of dividing up the household expenses. However, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) point out the importance of the women's income going primarily to subsistence needs. Sue and Carol both kept only a few dollars for their expenses or small purchases during the week. Blumberg and Coleman state that true economic power lies in the management of surplus income. Of the two couples, only Sue and Joe generated a significant economic surplus at the time of the interview. This came from Joe's paychecks from substitute teaching. The couple jointly decided to use his money as savings for their future baby.

The four top wage earning women in this sample controlled their family's economic resources to varying degrees. Carol and Sue maintained complete control over their earnings. However, the amount of leverage this garners the women is complicated by Sue not having ownership of the family home and Sue and Carol leaving final-say over decisions beyond subsistence needs primarily to their husbands. Emma and Hope kept their earnings in a common fund. This arrangement, combined with the women's higher relative earnings compared to their husbands', garners the women significant economic power in their household. However, Lou's family ownership of the couple's home somewhat diminishes Emma's potential economic power.

Now compare the top wage earners with Jan and Opal, whose earnings approximately matched their husbands'. Jan's disability check equaled her husband's. Jan and her husband Sam shared responsibility for managing their finances. They threw their money into a common pot. The couple said that when they needed something, they would decide together how the money was to be spent. Jan and Sam had put their house and land in their son's name and their truck was in both of their names.

Opal earned slightly less at her cooking job than her husband Hank brought in with his disability check (40 percent of total family income for the year prior to the interview). When her husband was no longer employed, Opal took responsibility for the family checkbook. What little surplus earnings they might make were managed together. All of their property was in both of their names.

Jan and Opal made substantial earnings compared to their husbands (fifty and forty percent of their families' incomes respectively). The two women would be expected to wield slightly less economic power in their families than the top wage earners in the sample if income relative to one's spouse was the only factor which must be considered in this analysis. However, these two women had more control over surplus earnings and property than Emma, Carol, and Sue, who each made more than their husbands. Blumberg and Coleman suggest that this greater control over critical

economic resources will increase Jan's and Opal's overall economic power relative to the top wage earners in the sample.

The women who earned the least relative to their husbands were Gail and Peggy, who earned thirty and twenty percent, respectively, of their families' yearly income. Gail was a secretary and her husband, Ernie, had a job at a local factory. Ernie said he gave his weekly paycheck to Gail, who did all of the family's bookkeeping. After Gail had paid the bills for the month, she gave Ernie money for gas and expenses and deposited the rest in their joint checking account. What little the couple had in the way of surplus income was used to pay for large expense items. The couple had joint ownership of a vehicle and rented their house.

A different arrangement for handling the family finances was used by Peggy (a cashier at a fast-food restaurant) and her husband (a truck driver). Peggy, the female informant in the simulated couple, said that she and her husband split their bills. Peggy used her paycheck for groceries and spending money for herself and her two children, while her husband used his check for big bills. The couple closed their checking account when they switched to this accounting method from a system in which Peggy's husband handled all the accounts and gave Peggy an allowance. The couple devised this system so that Peggy's

husband would not have to worry about her needing and frequently obtaining extra money from him and to help Peggy budget her spending. Since changing the budget, Peggy began limiting herself to her paycheck and did not spend beyond that. Her husband's paycheck was used for family needs beyond subsistence and he was primarily in charge of making these decisions. The couple did not own much property. Their principal tangible assets were their cars, for which both of their names were on the titles. The couple was in the process of buying their house from Peggy's parents.

On the surface, Gail and Peggy--despite earning relatively little of their families' income--appear to maintain considerable control over their own incomes and property. However, certain factors tend to mitigate the women's power. Gail had less immediate control over her own earnings and property because, unlike Peggy, her parents did not own the home she was buying and she shared a bank account with her husband. However, Peggy's smaller income was retained by her for the sole purpose of limiting her spending. In addition, Peggy's income was used entirely for the subsistence needs of her family while her husband's income was used for large bills and savings. These two factors negate in some degree Peggy's economic control over family finances.

In summary, six of the working women maintained joint accounts with their husbands. Two working women kept their

paychecks to pay for weekly expenses for their families because they and their spouses did not maintain a checking or savings account. One might expect that these arrangements would offer all of the income-earning women perfect conditions under which to translate their income into leverage in the household. Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that the proportion of leverage a woman wields in her household rises as her relative contribution to the family fund rises. In addition, power gained by having a large income in comparison to one's spouse is mitigated first and foremost by the woman's ability to control her earnings. However, the income-earning women in the sample did not have as much control over their earnings as a cursory examination of banking accounts might suggest (see Table 4).

Blumberg and Coleman also state that earnings beyond what is needed for survival are critical to women's leverage in marriage. Only two of the couples in the sample, Emma and Lou as well as Sue and Joe, had any regular surplus earnings. Both couples said they deposited their surplus money in a joint savings account and made decisions regarding the money's distribution jointly. However, Sue's income was essential to her family's survival. It was her husband's income which was considered surplus. This could mitigate Sue's leverage in the family compared to Emma.

In addition, property ownership must be included in any discussion of marital economic power. Property ownership for the couples with income-earning wives was at most a home and/or several vehicles. Joint ownership of property was the norm. Only one working woman who made more than her husband, Sue, said her husband maintained sole ownership of their home. In several other cases, couples rented or stayed in a house owned by family members. A spouse whose family owns the couple's house gains potential economic leverage in the family. Among the income-earning wives, one woman--Emma--lived in a home owned by her husband's family. This situation can potentially work against her if she tries to exert leverage which her high income relative to her husband's should offer her. In contrast, Peggy and her husband were buying their home from her parents which gave her some added leverage in terms of property ownership over her husband. Sue and Emma lose some economic power due to their lack of ownership of their homes, while Peggy is at an advantage in terms of property ownership. The actual ability of these income-earning women to exert leverage which their incomes relative to their husbands' and their control over earnings and property should afford them is explored in chapter five.

Non-Income-Earning Women

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) tend to lump non-income-earning women together in the analysis of overall economic

control. They suggest that the lack of an income will negate the women's overall economic power in the household. However, the eight non-income-earning women in the Centerville sample had varying control of family income and property (see Table 4). In large measure, this was due to the fact that most couples in the sample emphasized the importance of the husband's income being community property. However, several unexpected factors also increase some of the non-income-earning women's overall economic power.

Two of the couples in which the wife was not employed maintained a joint bank account. Kay and her husband Tom-- who was disabled--opened a joint checking account a few months before the interview. Previously they, like many couples in the area, did not have a bank account. Kay was in charge of keeping track of her husband's disability checks, the family checkbook, and the budget for household spending. Occasionally, she would take an odd job sewing to pick up extra money for gifts. Kay kept this money herself. The couple was still paying for their home. Both names were on the mortgage as well as on the title to their cars. Similarly, Mary and Steve--a striking miner--also kept a joint checking account in which Steve deposited his strike pay which he received from the union to which he belonged. The couple jointly owned their own home and vehicles. Neither Kay and Tom nor Mary and Steve had a significant amount of money left as surplus once the bills were paid.

Five of the non-income-earning women said they and their spouses did not keep a bank account. All of these couples were just getting by due to the husbands being on strike from their regular job, possessing a disability, or having experienced a layoff from a steady job in the previous year. Of the three remaining non-income-earning women with employed husbands, the husbands kept a few dollars for meals and gas. The majority of the money went to pay bills and immediate needs of the family. All but one of the eight non-income-earning women in the sample had worked at some point in the past year either on a full-time or part-time basis. Two of these women, Ann and Donna, kept their money to buy things for themselves or gifts for the family because their money was considered to be surplus. The rest of the women contributed their earnings to the common pot. All but two of the couples owned their homes jointly. One couple rented their home. Keith and Fran gave varying accounts regarding the ownership of their home. Fran did not believe the paperwork on their home had been completed but said the house would eventually be put in their son's name. Keith said everything was in his name. Some inquiry revealed that Keith's name was currently on the deed to the house. This left Fran without much significant economic leverage. The last time the couple was contacted by the researcher the couple was separated. Fran had gone

on welfare and was living with relatives. The couple had experienced similar break ups before.

The remaining couple, Lynn and Mike, had a checking account in the husband's name only. Mike handled the finances. Lynn had worked as a maid in a hotel earlier in the year. She had kept her earnings for her own needs or to spend on other family members. Due to her husband's concerns about her work situation she quit her job. At the time of the interview she was in charge of the home and helped Mike on the family farm. The house and farm were in Mike's name. His bank account and property were in his name when they married. Mike says he wouldn't mind if Lynn put her name on his account but "she's never brought it up." This woman had less direct access to the economic resources of her family than any of the other housewives in the sample.

Table 4

Summary of Couples' Economic Characteristics

Couples	Wife's Employment Status	Husband's Employment Status	Wife's Earnings as % of Total Family Income	Wife's Control of Earnings
<u>Income-Earning Women:</u>				
Hope & Al	Full-time	Disabled	70*	High
Emma & Lou	Full-time	Laid Off	50**	Middle

Table 4 (Continued)

Couples	Wife's Employment Status	Husband's Employment Status	Wife's Earnings as % of Total Family Income	Wife's Control of Earnings
Carol & Al	Full-time	Strike	56	Mid-Low
Sue & Joe	Full-time	Part-time	55	Mid-Low
Jan & Sam	Disabled	Disabled	50	High
Opal & Hank	Full-time	Disabled	40	High
Gail & Ernie	Part-time	Full-time	30	High
Peggy***	Full-time	Full-time	20	Low
Ralph***	Part-time	Strike	10	NA
<u>Non-Income-Earning Women:</u>				
Kay & Tom	Housewife	Disabled	0	High
Ann & Bill	Housewife	Strike	0	High
Mary & Steve	Housewife	Strike	0	Middle
Lynn & Mike	Housewife	Part-time	40****	Low
Meg & Dan	Housewife	Disabled	0	Middle
Bonnie & Kris	Housewife	Full-time	0	Middle
Donna & Greg	Housewife	Full-time	10****	Middle
Fran & Keith	Housewife/ Laid off	Full-time	60****	Low

*Husband reports lower earnings for wife.
 **Wife currently earns larger percentage of family income.
 ***Report participants name only for simulated couple.
 ****Wife worked during first part of year and husband reports lower earnings for wife.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that due to lack of monetary contribution to family finances,

unemployed wives will have less leverage in their marriages than women who are employed. In general, the findings from the Centerville sample support the prediction. Four of the eight income-earning women exhibited a high degree of overall economic power, while only two of the eight non-income-earning women did. However, a closer examination of the findings indicates additional factors are important to this analysis. There is greater variation in control over economic resources for non-income-earning women than Blumberg and Coleman predict (see Table 4).

One potential measure of spousal influence is "control over the family checkbook." However, it should be noted that handling the accounting for the family is an ambiguous form of power within the marriage. For some couples with joint checking or savings accounts it was evident that the wife's responsibility for the family accounting tasks was a means by which she maintained control over the family expenses. For example, Opal, an income-earning-woman, and Kay, a non-income-earning woman, both took over their families' checkbooks because of the women's dissatisfaction with their husband's way of handling the family finances. In other couples, the husband viewed handling the checkbook as a hassle with which he did not wish to be troubled. In these couples the wife received the accounting job because it was considered undesirable; nevertheless, the husband still maintained final authority over how the bulk of the

money was budgeted. Other couples assigned the wife the job of handling the accounts due to the husband's lack of formal education. This was the case for Gail, an income-earning woman, and Bonnie, a non-income-earning woman. The handling of the accounts was given to these women due to certain skills they possessed which increased their control over family earnings. Finally, in some couples, the husband had sole control over the family finances as seen with non-income-earning wife, Lynn. This is the least powerful position for a woman, according to Blumberg's and Coleman's (1989) predictions. Whether she earns an income or not, a wife who controls the family's financial accounts due to skills she possesses or dissatisfaction with the spouse's abilities to perform the job has greater leverage in her family than a woman who does not participate in family financial matters.

It should be further noted that women's degree of control of family income is largely connected to both her earnings and her husband's employment status. Of all the women who had a high level of control over their families' income, only one had a husband who was employed at a full-time job. Two non-income-earning women are among this group. These women had worked in the past and expected to become the primary breadwinners in their family in the near future. Future employment expectations must also be considered when determining women's overall economic power.

Furthermore, all but one of the men who were disabled had wives with high control over family income. This further accentuates the importance of both current and future employment status of men. It is possible that disabled men lose confidence in themselves due to the loss of their primary breadwinner role in the family and withdraw from roles they traditionally perform in the family which allows their wives to gain control over family finances which they did not have when their husbands worked.

In contrast, the women with the least amount of control over family earnings were married to men who were either employed on a part-time or full-time basis. Interestingly, the two income-earning women who had average to low levels of control over family earnings had only recently increased their activity in family finances. This was associated with their husbands losing their full-time employment status. Both couples expected the husband to regain his position as primary breadwinner in the future. This contributed to the men's continued control over important family earnings.

In addition, Blumberg's and Coleman's prediction that income-earning women will have greater overall economic power than non-income-earning women ignores the local (and national) norms which consider all economic resources brought into the marriage to be joint property. The majority of couples made comments suggesting that they considered any economic resources brought into the marriage

to belong to everyone in the family. This was pointed out by comments such as; "What's mine is hers" and "It all goes in the same pot." The researcher suggests that the norm of joint ownership of property and income, as well as wives managing the family accounts, can be a source of leverage within the family. This auxiliary hypothesis will be discussed in relationship to women's leverage in the household which is found in chapter five.

At this time a preliminary ranking can be made of the women based on their overall economic power (see Table 5). This ranking is based on Blumberg's and Coleman's (1989) prediction that income-earning women will have more power than non-income-earning women. This creates two categories of women with income-earning women assumed to have greater overall economic power than non-income-earning women. The sub-sample of income-earning women is ranked based on the women's earnings relative to their spouse and the women's control of family earnings. In addition, non-income-earning women are ranked according to their control of family earnings. This ranking is based on the researcher's assumption that non-income-earning women have differential access to family funds. Access to these family funds is a source of power that non-income-earning can benefit from much as income-earning women do, with the caveat that earning one's own income is better than having access to family funds. These rankings are a starting point from

which to assess micro- and macro-level discounts to women's overall economic power and women's leverage in the household.

Table 5

Women's Rankings Based on Overall Economic Power

Overall Economic Power	Income-Earning Women	Non-Income-Earning Women
High	Hope Emma	
Medium	Sue Carol Jan Opal Gail	
Low	Peggy	Kay Ann Bonnie Mary Meg Donna
Lowest		Fran Lynn

Discount Factors

Macro-Level Discounts to Women's Power in the Household

Blumberg asserts that three discount factors operate at the macro-level to discount women's power at the micro-level. The three primary macro-level discounts of women's power are (1) the extent to which the "upper levels of the 'political-economy' are male dominated and repressive

of females" (Blumberg & Coleman, 1989, p. 234), (2) The degree to which regional and societal ideologies emphasize male's position and value over women's position and value, (3) the effects of women's birth cohort as it relates to historical factors affecting women's position in society. This section evaluates how these discount factors relate to the balance of power among Centerville couples.

Political arena.

The recent history of women in the United States has been one of movement toward equality in both the political and the economic arena. However, the political-economy of the United States is still weighted in favor of men. The corporate boardrooms and top political offices of this country are only just beginning to bring women into their fold. An examination of the region in which Centerville is located shows women's position in the political-economy to be even more skewed than it is at the national level. The state of Tennessee has only one woman legislator at the national level. Nine percent of state senators and 12% of state representatives are women. The two county region in which this research was conducted has only seven percent and fifteen percent women employees, respectively, in key positions such as commissioner and county clerk. Centerville government has only nine percent female employees, none of which are employed in high status elected positions. This illustrates a lack of power for women in

the macro-level political arena which acts as a discount for women in their attempts to exercise power in their own homes (Tennessee Government Officials Directory, 1993).

Economic arena.

Women exhibit a larger presence in the economic arena than in politics but still do not equal men in the number of positions held. In 1989 women formed 45.8% of the civilian labor force in the state of Tennessee compared to 45.2% for the entire U.S. (Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/93. "Table 3.18 "Civilian Labor Force and Participation Rates, By Sex, Southeastern States and United States, 1980 And 1989 [Labor force in thousands]", p. 161). At the county level 40.6% and 43.7%, respectively, of women were in the labor force in 1990. These figures can be compared to men's labor force participation rates for 1990 which were, 61.7% and 66.0% for the two counties (1990 Census of the Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee, Table 2 "Summary of Labor Force and Commuting Characteristics: 1990 p. 5). For the city of Centerville, women's labor force participation rate dropped to 35.4% for 1990 (1990 Census of the Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee, Table 5. "Employment Status and Journey to Work Characteristics: 1990", p. 46). In 1989 women earned 51 cents and 47 cents for every dollar a man earned for the two counties in which the research was conducted (1990 Census of the Population: Social and

Economic Characteristics: Tennessee, Table 3. "Summary of Occupation, Income, and Poverty Characteristics: 1990", p. 9). Inquiries into the number of female owned businesses in Centerville and the surrounding area revealed that women did own several small businesses but they were very few in comparison to the number of male or family owned businesses. This macro-level summary of the economy in the region illustrates that although women are employed in relatively high numbers, the degree to which that translates into business ownership or high pay relative to men's is small. This creates a discount effect for working women in their own homes.

Social ideology.

The social ideology of the region has traditionally espoused the ascendancy of males over women. Historically, men's position in the community has been primary. Men were the breadwinners and were the primary connection between individual families and the outside community. Women were primarily in charge of the domestic realm (Shifflet, 1991). When remarking about their mother's generation, many respondents in the sample said the women "served" their husbands. The image the female respondents drew was of a woman jumping up to fulfill her husband's every whim as the man "sat in his chair". Several women remarked that they did not "serve" their husbands in this manner but knew many women who still did.

The social ideology backing this behavior can be traced to the religious institutions rooted in Central Appalachia. Appalachian-based religious movements at the turn of the century spawned the growth of a number of Baptist sects and other Protestant derived groups such as the Church of Christ, Christian Church, and Holiness Churches. These religious groups emphasize the literal interpretation of the Bible. This includes a clear distinction between men's and women's roles within the familial and public spheres. The man's position is expected be that of the "head of the household" and the woman is expected to be subordinate to his headship. This religious tradition is still a prominent part of the dominant religious institutions in the region (Webb, 1990, Weatherford & Brewer, 1962). The regional ideology can significantly discount women's power at the micro-level.

Birth cohort.

Birth cohort is a potential discount factor for women's power at the micro-level. Blumberg and Coleman (1989) assume that the women's movement and the resulting call for women's equality has its biggest impact on women in the younger birth cohorts. Women in the older birth cohorts can be expected to have greater discounts to their economic power due to their greater adherence to traditional expectations regarding men's and women's spheres.

Respondents from Centerville frequently referred to differences between themselves and older generations when speaking of the division of labor within the family and sexual mores. Younger respondents were more likely than older respondents to describe previous generations as having a stricter division between men's and women's roles. Respondents also commented on the loosening of double standards regarding sexual mores among younger persons in the community. In addition, younger respondents who believed in following traditional gender role patterns and sexual mores were more likely to describe themselves as being "old fashioned". These respondents tended to be more involved in traditional religious institutions. These comments indicate that respondents were conscious of a slow movement by younger generations away from traditional lifestyles and beliefs. However, there was no clear relationship between age cohort and the behavior of members of the Centerville sample. Both older males and females did not appear to be significantly different in their behavior from many of the younger participants.

In summary, the ability to discuss the impact of macro-level discounts to women's overall economic power is limited in a micro-level research project. The degree to which a lack of women in higher levels of the political-economy affect Centerville women is outside the scope of this particular project. Inferences can be made regarding the

effects of birth cohort and social ideology on women's overall economic power. Birth cohort is found to be of limited importance for this sample. Social ideology can be most clearly linked to respondents' behavior at the micro-level. Informants were asked a variety of questions regarding religious beliefs and gender role ideology. Several women and men discussed how the division of labor in their family and patterns of decision-making were based on the belief that the male is head of the household. For these couples, a traditional gender role ideology, which is often linked to religious beliefs, has a direct impact on their daily life. These macro-level discounts are discussed in more detail in chapter five.

Discount Factors at the Micro-Level

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that four micro-level variables act as discounts to women's overall economic power. These discount variables are (1) commitment to marriage (or the principle of least interest), (2) attractiveness, (3) personal ideology, and (4) perception of need for the wife's income. Personality characteristics of the individual are also considered to be a potential discount to women's overall economic power. However Blumberg and Coleman give individual personality less emphasis than the four other discount variables. This section provides a partial description of the members of the sample using each of these variables.

Commitment and principle of least interest.

Each partner's level of commitment to the marriage is believed to be a potential discount factor to women's power within the marriage. Blumberg and Coleman assume that in relationships in which one spouse is less committed to the continuation of the marriage than the other, the least interested partner automatically wields more power. This is due to the greater willingness of the least interested partner to leave the marriage. The most committed partner, afraid that his or her partner will leave, will submit to the desires of the less committed partner in order to maintain the relationship (see Waller, 1938, for a more detailed discussion).

For this reason, each person in the sample was asked how committed he or she was to his or her marriage; and if they would ever consider leaving their marriage. If the person said they would consider leaving their spouse, they were asked if they thought they could get along without their spouse. Eleven women and twelve men said they were very committed to their marriages. Four women and two men said they were committed to their marriages. One man said he was somewhat committed to his marriage. Only one woman and one man said they were not committed to their marriages (see Table 6). Two women said they currently would consider terminating their marriages. Only one man said he currently would consider ending his marriage.

There is an imbalance of commitment for six of the couples in the sample. The less committed person has an added bargaining chip in any marital disputes due to his or her greater willingness to terminate the relationship.

Table 6

Level of Commitment to Marriage

Respondents	Level of Commitment			
	Very	Committed	Somewhat	Not
Wives	11	4	0	1
Husbands	12	3	1	1

However, if a person does not believe he or she can get along without their spouse for economic or other reasons, any power gained by the less committed partner is negated. The male respondent who said he was not committed to his marriage gained power by the imbalance of commitment in his marriage. After the interviews were completed the interviewer learned that this couple had separated. The man said he was unwilling to modify his behavior to his wife's satisfaction, therefore they had separated. He was pleased with this outcome. A very different situation is seen for the woman who said she was not very committed to her marriage. She told that she had left her husband in the past but had returned because she and her children found it difficult to get by without his financial help. Another

woman who said she was simply "committed" to her marriage had also considered leaving her spouse. When asked if she thought she could get along without him, she said, "I don't know." She was uncertain as to her financial and emotional ability to manage caring for herself and her children without her children. Despite dissatisfaction with their marriages, these women are not able to use termination of their marriage as a bargaining chip to resolve disagreements in their favor.

Attractiveness.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that a person who believes his or her partner is more attractive than himself or herself will have less leverage in the relationship. Each person in the sample was asked what initially attracted them to their spouse and if they still found their spouse attractive. All of the men in the sample said they still find their spouse attractive. Fourteen women said they found their spouses attractive. Two women of the sixteen women said they sometimes found their spouse attractive. This feeling was expressed by both an income-earning woman and a non-income-earning woman who were both less satisfied with their marriages than the other women in the sample. These two women said that their general feelings of dissatisfaction with their marriages caused them to have less favorable perceptions of their husbands' physical attributes. None of the men in the sample expressed a

similar relationship between their feelings about their marriage and their perception of their wife's attractiveness.

Personal ideology.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that each spouse's personal ideology can act as a discount to women's overall economic power. The perception by one or both spouses that the male should be the primary decision-maker and provider for the family is an effective discount to women's power in the family. Each of the informants were asked a variety of questions regarding their personal gender role ideology. This section focuses on four questions which Blumberg and Coleman suggest are critical as potential discounts to women's power in the household.

Each person in the sample was asked what they believed their spouse's primary responsibilities were in the marriage, as well as their own primary responsibilities. Nine of the sixteen women included care of the house and children as primary responsibilities they should perform in marriage. Ten men said their wives' primary responsibilities to them included the care of the home and children. When asked what the husbands' primary responsibilities were to the wives, nine women and thirteen men said the men's primary responsibilities included providing for the family. Men tended to respond in a more traditional manner than the women when describing husband

and wife roles. Men also gave more traditional responses for their own marital roles than for their wives.

Each participant was asked who should have the final say-so in the family in order to address beliefs regarding responsibility for decision-making (see Table 7). Fourteen women said decision-making should be shared by the husband and wife. Two women (Sue and Patti) said the husband should have final say-so in the family but they would like to be consulted on big decisions. Thirteen men said decision-making should be shared by the husband and wife. Three men (Greg, Al, and Ralph) said the husband should have final say-so in the family but he should also consult with his wife.

Table 7

Expectations Regarding Decision-Making

Respondents	Final Say-so	
	Husband's	Shared
Wives	2	14
Husbands	3	13

Participants were asked under what circumstances they believed women should work for pay and if they believed women working reflected poorly on their husbands (see Table 8). These questions were asked to address beliefs regarding who should be the primary breadwinner in the family. Eight

women said women should be able to work under any circumstances. Only two men believed a woman should work under any circumstances. The rest of the men put stipulations on women working depending on the age of the women's children, availability of child care, and/or the husbands' disability status. Eight women put similar stipulations on women working for pay. Only one woman thought that a woman working reflected badly on her husband. Five men thought the wife working could potentially reflect badly on the husband.

Table 8

Personal Ideology Regarding Breadwinner Responsibilities

Respondents	Conditions Under Which A Woman Can Work			Wife Working Reflects Badly On Husband		
	Any	Limited	None	Yes	Sometimes	No
Wives	8	8	0	1	0	15
Husbands	2	14	0	0	5	11

The men in the sample hold more traditional gender role expectations regarding breadwinning than the women. However, half of the women followed the men's lead in putting stipulations on when a woman should be allowed to work. For women, these stipulations tended to revolve around women's primary responsibility for caring for young children.

A significant number of men and women in the sample displayed a traditional gender role ideology, which could potentially act as a discount to the women's leverage in their marriage relationships. The way in which personal ideology acts as a potential discount to the Centerville women's power will be discussed in the final conclusions.

Perception of need for wife's income.

Lastly, the husband's perception of the need for the wife's income is a potential discount to women's overall economic power in the relationship. Each of the income-earning women in the sample and their spouses were asked if their family needed the wife to work to get by financially. Six of the eight men with an income-earning wife felt that it was necessary for their wife to work. Ralph and Ernie were the only husbands with income-earning wives to say it was not necessary for their wives to work. Both did say that the extra money was nice to have, and as long as their wives wanted to work they would support them.

In addition, all of the men with non-income-earning wives were questioned about their families' financial needs. Only two of these men, Tom and Steve, said it would be necessary for their wives to work in the near future. Both of their wives were going to school and preparing to seek full-time employment. In contrast, two non-income-earning women, Lynn and Meg, specifically stated that they had recently quit a job due to their husbands' wishes or lack of

cooperation. It is possible that more of the non-income-earning women were being influenced into not taking paid employment due to their husbands' perceptions that their incomes were not needed, but this was not pursued during the interviews.

All of the income-earning women felt that their husbands agreed that it was economically necessary for them to work. However, all of the income-earning women said their husbands did not like their wives' current jobs, or would prefer that the women could stay at home. If at some future date the couple is in a better financial situation, these women could lose whatever power they currently possess due to providing necessary income for the family. The degree to which this factor affects women's leverage in the household will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.

Intervening Variables

According to Blumberg and Coleman (1989), important factors to consider in the analysis of women's net economic power are the intervening effects of stability versus transition and class differentials. Both of these variables have an important effect on the ability of women to realize the full benefits of earning an income.

Stability versus transition.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that when a woman's economic power relative to her spouse rises suddenly, her ability to exercise leverage over a variety of life events

in the family can be seriously diminished. A man who is threatened by his wife's economic gains is likely to use force to keep the woman in her place. Four of the income-earning women in the sample had recently found themselves in the position of being the primary breadwinner in their families. These women were Sue, Carol, Emma, and Hope. Two non-income-earning women and one income-earning woman in the sample--Kay, Ann, and Jan--anticipated becoming the primary breadwinner in their families in the near future. The degree to which recent changes in women's economic power or anticipated changes in women's economic power affected their ability to influence various areas of their lives will be discussed in the conclusion section of this paper.

Class differentials.

A second intervening variable addressed by Blumberg and Coleman (1989) is social class. Blumberg and Coleman predict that couples in which both partners are employed in lower status jobs will achieve greater parity due to greater equity in their earnings than couples in which the husband is employed in a middle or upper-middle status position and his wife has a lower status position. Part of men's advantage in middle and upper class families is their generation of surplus income (income above subsistence needs) and their ability to control the use of surplus income.

Each participant was asked to state the social class to which their families belonged. Eleven of the men in the sample saw their families as falling into the middle class in their community. Three men said their families would be ranked as poor and two men did not answer this question. All sixteen women in the sample identified their families as being in the middle class of their own community. The respondents' self-rankings of their social class are consistent with regional norms which disapprove of individuals trying to appear as if they are better than others. Despite obvious income differentials in Appalachian communities, theorists have frequently noted attempts by residents to minimize economic differences (Bryant, 1981; Brown 1988). When the informants were asked to choose which income bracket they fell under in the year prior to the interview, answers ranged from as high as \$39,999-30,000 to \$9,000 and below. When compared to earnings for the United States the respondents fell in the middle- to lower-classes. There is a significant discrepancy between the informant's self-rankings and actual incomes. Therefore, it is useful for the purposes of this research project to concentrate on differences in the occupational classifications of husbands and wives rather than income brackets.

Only two women in the sample, Sue and Emma, held white-collar, professional positions. Both of these women were married to men who were currently unemployed or worked part-

time. This was a source of power for these women. Another woman, Hope had a semi-skilled, technical position. She was married to a man who was disabled. This gave Hope greater potential leverage in her marriage. These women can be contrasted with Carol, who held a semi-skilled, blue-collar job. She was married to a man who was on strike from a skilled, blue-collar position which paid a middle-class wage. For this reason, Carol was not able to exact as much leverage from having paid employment as did other women. A different variation is seen with Jan. Both she and her husband were disabled, which put the couple on equal footing. The rest of the income-earning women held low status jobs. The women's husbands were employed at working class jobs or were disabled. The status of the disabled is relative in the community. The man who is disabled in the mines or at a physical labor job who supported his family in the past has a certain amount of prestige in the community. These men are distinguished from certain individuals in the community who are said to have tricked government agencies into giving them disability status. The degree to which social class was a factor for these couples will be addressed in more detail in the final conclusion.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who earn a large income relative to their spouses and who maintain control over the use of their income will have high levels of overall economic power compared to women who do

not earn an income or who do not maintain control over the income they earn. However, macro- and micro-level discounts work together to diminish women's ability to translate their overall economic power into tangible forms of leverage in the household. The next section explores the degree to which income-earning and non-income-earning women from the Centerville sample exercise leverage in specific areas of married life.

CHAPTER FIVE

WOMEN'S LEVERAGE IN HOUSEHOLD POWER

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) assert that net economic power in the household can be measured by examining the amount of leverage women wield over various areas of their domestic life: a) women's say-so in their marriage relationship, b) women's leverage over economic decision-making, c) women's leverage over domestic decision-making, d) women's leverage in decision-making regarding their own fertility, e) women's control over their own sexuality, f) parity in household labor and child care, and g) conflict resolution strategies. Women's ability to influence these areas in her favor is thought to be a direct result of the amount of net economic power held by the woman. The ability of the women in the sample to influence each of these areas of their lives will be examined next.

Leverage in Say-So

According to Blumberg and Coleman (1989), "say-so" in decision-making is an important area in which women may exhibit leverage gained from increased income at the micro-level. Each couple was asked a series of questions about who had the most say-so in their family. Beliefs regarding who should have the final say-so were explored as well as

actual decision-making behavior of the couple. According to Blumberg's model, the top wage earners Carol, Sue, Emma, and Hope should have the most say-so of the women in the sample. However, the interviews reveal that the distribution of spousal decision-making power for working women is linked to two important variables: financial leverage and gender role ideology.

Say-so in Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women

The analysis of leverage in decision-making begins by looking again at the top wage-earning women in the sample. Carol, Sue, Emma, and Hope currently earned more than their spouses at the time of their interviews. Carol, a factory worker, and her husband Al, a striking miner, agreed that he had the last word if there was a big decision to be made in the family. They also agreed that the man should be the head of the household. Sue was a social worker and her husband Joe was temporarily working a substitute teacher. Sue's husband Joe had a more egalitarian ideology. However, Joe revealed that he reluctantly accepted responsibility for making most of the important decisions in the family because of Sue's strong belief that the man should be the head of the household. In reference to decision-making; Sue said,

...[W]e always discuss things but I, whatever he wants, I usually go ahead with because like I say, I think that I should. He's head of the household and he should make the decisions.

Joe felt compelled to accept the position of head decision-maker for the family. He said,

[Sue] sees the man as the leader in the home. She thinks I should make all the decisions and she usually forces that on me. Which I always try to get her input.

These top two wage earners relinquished whatever leverage they might have possessed in the area of say-so because of their own or their husband's belief in traditional gender roles.

Not all of the income-earning women in the sample relinquished final say-so as readily as Carol and Sue. Emma and Hope also earned more than their husbands in the year prior to the interview. Both women and their husbands said they believed decision-making should be a fifty-fifty proposition for a husband and a wife. Hope, a hospital worker, and Lyle, who was disabled, said they made all major decisions together. Lyle said, "I don't think we've ever done anything that we didn't agree about first." When asked if either she or her spouse had more say-so in decision-making, Hope said no and added, "If we did it would have caused problems."

Emma, a nurse, and her husband Lou, a laid-off factory worker, agreed that decision-making should be a joint venture but expressed some tensions in this area. When asked who played the biggest role in making decisions in their family Emma said, "I always do in everything. I play the biggest part in every decision which I don't really like that." Later she said,

I feel like I have to make enough decisions at work. He always says, 'You decide. It doesn't matter to me what we do.' I say, 'My brain hurts from making decisions. You decide.' His reasoning is that he wants to make me happy. I joke that I wear the pants in the family which I don't like. I'd rather that it was shifted more toward him.

On the other hand Lou said,

[S]ometimes there will be something that I'm not particularly crazy about that's something she wants. I call it, say she cuts your nose off to spite your face. If I'm not particularly for it and, you know, then she'll flare up and say, 'I just won't do it.' and (I'll say, 'There ain't no need for that.')

Unlike Hope and Al, who had established an egalitarian decision-making pattern, Emma and Lou were jockeying for power in this area. Emma frequently found herself taking responsibility for decisions she believed should be made jointly. Although Emma felt she was being forced to "wear the pants" in the family, Lou was demonstrating his power to delegate decision-making responsibilities in areas he did not care about. This was revealed when Lou said he felt most important decisions were made jointly in their family. The couples' contrasting views regarding their decision-making highlight the struggle for power which was occurring in this family.

Lou revealed that he and his wife outwardly disagreed on a few issues. When these events occurred, Lou was frustrated because Emma terminated negotiations with him on the issue by throwing up her hands and saying angrily "I just won't do it". Emma's actions demonstrate a sense of

powerlessness which her previous comments did not reveal. Emma does not feel she can gain her goal in contested areas through direct conflict resolution strategies. By saying she will not do something she desires Emma does not achieve her goal, but, she does let Lou know she is frustrated by not getting what she wants. Emma would like to be able to rid herself of the responsibility of making decisions which she and her husband both do not care about the outcome, but cannot gain direct influence over say-so in areas she does care about. This leads to an ongoing power struggle between Emma and Lou which they both are aware of but are unsure of how to settle. Emma's high pay relative to her husband's did not result in egalitarian decision-making to the same degree that it did for Hope and Al.

The two women who approximately matched their husbands in earnings, Jan and Opal, used their potential leverage for decision-making in equally varied ways. Jan and her husband Sam said they made all family decisions together. The two shared an egalitarian view of gender roles. This egalitarian ideology allowed Jan to retain leverage in decision-making which she gained from earning a disability check.

Opal, who was a cook, claimed that over the years she had gained equal say-so in her family. Her husband, Hank, said he and his wife generally had equal say-so in the family but he retained the final say in one area of

decision-making: the children. Hank has given their teen-age son a great deal of freedom. Opal did not appreciate this. She said her son took advantage of this situation by going to his father first when he wanted to do something he knew his mother would disapprove of. The result, according to Opal, was "...I find out..., then [my husband] and I'll get into it." Nonetheless, she believed she had the final say in the family. "If it's right down to it, I do. I mean if I get mad."

There is a struggle going on between Hank and Opal regarding power in decision-making. Opal's lack of say-so over her son stems from her husband's belief in his right to intervene in areas in which he thinks Opal is "too hard on" their son. Hank's behavior may stem from his slightly larger paycheck, past family norms giving him more say-so, a deeply ingrained cultural belief in what are appropriate roles for fathers and sons, or a combination of the above. Opal's paycheck probably gives her greater say-so in some areas than she would have otherwise. However, when it comes to an area of contention Hank still has the upper hand, forcing Opal to "get into it" over something she believes in strongly. This situation, as already seen with Emma and Lou, outlines the tensions which can occur when the wife suddenly makes more money relative to her husband than she did in the past. Opal's paycheck brings her added leverage in the marriage but, her husband's personal ideology and

slightly larger paycheck work to frustrate her efforts to have a greater say in family decisions when there is a conflict.

Peggy and Gail, the two women who earned low wages in comparison to their husbands, did not demonstrate a similar power struggle in their families. Gail, who was a secretary, and Ernie, who was a factory worker, both believed the husband and wife should be equally involved in decision-making. However, when asked who had the final say-so in their family, Ernie said, "She'd probably say I would." He did comment that in regard to any important decisions he felt they both contributed to the decision-making process. If one of them had more expertise or stronger feelings about a subject, then that person had more influence on the final solution to any problem. Gail said they both had equal say-so in the family. She agreed with Ernie that one or the other of them might play a bigger role, depending on the topic under discussion. Regarding matters about which she was most concerned, Gail felt she had an equal amount of influence in decision-making.

On the other hand, Peggy (the female informant in the simulated couple) had a more traditional view of decision-making roles in the family. Although Peggy said both the husband and wife should be involved in decision-making, she relinquished final decision-making responsibilities to her

husband whenever she could. When asked who had the final say-so in her family, she said,

[He does] definitely, even though he might make you think like I would have some say-so but, but he mostly does and I'd rather have it that way because you know, it's easier on me in some ways. Now when he's out on the road, I've made some major decisions and I really, [I think], 'Am I going right or wrong?', you know, but you know, everything turned out all right but it just made me feel, cause I wasn't used to it and I wasn't sure you know. [I thought] 'Will he kill me when he comes home?' [said laughingly].

Peggy's traditional gender role ideology resulted in a differing method of handling decision-making responsibility than the one devised by Gail and Ernie. Although both women had approximately equal economic power in their marriages, gender role ideology played an important role in shaping who had the final say-so in their marriages.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who earn a larger amount of money compared to their husbands will have greater over all say-so in their families than women who earn less than their husbands. The income-earning women in the sample demonstrate a wide range of ability to influence decision-making in their families (see Table 9). Two women--Jan and Hope--who equaled or exceeded their husband's earnings, had a great deal of control over say-so in their families. The other income-earning women in the sample were struggling to gain greater say-so in their families or had relinquished say-so in their families due to their own or their husbands' gender role expectations.

Table 9

Income-Earning Wives and Final Say-so Over Decision-Making

Respondent	Who Has Final Say-So	Wife Believes Should Have Final Say-So	Husband Believes Should Have Final Say-So
High Income-Earning Women:			
Carol	Husband	Husband	Husband
Sue	Husband	Husband	Egalitarian
Emma	Husband*	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Hope	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Middle Income-Earning Women:			
Jan	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Opal	Husband*	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Low Income-Earning Women:			
Gail	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Peggy	Husband	Husband	Husband

*Final say-so is in contention.

Recent changes in the earning structure in these families and traditional gender role expectations are the most important variables intervening in this equation to diminish the income-earning women's say-so in their families. Final say-so among non-income-earning women is explored next.

Say-So in Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who do not earn an income will have less say-so in their families than women who do earn an income. Surprisingly, some of the non-income-earning women were highly involved in decision-making in their families. This section explores specific

cases of say-so in decision-making for non-income-earning women in the sample.

Three couples with non-income-earning wives had a relatively egalitarian decision-making system (see Table 10). For instance, Kay consistently has equal say-so in her family, and possibly had the swing vote. She successfully negotiated, opposed by her husband, the timing of their first child, as well as an addition to their home and other family decisions. She and her husband both had egalitarian attitudes regarding decision-making, which provided Kay with the opportunity to participate fully in this area.

Along the same lines, Bonnie and her husband Kris also had egalitarian views of how husbands and wives should handle decision-making. The couple said that most of their decisions were handled jointly. Bonnie related that in some important decisions, such as the purchase of her last car, she had final say-so. However, when she wanted another child, Kris said he did not want one and Bonnie had followed his wishes. This could be an indication of Kris' greater ability to settle a disagreement when he wants to. Kris explained that when the couple disagreed, "We talk it out. If we don't agree, then we don't do it." In most instances, this couple used egalitarian methods of making decisions; however, in some matters one or the other of them may have had more pull.

Similarly, Ann and Bill said they believed in egalitarian methods of decision-making. They both told that if they disagreed they would talk things out. However, both commented that if either one of them they really wanted something, they would get it.

In contrast, Lynn and Donna, whose husbands were employed full-time, had relatively little say-so in how decisions were handled in their families (see Table 10). Although Donna believed decisions should be handled in an egalitarian manner, her husband Greg thought the man should be in charge of the decision-making. Greg said he usually had the final say-so in the family but "there are some exceptions". Greg believed he should have more say-so in these areas as well. Donna said in regard to who had the final say-so in the family, "Well on little things, me. On big things he usually does".

Lynn and Mike described a similar situation. Mike said he believed decisions should be made jointly. When asked who actually had more say-so in his family, Mike said, "She says I do whether I like it or not, so maybe that's the way it is." He felt big decisions were discussed together before any action was taken. Lynn exclaimed, "Whatever he says I do." Lynn did not attempt to assert herself in any important area of decision-making in her family.

The remaining three couples with non-income-earning wives said they believed decisions should be handled in an

egalitarian manner but their actions were not always congruent with their stated beliefs (see Table 10). Mary, Fran, Meg and their husbands said final say-so in their families was handled jointly. However, two of these men said, like this man, ultimately "I always get what I want though." The three men and their wives indicated that although most decisions were made jointly, the husband did have some extra pull when he wanted it. In particular, Keith and Fran said they believed decisions should be handled jointly. However, there were many areas about which the couple argued, and Keith often had the final say in these areas. The other two couples had been married long enough that the handling of areas of contention may have been settled in the earlier years of marriage. The women may have resigned themselves in previous years to accept their husbands' ability to do as they wished in certain areas and no longer even involved themselves in these areas.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that non-income-earning women will have less influence over the final outcome of decision-making in their families than income-earning women. Among couples with a non-income-earning wife, only one husband and one wife said the man should have the final say-so in the family (see Table 10). The remaining husbands of non-income-earning women and their wives expressed egalitarian beliefs regarding decision-making. However, there is some discrepancy exhibited

Table 10

Non-Income-Earning Wives and Final Say-so Over Decision-Making

Respondent	Who Has Final Say-So	Wife Believes Should Have Final Say-So	Husband Believes Should Have Final Say-So
Non-Income-Earning Wives:			
Kay	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Ann	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Bonnie	Shared	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Mary	Husband	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Meg	Husband	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Donna	Husband	Egalitarian	Husband
Fran	Husband	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Lynn	Husband	Husband	Egalitarian

between beliefs of some of these couples and their behavior. Various factors combine to give some of the non-income-earning women more leverage in their families than others.

First, the non-income-earning women with the least amount of say-so over family decision-making are examined. Five non-income-earning women said the husband had final say-so. However, two of these women, Lynn and Donna, consistently relinquished say-so to their husbands. These women had several things in common. They were married to men who worked at full- or part-time jobs. Secondly, these women were married to men who had higher educational achievements than their wives. Lynn dropped out of high school and her husband was working towards a college degree at the time he was interviewed. Donna and Greg had General

Equivalency Diplomas but Greg had taken night school, job training courses, and wanted to go to college. Third, Lynn, Donna, and Greg expressed traditional views regarding men's and women's gender roles. Lastly, Greg and Lynn were the only persons in this sub-sample who said the man should be in charge of decision-making.

In contrast Kay, Ann and Bonnie, who showed the greatest degree of influence over say-so in families with non-income-earning wives, all had some college education while their husbands had high school degrees or dropped out of school in their teens. Secondly, Kay and Ann both expected to pursue careers which would enable them to make significant contributions to their families' incomes in the near future. Third, all three of these women had strong personalities which provided them with added leverage in their families. Fourth, Kay and Bonnie were married to men who had highly egalitarian views of gender roles in the family compared to the other men in the sample. Ann's husband had more traditional views of gender roles, but believed decision-making should be a joint venture. It should be noted that each of these men did say that in regard to their work, leisure time and purchasing of things they wanted, they often were able to get their own way. Although none of the women were able to influence every decision in their family the way they would have liked, these factors combined to provide the non-income-earning

women with more leverage in the household than would be predicted using Blumberg's theory.

Decision-Making: Economic

Marital decision-making covers a broad array of issues. Blumberg and Coleman (1989) suggest that three areas of decision-making are particularly important in the analysis of women's leverage in the household. These arenas include economic decision-making, domestic decision-making, and decisions regarding fertility. This section begins a more detailed discussion of decision-making by focusing on economic decision-making.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that the higher a woman's income relative to her husband's the greater will be her ability to influence economic decision-making in the family. They further suggest that due to the traditional patterns by which household labor has been divided, women will have a great deal of influence over smaller purchases related to the domestic realm such as clothing, small items for the household, and groceries. It is the ability to influence decision-making in the area of large purchases which is most important in determining the balance of power in the household. To test this hypothesis, the participants in this study were asked to discuss overall decision-making patterns with respect to how family income was spent, as well as a variety of levels of consumption decisions including large purchases, small household purchases, and grocery

shopping. The participants were asked to discuss how these decisions were made, as well as who had the most say-so in each arena. The seven women in the sample who earned an income at the time of the interview are examined first to determine the degree of control they exercise over economic decision-making.

Economic Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women

Sue, Carol, Emma, and Hope earned more money than their husbands. Sue was a social worker who was married to a substitute teacher. Carol was a seamstress in a factory who was married to Al, a striking miner. Emma was a nurse whose husband, Lou, had been laid off from a factory job. Lastly, Hope was a newly employed hospital worker whose husband, Lyle, was disabled. On the basis of their earnings, these women should be relatively powerful in their ability to influence economic decision-making in their families. Each couple's actual behavior is to be examined in turn.

Emma, a nurse, and her husband Lou had the most unique arrangement regarding economic decision-making. Lou did a relatively large amount of shopping for food items because he had taken over the cooking for the family since being laid off from his job. The rest of the men in the sample said that, at most, they might pick up some bread or milk for their wives on their own. Some of the men accompanied their wives on grocery trips, but none were as actively involved in making decisions regarding the

groceries as Lou. Emma was in charge of the majority of other domestic purchases for the family, as were the rest of the women in the sample. Big purchases such as cars or vacations were researched and decided on together. Lou told about the couple's recent purchases of two automobiles:

[W]ell, the last one ...we bought was more or less goin' to be my vehicle so I did, I did more. Then when we bought Emma's car, it was more of a family car.... When we were buying the family car we both played a large role in deciding what to get there.

Emma also said that the decision to buy her car was a joint decision in which the couple researched available information on styles and prices before going out together to find the car they wanted. This couple had a highly egalitarian system of economic decision-making compared to other couples in the sample. Lou's participation in grocery shopping was the direct result of recent changes in the couple's employment patterns which had him staying at home and his wife working full-time. However, it should be noted that in the area of small domestic purchases for the house or clothing, Emma fulfilled the traditional role expectations in this area.

Hope, a hospital worker, and Lyle, who was disabled, were equally involved in decisions regarding large purchases. The couple had limited funds, so these decisions were a rarity. When they did need a new car or other large item they said they both participated in the decision. However, Hope had sole responsibility for smaller purchases.

This couple followed traditional gender roles despite the fact Hope worked full-time and Lyle is disabled. Since Hope still did the vast majority of the household labor she did all of the shopping for domestic items, clothes, and groceries. As Lyle said, "That's her area." Hope did say she recently started to involve Lyle in the grocery shopping after they made the decision to switch to a low-fat diet for health reasons. Lyle said Hope was still the one who made the real decisions regarding shopping, that he "just goes along". Hope was actively involved in all levels of economic decision-making in her family.

The remaining two top wage earning women are Carol, a factory worker, and Sue, a social worker can be contrasted with Emma and Hope. Both Carol and Sue participated in decisions regarding large purchases, but the women tended to play a secondary role. Their husbands made the final decisions in these areas. Sue and her husband, Joe, described how they recently remodeled their kitchen. Joe said,

When it came time to pick out the cabinets, I looked and she had looked and showed me all these cabinets that she had wanted you know. She thought she knew everything she thought she wanted. When it came down to making the actual choice she just didn't do it. She was too nervous. It all fell back on me to pick the actual cabinets and everything.

Sue confirmed that she becomes nervous when she has to make a decision and even consults her husband when deciding what to eat at a restaurant. Carol and her husband Al said it

depended on who is most affected as to who has the final say in their family over large purchases. Al said of a recent purchase of a dinette set,

I just let her pick it out and I bought it a couple weeks ago. I feel like furniture, you know, if that's what she wants, she's the one that has to clean it up and stuff, that's fine. You know, whatever she wants in the house is fine, but you know, a woman, if they really wants a home, you know, they'll watch the budget theirself [sic]. You know. I don't believe a woman should go over what the budget is, but a lot of them does I understand, but Carol never done that.

Carol and Al said that in other areas such as the purchase of a vehicle or the home, Al had the final say, although her opinion was always taken into account. Both of these women retained exclusive responsibility over small purchases for the household, clothing, and grocery shopping. Al and Joe both said they had no interest in these areas. Carol and Sue on the other hand enjoyed making decisions about domestic purchases.

The four top wage-earning women in this sample had varying degrees of say-so over economic decision-making in their families. All four women participated in decisions regarding large purchases. However, Sue and Carol relinquished final say to their husbands in these matters. Emma and Hope played larger roles in deciding on big purchases. This indicates that although the women had similar income levels compared to their husbands, Emma and Hope were the only two women in this sub-sample who

maintained a relatively high level of power in money management responsibilities for their families.

It should be noted that Sue, Carol, and Carol's husband Al all held highly traditional gender role expectations compared to the other top wage earning women in the sample. This could contribute to the women's lack of participation in these areas despite their high levels of economic power. Emma and Lou had relatively non-traditional gender role expectations, which had led to the highly egalitarian patterns this couple had adopted at all levels of economic decision-making.

Now compare the top wage earners with Jan and Opal, who approximately matched their husbands' earnings. Jan's disability check equaled her husband's. Jan and her husband Sam shared responsibility for managing their finances. The couple said they threw their money into a common pot and, when something was needed, they decided together how the money was spent. The couple told how they recently purchased a freezer, which they went to the store and chose together. However, Jan--like most of the sixteen women in the sample--was responsible for the grocery shopping and small household purchases.

Opal earned slightly less at her cooking job than her husband Hank brought in with his disability check. Opal and Hank said they were equally involved in how the money is spent in their family. They pointed out that they recently

purchased a car for Opal. Hank said that he did the primary searching for the car based on his knowledge of what Opal wanted since he had more free time than Opal. When he found a reasonably priced car he thought she would like, he brought it home for her to test drive. He said, "She had the final say." In the area of small household expenses, clothing, and groceries, Opal was in charge. Jan and Opal, like the top wage-earning women discussed above, made substantial earnings compared to their husbands. However, Sue and Carol, who earned more than their husbands, had less say in how the family's finances were spent than Opal and Jan who only matched their husband's earnings. Before explaining why this is so, economic decision-making patterns of the women who earned substantially less than their husbands are examined.

Gail was a secretary and her husband, Ernie, had a job at a local factory. She was in charge of taking care of all the family's small domestic expenses and grocery shopping.

Ernie explained,

Well, if there's any extra, you know, as far as extra to be spent on extra things that we don't need or whatever, well, ...if it's somethin' big you know, we both decide on it.... Little bitty stuff, I mean, she wants it or whatever, she'll go ahead and buy it..., but there usually ain't much of that left once we've paid the bills.

They both told of a recent purchase of a new vehicle for the family. They both agreed on what type of car they wanted. Over a period of months they looked around at a variety of

automobiles. Eventually they heard of a car which Gail pushed Ernie to look into. Ernie checked the car out and the couple decided to buy it for their family. The couple agreed that Gail was typically involved in any decision regarding a large purchase for the family.

Peggy, a cashier at a fast-food restaurant, said her husband had final say in how big expenses were handled and she preferred it that way. She was uncomfortable when forced to make a decision about finances. She told a story of their son's dog becoming very ill when her husband was recently out of town. The following was her response when the veterinarian told her how much treating the dog would cost.

...I mean, here I was, him gone out on the road in Nebraska, Indiana, who knows where and I'm thinking "Two hundred dollars!" ...I've never had that type of situation thrown in my lap. ...I was used to little stuff, but, you know, I'd rather have him make the big, major decisions if it really came down to it.

Peggy reluctantly decided to have the dog treated for her son's sake. Her initial uncertainty about her decision was exacerbated when her husband returned from his trip. He was shocked by the size of the veterinarian's bill. Peggy had to defend herself by pointing out that their son would have been heartbroken had the dog died.

Peggy--like Sue and Carol, two of the top earners in this sub-sample--did not use her paycheck as an opportunity to control family finances. Traditional beliefs which

charge men with the responsibility for making major economic decisions in the family work to diffuse any power gained by the women from earning a paycheck. On the other hand, Gail earned only a small amount per year compared to her husband; however, she was active in economic decisions for the family from grocery shopping to large purchases. Her ability to influence economic decision-making was approximately as great as that of top wage earners, Emma and Hope, and mid-level earners, Jan and Opal.

Gail and Peggy illustrate that women's control over economic decision-making cannot be predicted solely on the basis of women's earnings in comparison to their husband's. A traditional ideology regarding husband and wife roles intervenes to negate power gained by earning a paycheck. Although Gail and Peggy both earned only a small percentage of their families' total income, the women varied markedly in their control over economic decision-making. Whereas Gail was fully involved in family purchasing decisions, Peggy was only peripherally involved.

In conclusion, for couples in which the wife earns a wage, there is not a one-to-one relationship between the ratio of husband to wife earnings and women's control over economic decision-making (see Table 11). None of the wage earning women had the complete say-so over purchasing decisions within the household. However, five of the eight women exercised considerable leverage in determining large

purchasing decisions. This is important due to Blumberg and Coleman's belief that women's involvement in large purchases for the family (such as cars, homes, furniture, and property) is more important than having control over the purchasing of small domestic items such as clothing, household items, and groceries. Emma and Hope, who earned slightly more than their husbands, were actively involved in decisions regarding large purchases. Furthermore, Emma's husband was involved in traditionally female areas of economic decision-making such as grocery shopping, which indicated a high level of power being wielded by Emma. However, Sue and Carol, who also earned more than their husbands, left final decisions regarding most large purchases to their husbands' discretion. Once again, Opal, Jan, and Gail--who earned the same or less than their husbands--were actively involved in decisions regarding large purchases for their families. Peggy, who earned significantly less than her husband, left decisions regarding large purchases to her husband.

The income-earning women who left decisions regarding big purchases to their husbands all explained this decision in the context of gender roles and the division of labor. These three women had the most traditional gender role expectations of the income-earning women in the sample. Sue reflected these women's attitudes when she said, "I put him in the role of head of the household." Although Sue's

Table 11

Income-Earning Wives and Economic Decision-Making

Final Say-So Over Purchases				
Respondents	Large Items	Small Household Items	Groceries	
High Income-Earning Women:				
Emma	Both	Wife	Both	
Hope	Both	Wife	Wife	
Sue	Husband	Wife	Wife	
Carol	Husband	Wife	Wife	
Middle Income-Earning Women:				
Jan	Both	Wife	Wife	
Opal	Both	Wife	Wife	
Low Income-Earning Women:				
Gail	Both	Wife	Wife	
Peggy	Husband	Wife	Wife	

husband would prefer that he was not put in that role, he says he has accepted it. Peggy and Carol's husbands both expressed agreement with the idea that, while they should ask their wives' opinions, they should have the final say-so over large purchases. The wives' and husbands' gender role expectations mark out a division of labor which gives the men final say-so in the area of economic decision-making. The other women and their spouses in this sample had less traditional to egalitarian gender role expectations in this area, which facilitated the women in being highly involved in this area of family life. These findings indicate that

Blumberg and Coleman's (1989) expectations regarding women's leverage in economic decision-making are accurate for income-earning women.

Economic Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who do not earn an income will have relatively little power to influence economic decisions, except when they occur in the domestic arena. Domestic purchases are appropriate to women's traditional roles caring for home and family, which gives women more say-so in this arena. Economic decision-making in the households of couples with a non-income-earning wife are explored next to see if this prediction corresponds to the behavior of the members of this sample.

Kay was married to Tom, who was disabled. She played an unusually active role in determining economic decisions for her family. Kay was in charge of the family checkbook and determined the budget for household spending. She exhibited considerable leverage in decision-making regarding big expenses for the family. Kay recently persuaded her husband to take out a loan so that the couple could build an addition onto their home. Tom said,

I dread the responsibility of a loan. [Kay] drove for it. There's a lot that needs done. On the income we draw we can afford it. I just don't feel right about it. I'd rather it was me paying for it. The way it is now the government is paying for it. Since my back got hurt, with my business being labor, I can't provide for the family solely like I think I ought to be.

Tom agreed with Kay that an addition to their home was necessary so that their son and daughter could have separate bedrooms. With this in mind, he gave in to Kay's idea that they should take out a loan for this purpose. Kay and Tom went to several banks together to investigate which would offer them the best terms for taking out a loan. They made the decision jointly as to where they would take out the loan and what improvements to their home would be necessary. Regarding smaller purchases for the home, such as clothing and groceries, Kay had complete say-so over these decisions.

This couple was anticipating a significant transition in their economic status when they were interviewed. Tom had been disabled on his job several years before. As Tom himself had noted in the above quotation, he was greatly disturbed by the loss of his provider role in the family due to his disability. At the time of the interview, Kay was taking college classes and would occasionally sew in her home to earn a little extra cash. She was determined to prepare herself for a career which would allow her to support their family. Tom supported her in this effort. Kay had a strong personality and highly egalitarian views on family life. Kay's future earning potential and Tom's disability status played a role in their egalitarian behavior regarding large economic decision-making. Tom said he was slowly coming to share his wife's egalitarian views on gender roles. These circumstances gave Kay added

leverage in controlling large economic decisions. However, Kay--like the other non-income-earning women--continued to have primary responsibility for traditionally female areas of economic decision-making such as small household purchases, clothing, and groceries.

Bonnie and her husband Kris, who was a construction worker, said they made decisions regarding large purchases together. The couple was considering buying a new car for the family. The day of their interview Kris brought home a used vehicle booklet. The couple sat flipping through the pages. They joked and chatted about the strengths and weaknesses of various cars pictured in the booklet. They explained that when they see one they like, they go to check it out in person. They will not buy the car without one another's approval. Bonnie said she bought her last car herself and did a good job of selecting it. They said that smaller purchases were typically Bonnie's arena. Kris occasionally picked something up for the kids or Bonnie, but most of these purchases were discussed by the couple first. Kris accompanied Bonnie on grocery expeditions; nevertheless, Bonnie made the real decisions. Bonnie, like Kay was able to wield a good deal of influence over economic decision-making in her family regarding both expensive purchases for the entire family and smaller domestic purchases.

Ann and her husband Bill, a striking miner, also said they discussed every economic purchase. Ann said that,

Even little things now, we'll tell each other. 'I need this so we need to put a little back there, or I need that, so we need to put a little back there.Like the other day he was saying that he wanted to buy some fishing line. ...I couldn't care less if he buys some fishing line. He already knew he was going to get it when he said that. We both do, but we'll say something to each other, but even when he was working (a big thing like) a car we would both decide.

Both Ann and Bill remarked that if they really wanted something they would go ahead and get it without receiving one another's approval. Ann said that one time when her husband was laid off from his job, he told her she didn't need a ring she wanted to buy. Since she was working at the time she bought it any way. Bill also stated that if he really wanted something he'd buy it but, "I try to do it and not be too careless about it." Neither expressed any displeasure over their partner's purchases. Ann--like the other non-income-earning women--had sole responsibility for smaller purchases. Ann exhibited a high degree of independence in decisions regarding mid-level and small purchases such as clothing, decorative items, and groceries. She was also highly involved with her husband in any costly purchases the couple made.

Mary and Steve, Meg and Dan, and Fran and Keith exhibited similar patterns with respect to economic decision-making. Each of these couples said that both the husband and wife discussed any large purchase thoroughly

before making a decision. Each of the couples had limited funds, so decisions regarding major purchases were rare. The wives in each of these couples had complete control over decisions regarding smaller purchases for the family. Each of the husbands said that whatever their wives wanted, or needed for the home, was fine with them. These men were comfortable with their wives purchasing these smaller items since their wives never spent more than the family could afford.

The remaining couples in the sample exhibited different patterns with respect to economic decision-making. Donna was married to Greg, who worked in construction. The couple did not have much disposable income, so they had not made many recent big purchases. Donna explained that they were considering buying a trailer home, but the couple had been discussing this for years and still were uncertain as to what they wanted to do. Greg, who was a traditionalist in his views regarding gender roles, said he thought he "should" have the final say-so on large purchases, but did not always have this prerogative. He and Donna described an incident when Donna recently bought a piece of exercise equipment she saw on television. Donna related the story this way:

It cost a hundred dollars and he let me get it. He said, 'You won't use it.' I said, 'Yes I will.' I asked him. If he said no, I wouldn't have got it because he's paying for it now. If I was payin' for it, I'd get it anyhow.

Greg told the story somewhat differently.

I told her if she got one she'd use it once or twice and then it would just sit in the corner, under the bed or something. I said it was quite expensive for a piece of plastic. So uh, she wanted it. I said, 'No, no, no, no.' 'Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.' 'No, no, no, no.' We argued on that for goin' on about a month. Finally she just went ahead and got it. She uses it maybe, well, she uses about once a week. I still think it's a waste of money.

Greg and Donna illustrate an interesting point which was exhibited by other non-income-earning women. Like Donna, in areas of small domestic purchases the aforementioned non-income-earning women typically had a free reign on what they spent. Some of these women had a strict budget set by their husband, but how that money was spent for food, clothes, and the home was determined by the wife. Bigger purchases, though, were thought to be something the women should ask their husbands about first. The husbands' opinion was particularly important to the women if they were not working. Donna said, as did Lynn, Ann, and Bonnie, that when she worked she might have said something to her spouse about buying a large item, but even if he disagreed, she would have spent the money regardless. This was true even if funds were tight because the husbands were not working and the women were. These non-income-earning women demonstrated quite clearly how women restrained their purchases when they were not the one who was earning the money for the family. The limitations on how the women spent money comes from both their spouses and themselves.

Lynn, who was married to Mike, a bus driver, provided an interesting contrast to the first non-income-earning women discussed in this section. Lynn said she left all of the financial matters to her husband. She described how she and her husband had recently bought a car for her to drive. "I was askin' him about it. Most of the time I leave it up to him." When asked if her husband played the biggest role in deciding on what car to get, she remarked, "That's right. Oh, if I did it, it wouldn't be any good anyway. He always makes the decisions." Her husband Mike said he always discussed decisions regarding large purchases thoroughly with Lynn. As examples he referred to their recent purchases of a car and life insurance. However, Mike was aware that Lynn said he had the final say-so in the family and admitted that she might be correct about that.

In regard to small household purchases, clothing, and groceries, Mike set the overall budget for these areas. He turned over a lump sum to Lynn and she made all of the decisions as to how the money would be spent. Lynn said the couple argued over money for these smaller items at times. She said,

Money. We disagree a lot on that. I guess what get's so aggravatin' with the disagreement, see if I had a little, like when I worked, if I had extra money, I'd take it and blow it.

Lynn told that when she worked, she and Mike would argue over whether or not she should spend her money on clothes and other things she wanted to buy. However, she would keep

some money back out of her paycheck before giving it to Mike to deposit in a checking account. This allowed her to have greater power in deciding how to spend her money. Since leaving her job, Lynn was dependent on the amount of money her husband budgeted for her to spend on these small items. This further reduced her ability to determine economic spending in her family.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who do not earn an income will have less ability to influence economic decisions in their households relative to women who do earn an income, particularly when large purchases are being considered. In contrast to Blumberg and Coleman's prediction, the eight non-income-earning women in the sample exhibited more control over economic decision-making than expected (see Table 12). Three non-income-earning wives--Kay, Ann, and Bonnie--have a great deal of influence over economic decision-making. This is evidenced by their ability to make large economic purchases their husbands oppose without being criticized or suffering interference from their husbands. These women were similar to some of the income-earning women discussed earlier in this section in their ability to influence economic decisions in their families.

In contrast Lynn, a non-income-earning wife, showed the least ability to influence economic decision-making in her family. She entirely removed herself from the possibility of

Table 12

Non-Income-Earning Wives and Economic Decision-Making

Final Say-So Over Purchases				
Respondents	Large Items	Small Household Items	Groceries	
Non-Income-Earning Women:				
Kay	Both	Wife	Wife	
Ann	Both	Wife	Wife	
Bonnie	Both	Wife	Wife	
Mary	Both	Wife	Wife	
Meg	Both	Wife	Wife	
Donna	Both	Wife	Wife	
Fran	Both	Wife	Wife	
Lynn	Husband	Wife*	Wife*	

*Husband sets strict budget.

exerting an opinion regarding large purchases, and was limited in her ability to make smaller purchases by budgets set by her husband. The other non-income-earning women were actively involved in large purchases for their families and had complete control over smaller domestic purchases, as befits the traditional division of labor in most families.

It is evident that, in terms of large purchases, generalized local norms dictate that both the husband and wife should be involved in the final decision regardless of whether the woman earns an income or not. Only two non-income-earning women (Donna and Lynn) and three income-earning women (Carol, Sue, and Patti) said they or their

husbands believed the man should have final say-so over large purchases. For these couples, gender role expectations which dictated that the man was the final authority in the family influenced the women's willingness or ability to affect the final outcome of these decisions. However, in each of these cases it was made clear that the wife's opinion should be considered in these matters. These women demonstrate that Blumberg and Coleman (1989) are correct in their assumption that gender role expectations can diminish income-earning women's ability to influence economic decision-making. However, traditional gender role expectations were also an apparent influence over non-income-earning women's ability to influence economic decision-making.

Non-traditional gender role expectations are also important to the analysis of economic decision-making among these couples. Emma, an income-earning woman, and Kay, Bonnie, and Ann, non-income-earning women, held highly non-traditional gender role expectations or were married to men with non-traditional gender role expectations. Each of these women demonstrated the ability to independently influence expensive economic decisions within their families. Emma was also the only woman in the sample who was able to delegate routine domestic economic decisions to her husband. These women exerted greater power in the area

of economic decision-making than the other women in the sample.

As Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict, the amount of income these women earn relative to their husbands is somewhat indicative of the degree to which the women in the sample independently influence economic decisions inside and outside of the domestic realm. The most powerful woman in the group is Emma, who was the primary support of her family at the time of the interview. She wielded considerable economic power in her family. The woman with the least ability to influence economic decisions at any level in her family was Lynn, who did not hold a job. Lynn and three other non-income-earning women in the sample said that when they hold jobs, they feel more freedom in making decisions to purchase items without first obtaining their husband's permission. Earning an income increased these women's power in their families.

Another variable not discussed by Blumberg and Coleman (1989) is women's potential to earn an income. Three women in the sample who did not earn an income wielded considerable power in the arena of economic decision-making compared to the other women in the sample. These women are Kay, Ann, and Bonnie. It should be noted that each of these women had worked in the past. Each of these women was enrolled in a college program at the time of the interview or had been in the past. Each of these women was married to

a man who was disabled or was frequently laid off from work. Two of the women had specific plans to enter a profession in the near future that would make them the primary breadwinners in their families. This potential to earn a larger income could contribute to these women's ability to wield more power in their families than would be predicted by Blumberg and Coleman's (1989) model.

Decision-Making: Domestic

Say-so in domestic decision-making is the last of three types of decision-making considered by Blumberg and Coleman (1989). Domestic decision-making is a broadly defined term which includes decisions regarding the way in which leisure time is spent, consumption choices, friendship choices, home decoration, discipline and care of children, and whether or not the wife will work for pay. The interest of each spouse in the nature of the decision is critical in determining the amount of say-so each spouse has. Blumberg and Coleman (1989, p. 241) state,

If it is irrelevant to him what color scheme they have in the living room, and it is irrelevant to her which restaurant or movie they go to, each may leave the decision to the other partner. But even here, if both rate a particular decision area to be of comparable importance, then we expect that each spouse's relative economic power will affect the outcome.

Each person who was interviewed was asked who they thought should have the final say-so in the family. This question was accompanied by a question regarding who actually had the final say-so in their own family.

Participants were then asked a series of specific questions regarding particular issues in the family to assess who had final say-so in their family in given situations such as childrearing, economic decisions, and other areas. The degree to which the income-earning wives influence domestic decision-making will be explored first. Then non-income-earning wives' ability to influence decisions in the domestic arena and how they compare to income-earning wives' ability will be explored.

Domestic Decision-Making: Income-Earning Women

When asked about domestic decisions, Hope, who was a hospital worker said, "Mainly he let me do the choosin' when we first got married. Now we discuss everything." Hope's husband, Lyle, was not interested in the daily domestic decisions that were to be made when they first married. Hope took care of the home and Lyle worked full-time. After Lyle was disabled on his job, Hope tried to involve him more in domestic decisions, but Lyle still said he still preferred to leave those decisions up to her. After Lyle was injured, Hope went to work and Lyle cared for their children. The couple said decisions regarding how the children were to be raised and disciplined were made jointly.

However, Hope said the couple had some problems early in their marriage regarding her going to work. She said, "My husband was raised to think that a woman's place was in the

home. He didn't want me to work." Hope explained that circumstances forced her into the work force and now she did not know if she could handle not working. She said of her husband Lyle,

It was hard on him at first, but he's adjusted over time. He has things to keep him occupied. ...He's happier if he's working. He's resigned to it now.

She commented that Lyle still tells her that he wishes she could stay home with him in the afternoons. However, when Hope recently decided she wanted a job in the medical field which required specialized training, she said,

I didn't have the self confidence to do things when I went back to school. My husband and my son encouraged me to go back to school. Then I didn't have the self confidence to take the job. My husband encouraged me to do that. It worked out.

Change in the balance of economic power led to some initial problems for the couple. However, with time they renegotiated their roles and Emma increased her ability to influence domestic decision-making in areas in which she and her husband had an equal interest.

Emma and Lou had a similar situation with their work roles. Emma, a nurse, took primary responsibility for child care when her children were young. However, since Lyle was laid off from his job he had been primarily responsible for child care and some housework, such as cooking, while Emma works. The couple said they determined jointly how their children were raised and disciplined. Lou said Emma had primary responsibility for decoration of the home. Emma had

worked on and off throughout her married life whenever she wanted to. Lou said,

Well, it doesn't bother me if she works. I know when I was at the bank, at that time she didn't really have to work but she wanted to work. You know, I didn't mind. I can see that this gets old [staying at home]."

He did not feel that the man had to be the sole support of the family. He wished his wife could have more time with their children, but it was necessary for her to work and he had no problem with that. Emma felt her husband would prefer that she had a regular nine-to-five job, but thought she might be more concerned with her husband not working than he was.

Leisure time was a problematic issue for this couple. Early in their marriage the couple had disputes over in-laws and the amount of time Lou spent with his friends. Emma said she complained until Lou quit spending time with his friends altogether, which she now regrets. She commented that now she wishes she had found a baby-sitter and done something she enjoyed when he was out.

In addition, this couple recently planned a family vacation which revealed some tensions. Lou felt the decision was made jointly. When Emma was asked who had the final say in this decision, she exclaimed, "I always do in everything. I play the biggest part in every decision which I don't really like that." After some joint discussions about costs and general location, Lou left the final

decision to Emma. Both Emma and Lou said that he turned these decisions over to Emma because he did not share her interest in them and he felt he could make Emma happy by leaving these things up to her. Emma wanted to push some of this responsibility to Lou, but he was not receptive. Although Emma had a great deal of control over domestic decisions, she was not able to adjust decision-making in areas of contention to fit with her goals.

Carol, a factory worker, was married to a striking miner. Carol enjoyed showing off the decorating touches she had made around their home. She was a skilled seamstress who had made all of the living room curtains herself as well as a variety of other pretty items throughout the home. Staying within the family budget, Carol was in charge of any decisions regarding home decoration. She and Al consider the home to be her realm.

Carol had worked out of the home or in a factory setting as a seamstress since she and her husband Al were married seventeen years ago. She said that she originally started sewing with Al's mother as a way to occupy her time. Carol's extra income had kept the debtors away during the most recent strike in which her husband was involved. Al said he did not mind that Carol worked. He believed it had been a necessity for her to be employed throughout their marriage to help keep the family afloat during strikes and layoffs at the mining company where he was employed. Al

took a special pride in the help Carol was to him in this arena.

Domestic decisions regarding trips and leisure activities were discussed jointly by the couple. Al said,

I mean, if we go any, anywhere or anything like that we, you know, we just talk it over first. We, she wants to go we go. If I don't want to go we don't go. You know, it just varies.

The one area of domestic decision-making about which the couple had disagreed, according to Carol, was child-rearing. Carol said the disagreements occurred mainly when the children were young. If the matter was serious, Al made the final decision. This couple had a traditional gender role ideology which gave Carol primary responsibility for the domestic realm. However, if a critical decision must be made, Al had the final say-so.

Sue was a social worker and Joe a substitute teacher. This couple lived in a home which was previously owned by one of Joe's relatives. Joe moved in first, shortly before the couple married. It took Sue a while to feel comfortable about making adjustments around the home, but over the first year of their marriage she became more comfortable with rearranging things to suit her taste. She said she enjoyed decorating and did the majority of these activities for the couple. However, the couple told that they recently redecorated their kitchen. Sue had done some research on the cabinet styles and rug she might want, but when it came time to make a decision she could not make up her mind. She

had Joe make the final selection, which she says she did with most decisions.

In terms of leisure time, the couple had easily come to an agreement about how much time to spend together and alone in activities. The only troublesome area for the couple had revolved around where they should attend church. Both Sue and Joe were active members of their churches prior to marriage, and Joe held an official volunteer position at his church. However, Sue was raised in a more conservative church than Joe. She attended church with Joe for several years until she found that she could not conscience certain policies at Joe's church. She said,

[T]hey allow women to have a leadership role in the church and [my church] doesn't allow that and, and they have a woman as district superintendent, and it seems to me that that pastor really promotes women in the church and it really bothers me. I'm not comfortable so I go to a Baptist church now. I go with him some and we go to like church activities together at his church...and have a wonderful time.... It's very hard to go to a different church and not be with him. That's what I miss, is goin' together but, you know, it's like he said, 'That's between me and the Lord and you have to', I have to do whatever is right, you know. See it doesn't bother a lot of people but, it really bothers me.

In this serious matter, Joe gave Sue the space she needed to make her own decision. Although she had to give up the special time with her husband at church services, Sue made the decision she felt she had to make. This matter is a clear indication that Sue could wield a great deal of power in her family if she chose to do so. However, her gender

role ideology frequently motivates her to relinquish decision-making power she would otherwise wield in her family due to the leverage gained by her large paycheck compared to her husband's.

Another concern the couple said they would be confronting in the near future was whether or not Sue would return to work after the birth of their child. Joe would like to find a full-time job in the near future so that Sue could take some time off from work to be a full-time homemaker if she would like. On the other hand, Sue felt strongly that she would prefer to return to work as soon as possible. Since Sue had the most secure job and largest paycheck at the time of the interview, it appeared that she would be back at work soon after giving birth to their child. Sue felt that the decision to work should primarily be the woman's decision. The strength of her feelings on this issue should allow her to translate her leverage into a decision reflecting her preferences.

The high income-earning women in the sample wield wide control over domestic decision-making in their households. However, we see that in the case of Carol and Al, who held traditional gender role ideologies, that the husband retained final say over matters in which he had a large degree of interest. Emma and Lou had a similar domestic decision-making pattern, although the couple was trying to break free of this pattern. Traditional gender

norms had been reexamined by the couple and they were trying, as yet unsuccessfully, to find a new way to determine these matters. Sue and Joe maintained an inverted decision-making pattern. Sue's traditional gender role ideology and general discomfort with decision-making caused her to relinquish say-so over various domestic decisions to her husband. However, when she wanted to make these decisions herself, her husband's more egalitarian gender role ideology and her larger paycheck worked to provide her with the freedom to negotiate these decisions to her benefit.

The two women who earned approximately the same or slightly less than their husbands are discussed next. Jan and Sam, who were both disabled, said they made all domestic decisions together. However, their views on women working is slightly at variance. When asked if a couple should try to get along on the husband's income, Sam said,

No, I don't think they should just get along on what he makes up to a certain extent. It depends on the age of the kids. When the kids are young, I don't think (she should work. Maybe a part-time job would be all right.)

This comment revealed that, at least in some areas, Sam held some traditional views regarding gender roles. His expectations regarding the woman's role in caring for young children had shaped his and his wife's division of labor when their child was young. When their son was born, Sam was still fully employed. Jan said that she took off from

work for a period of time to take full responsibility for caring for their young son. Jan was not clear to what extent her husband's expectations or the inability to find suitable child care influenced her to quit her job at that time. She did say when asked if a couple should get by on the husband's income,

I think every man thinks that. It would have helped if I could have had just a part-time job when [my son] was young. I would have enjoyed that. You need to get out.

Jan and Sam share domestic decision-making under most circumstances. However, when Sam felt he had a greater interest in the decision under consideration, he did appear to have greater influence over the matter.

Opal, a cook, and Hank, who was disabled, had more problems in the area of domestic decision-making. Decisions regarding home decoration were primarily Opal's domain. Although home decoration was not an area of contention (since Hank is not particularly concerned with these matters), other areas of domestic decision-making had been more problematic for the couple.

Opal and Hank had problems both with decisions regarding the rearing of their children and with the use of leisure time. Hank felt that Opal was too tough on their teenage son. Opal, on the other hand felt that Hank gave their teenage son too much freedom and then was too strict on their teenage daughter. She felt that in general Hank was not as strong a disciplinarian as she was. The couple

agreed in their goals for their children. They both wanted their children to be well-disciplined and to have a strong work ethic. It was the implementation of these goals on which they differed. Hank had no problem with helping their teenage children out monetarily, whereas Opal felt the children should work to provide for their school clothing and leisure activities. Opal said,

My kids would go and tell their Daddy something before they would me cause they know, you know, [My son] says, 'Well Mom, you lecture me. Don't do this and don't do that.' Maybe I am bad for it. I don't know.

Opal believed she was more successful in maintaining control over her daughter than her son. However, she did concede that her husband had the final say with all of the children.

Opal also lamented that she and her husband did not spend more of their free time together. Opal explained,

Hank never talks to me. Somebody'll come to the house. He'll talk all day. I'll be sitting in there, he never talks to me.

They both said that early in their marriage Hank did as many of the local men did and spent most of his free time out with male friends. Hank said in recent years he has tried to stay near the house when his wife was home, but he preferred to be outdoors and his wife preferred the indoors.

These two areas of domestic decision-making had been highly problematic for the couple. Hank felt he was trying to alleviate some of their problems but it was apparent that he was the one who had been able to set the limits as to how

much adjustment would be made to appease Opal's desires. The result had been that Opal kept many of her desires to herself, which had increased her resentment over not having her needs met.

When asked about whether a woman should work, Hank said,

At any time, if she feels it's all right. It's her decision. If she can find a way to take care of the kids, then fine. If the husband has a nine to five, steady job then he can't. If they work different shifts they can do it. If they have enough money to get by on, then it's her decision.

Opal also felt it was the woman's decision as to whether or not she should work. However, they both told that when Hank became disabled from his job, he suffered from severe depression over his loss of the breadwinner role. Hank explained,

Opal more or less had to hold a job in order for us to hold our heads above water and educate the kids. It's been a burden on her. It made me feel like I wasn't the head of the household.

Opal remarked,

It hurts him. I believe it does. ...He says, you know, 'I just wish you'd quit.' I think it kinda, you know, hurts ...his ego, ...and you know I try not to. I say, 'Hank, I'd work. I don't care what; I've always worked. I love to work, but I think it kind of hurts him.

Circumstances had necessitated that Opal work almost the entire time the couple had been married and she preferred it that way. In this instance Hank had not been able to be the primary support of the family the way he would have liked. However, in other areas of domestic decision-making it was

clear that his gender role ideology had allowed him to maintain final say-so in matters of concern to him.

Jan and Opal earned approximately the same or slightly less than their husbands. For these couples it is found once again that decisions regarding the home are primarily the wife's domain, in keeping with traditional gender role expectations. How to raise the children, whether the wife should work, and leisure time involve a variety of problems for these couples because of the husband's varied perspectives on these issues. Jan's husband objected to women with young children working, which had some impact on Jan's decision to stay home when her son was young. Opal's husband did not agree with Opal on childrearing issues and how to make use of leisure time, which caused on-going problems for this couple. When the husbands' opinions regarding gender roles and other issues are at variance with the wives' it is apparent that they are able to wield more leverage in the outcome of domestic decision-making for these two couples. However, the women's paychecks are a bargaining chip which the women use to determine their work patterns even when opposed by their husbands, both of whom are disabled.

The two women in the sample who earned a low-level income compared to their husbands are the last of the income-earning women to be examined. Gail, a secretary, and Ernie, a factory worker, had divided household tasks such

that Gail was almost entirely responsible for caring for the home. Gail was in charge of decoration of the home and was primarily responsible for child care. In the months prior to the interview, this couple had to make a decision regarding how their child would be treated for hyperactivity. The school had recommended to Gail that their young son receive medication which would treat his condition and allow him to better settle into school. After some consultation with the school staff, Gail decided that the medication would be used on a trial basis. However, when she told her husband about the medication, he had some concerns. She recalled,

...[I]t took him awhile to kinda agree with it. You know, he's like, 'Well, the Lord wanted him that way or he wouldn't have made him that way.' or you know, he just kind of looked at it like we were tryin' to change [our son], you know, but then after the doctor explained to us the all the way [sic] it could help and, and the things about it you know, he kind of went along with it.

Gail was able to use her influence to help bring her husband to the point where he was willing to discuss the medication for their son with a physician and the school. Gail's higher level of education and greater ease with the school system probably worked to give her greater influence in this area. The couple jointly decides childrearing issues but Gail's focus on the home and childrearing gives her more leverage in this area.

Leisure time was jointly agreed upon for this couple. Ernie said he did most of the planning for their last trip

because it was an area of special interest to him. However, both Gail and Ernie agreed on the final decisions involved.

Gail's work was the last area of domestic decision-making the couple discussed. Gail said she quit working when her son was born because she believed that young children should have their mother at home. When her son entered school she returned to work. After several different jobs, she had settled into one she truly enjoyed. She exclaimed, "I really wouldn't want to stay home all the time." When asked what her husband thought about her working, Gail said, "He'd rather me be home, but [laughs]." Gail said she had worked nights for a while, which her husband did not like. At the time of the interview she worked days, which suited her and her husband better. She said bills were her main inducement to work now, but Ernie would prefer her to stay home. Ernie recalled that early in their marriage he thought the husband should be the only breadwinner but he had come to accept that almost everyone's wife worked to make ends meet. He said,

...[W]hatever she's happy doin'. Like I said, I would prefer her to stay home if we could afford it but I mean, but it's basically whatever. If she wants to work, then whatever she wants to do.

Economic necessity allowed Gail to make the decision to work. Continued economic need will probably allow Gail to continue to keep the job she enjoys despite the fact that both she and her husband see the man as the primary breadwinner.

Peggy, a cashier, had control over the majority of domestic decisions in her household. Her husband's job took him away from home for most of the week. When he was at home he tried to rest or spend leisure time with the family. Peggy cared for the home and decorated. She made the majority of daily decisions regarding raising the children since she was the one who was with them most frequently. However she admitted,

I'd rather have him really make the big, major decisions if it really came down to it. You know I'd like to be included in on it with my opinion but when it came right down to it, [I] like him [to] decide which way we should go, but if it's wrong, I say, 'It's your fault. You're guilty' [laughs].

Not all domestic decisions had been resolved in such an easy manner for this couple. Peggy said she and her husband argued in the early years of their marriage about how to spend their free time. Peggy wanted to spend most of their free time as a family. She deliberately avoided social events that took her away from home at night because she wanted to be with her husband and children. She felt her husband should do likewise. Early in their marriage her husband wanted to go out alone with his friends whenever possible. After a period of fighting when their children were first born, Peggy said her husband began to accept that if he went somewhere, she wanted to come also. The couple currently planned trips and weekend outings together.

Peggy was asked how her husband felt about her working for pay. She said,

No, he don't mind me working. He just hates that I'm working [at a fast food place]. I've worked almost all, ever since we've been married so 'cept [sic] when they both were little....

Peggy and her husband both felt that as long as the wife could find a way for the children to be cared for then it was her decision as to whether or not she should work.

Peggy wanted to work when her children were younger but could not find day care facilities which caused her to drop out of the work force for a period of time. Women dropping out of the work force due to a lack of alternative forms of child care was cited frequently by the women in the sample. To summarize, Peggy was responsible for a wide variety of domestic decisions. However, she had taken on more decisions than she liked due to her husband's job situation.

In conclusion, the low income-earning women in the sample exhibited interesting patterns regarding domestic decision-making (see Table 13). Both women were young and had working husbands. The women were entirely responsible for decisions regarding the decoration of the home, as seen with the other income-earning women. Childrearing decisions were also shifted more toward the women, although their husbands were involved in any major decisions. The greater amount of time the women spent with their children and Gail's perceived greater expertise gave the women added leverage in these areas. Leisure time was a joint decision

for the couples, but the women's work force participation was primarily the decision of the women. Gail met some resistance from her husband on this front, but the importance of her paycheck to the family allowed her to wield some leverage in this area.

Table 13

Income-Earning Wives and Domestic Decision-Making

Final Say-So Over Areas of Domestic Decision-Making				
Respondents	Home Decoration	Children	Wife's Employment	Leisure
High Income-Earning Women:				
Hope	Wife	Joint	Wife	Joint
Emma	Wife	Joint	Wife	
Husband*				
Carol	Wife	Husband	Wife	Joint
Sue	Wife**	NA	Wife	Joint
Middle Income-Earning Women:				
Jan	Wife	Joint	Husband	Joint
Opal	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband
Low Income-Earning Women:				
Gail	Wife	Wife	Wife	Joint
Peggy	Wife	Wife	Wife	Joint

*When the husband cared about the decision being made.

**Except when the wife chose to relinquish her choice.

The importance of the wife's paycheck to the family is a critical factor in determining domestic decision-making power for most of the income-earning women. It is also seen

that the husband's level of interest in decision-making and both the husband's and the wife's gender role ideology are important in determining final say-so in this arena for income-earning women.

Domestic Decision-Making: Non-Income-Earning Women

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who do not earn an income will have less influence over domestic decision-making than non-income-earning women. This section explores how the non-income-earning women in this sample negotiate domestic decision-making.

As with the income-earning wives, all of the non-income-earning wives said household decoration projects were primarily their responsibility. However, decisions regarding the rearing of children, leisure activities, and women's work were handled differently in the various households (see Table 14).

Ann and her husband Bill, who was a striking miner, said that the vast majority of domestic decisions were made jointly in their household. Ann explained,

Both of us. Even when the kids want to stay all night with a friend, we tell them to ask their Dad, or their Mom.

Ann had primary responsibility for the decorating of their home, as did all of the non-income-earning women but larger decisions such as remodeling or buying expensive items for the home were always a joint decision. Decisions regarding the children were handled jointly, although Ann said her

husband tended to want to go easy on their daughter but not their son.

Ann's employment status had presented some interesting questions for this couple to resolve. Ann and Bill both said that Bill would prefer to be the main provider for the family. Ann said,

...[H]e has this thing about the role of the provider. I just don't see him that way. I don't think it's fair for one person to have to bring in the money. I listen to him but I just don't see him that way.

Ann was attending college at the time of the interview. Bill spoke with pride about his wife getting a college education. They both said that she worked in the past and planned to work again in the near future. Bill asserted that he did not mind Ann going to work, but he would rather that he was able to provide the primary support of his family. He was proud that the family had been able to get by since he had been on strike. He did feel that the extra money his wife would bring in would be very useful for the family and he was proud of her plans to seek employment. Bill was wrestling with the same dilemma many of the men with non-income-earning wives in this sample were contending. The gender roles of the community say that the man should be the primary breadwinner in the family. However, outside circumstances, health problems, and economic necessity make this an impossibility for many families. Even men with egalitarian values such as Bill

feel a tremendous loss when they find themselves without the employment which always provided them with their primary sense of identity. This leads to ambivalent feelings about the wife's potential employment.

Kay was married to Tom, who was disabled. Kay had been unusually involved in domestic decision-making. Kay was involved in the traditional areas of domestic decision-making such as home decoration. Beyond this, she pushed Tom to take out a loan to pay for an addition to their home. The couple made decisions together about family trips and how to raise their children. About these matters Kay said, "It works about even. There's no dominant person. No ruler. No lord you have to bow down to."

The couple said the one area they argued about was Tom's habit of going out at night. Kay said the couple argued about, "[h]is wanting to get out and run around with his friends and he doesn't take me with him." Kay complained--as did many of the women--that Tom spent more time with his friends than he did with her. Tom said that frequently he was helping a friend fix a car or some other mechanical item when he was gone. However, he admitted that this was a source of contention for the couple.

The last domestic decision the couple discussed was Kay's work history and educational pursuits. Kay was taking college classes which Tom supported whole heartedly. He was proud of his wife's attempts to better herself for

the sake of their family. Kay worked until the birth of their first child, when her job was given to someone else during her maternity leave. She was offered a lower paying job, which she turned down. A second child came soon after, which led Kay to make the decision to take off work until her children were in school. She was taking college classes prior to the birth of her first child and planned to graduate in the near future. Kay was looking forward to working again. She said she missed the stimulation of being around other people at work and was looking forward to supporting her family.

When discussing her work history, Kay said the decision to work or not had always been her own to make. However, Kay said of the time period when she and her husband were first married,

If I hadn't lost my job, I don't know if Tom would ever feel like he was the supporter of the family. I don't think he could deal with not being the sole supporter. It gave him the opportunity to look for work.

Tom was unemployed when their first baby was born. When Kay lost her job, he found a full-time job. After several short-term jobs he sustained a disabling injury on the job. He reflected on his current feelings about Kay working,

It's okay with me as long as one of us is here for the kids. I've accepted that much. I was never taught this but I picked it up from TV or somewhere that it's a man's place to be responsible for his family and be the sole provider. I don't mind her working but I don't care for baby-sitters.

Because the family must rely on his disability check to get by, Tom felt he was "freeloading off the government." He was anxious for his wife to begin work so that they could support themselves again. Kay had a high degree of influence over this couple's domestic decision-making. It was only in the one arena of Tom leaving at night that she had not been able to influence things as much as she would like.

Bonnie was married to Kris, who was a construction worker. This couple had made joint decisions on most domestic decisions except in a few areas. Bonnie had held various jobs in the past. When she was younger she had worked as a manager of a night club for a period of time, which Kris did not like. Kris said he did not mind so much that Bonnie worked as where she worked. Bonnie agreed but said, "He wasn't used to the idea of women needing something else beside family [and] home." Kris grew up in a household in which the wife was primarily responsible for the home and the man was responsible for earning an income and could "run around with his friends" when off from work. Bonnie told that she finally walked out and left Kris with the kids to get through to him that she did not want things to be that way in their home. They both said they still had some arguments because Kris liked to go out drinking with his friends, but these arguments were fewer and farther between. Bonnie told that she had quit working now to stay home with

her children because "I want to". Although Bonnie had not been entirely able to influence her husband's use of leisure time to suit her wishes, she had been able to make decisions regarding her own free time and labor force participation. This indicates that Bonnie wields a good deal of influence in her family.

Mary and Steve, a striking miner, said they had some difficulty regarding leisure activities and childrearing. Mary said, "There's ...times he will go make plans without talking to me first and that really burns me up." She recalled that she had recently made plans to take her son on a vacation with some of her relatives. Steve came in one day and told her they had to take a trip associated with the union he belongs during the same time period as the trip Mary had already planned. Mary did not want to "put him in a compromising position." She rearranged her plans to go on a trip for the union, but not without some resentment. She said her husband frequently did things of this nature. Steve admitted that he had a habit of planning things without checking with his wife first, but he was trying to improve in this area. He also said he was trying to associate with a different group of people. After many years of arguing over his drinking habits and time spent with his friends, Steve was trying to reform himself. He said having their son had helped him try to settle down.

The way in which they raised their son had also been a matter of contention for this couple. Mary felt that her husband tried to rush their son too much. While Steve was enrolling their son in team sports and buying him a bike, Mary wanted to "hang on to her baby". Steve had the most influence in these areas thus far.

One area with which the couple had not had problems was Mary's schooling and work plans. Mary explained that she had not worked until the past summer, when she took a small part-time job with her husband. Prior to that she chose to stay at home with her son, but since he entered school she was looking forward to doing something different. Steve and her girlfriend recently talked Mary into taking some college classes and she was looking for work at the time of the interview. Mary felt that since her husband was on strike, financial necessity made him more agreeable to her working than he would have been otherwise. Steve admitted that he had some prejudices in the past, but he was working on them. Mary had a great deal of responsibility for domestic decisions which involved traditional women's work. Typically Steve had final say-so over matters in which he held some interest, such as the trips they take, but it appeared that he was trying to include his wife in more of these decisions than he had in the past.

Donna was married to Greg, who was working as a construction worker. Donna had complete responsibility for

taking care of the home and its decoration. Donna recalled that her husband had wanted to buy a picture for the living room that she did not like. When she vetoed his idea he said, "'I have no say over anything.'" She also took responsibility for the children because she spends the most time with them. She said that sometimes her husband wanted to discipline their children for something which he thought they could get hurt doing. Donna was more easy going and would tell him, "'You can't whop them for that. I let 'em do that the other day and they'll get confused if you whop 'em for it now.'" For this reason, Greg left most childrearing decisions to his wife.

When it came to larger decisions or ones in which Greg had more interest, Donna left the final say-so to her husband. She said that they had been debating about whether to move for a number of years. She had suggested they move from the small community they lived in to Centerville. "Greg said, 'No! Absolutely not. Absolutely not.'" She explained that her husband did not get along with certain members of her family who lived in Centerville, so they would not be moving there.

Leisure time had been more of a problem for this couple. Donna said she wished her husband would not run around late at night with his friends so often. The couple had some serious confrontations over this issue in the year prior to the interview. Greg cut back on the amount of time

he spent out at night, which had alleviated the problem for them. However, it was apparent that Greg had the final say on how the couples' leisure time was spent.

Greg said he did not mind if his wife worked. Earlier in the year Donna worked as a maid on a part-time basis while Greg was laid off from his job. She wanted to take a job at a nursing home, but her husband did not like the idea. When her husband went back to work circumstances made it impossible for her to take the job. The couple had two pre-school children whom Greg babysat when he did not have a job. At the time of the interview Greg worked full-time and the couple did not have a vehicle that worked, so Donna had quit her part-time job and given up on the idea of working at the nursing home. She said she enjoyed getting out of the house and would like to work when the kids were in school. Donna appeared to have some say-so in this area but Greg may have exerted a good deal of influence over which jobs she took. This couple had traditional gender role expectations and Greg's paycheck was considered most important by the couple, which gave him the final say over those domestic decisions in which Greg was most interested.

Fran was married to Keith, who was a self-employed mechanic. This couple was in the process of building a home. The couple said they made the decision of where to live jointly. Keith said of decisions regarding the floor plans and details of the structure,

It's an equal right thing. She might want the kitchen one place and I might want the bedroom another place. We could work it out.

The couple's son was of pre-school age. Major decisions regarding childrearing had not been a problem for the couple as of the time of the interview. If their son needed correcting, whoever was closest handled the situation. Since their child spent most of his time with Fran, she did the majority of the disciplining herself.

Fran and Keith had more problems in resolving issues regarding leisure time. The couple did not have much money or a car, therefore long vacations and other activities which cost money were out of the question. The couple often spent time together in the evenings. Fran said she valued her time alone when Keith was out. However, the couple argued over how much time Keith spent partying with friends and how little time he spent with their son. (This was such a great issue that at the last time the couple was heard from by the researcher, they had separated.) Fran had not been able to use her influence to change this situation.

In regard to Fran's work history, she was laid off from a job at the time of the interview. Keith believed it was Fran's "choice" as to whether or not she worked and at the current time she preferred to stay home with their son. Fran, like many of the non-income-earning women in the sample, made many of the domestic decisions herself or jointly with Keith. This would make it appear that she was

able to wield a great deal of power in the family. However, it was apparent from her inability to influence Keith regarding how his free time was spent that Fran did not wield a great deal of authority in this area.

Meg was married to Dan, who was disabled. Meg was in charge of household decorating but it was Dan who has decided where they would live. Meg did not beg her husband to leave his childhood home. Rather, she appeared resigned to their present location, but dreamt of living in another state.

Meg took primary responsibility for childrearing decisions. She told that her husband did not "get along well" with their children, so she had the final say in these matters. She had resorted to leaving her husband occasionally over an argument about the children; each time he came and asked her back and she would return.

Leisure activities were decided on jointly by this couple. Dan told that the couple recently decided to take a short trip with their kids that turned into an extended vacation because they were having so much fun. Meg and Dan made this decision jointly.

This couple had some problems regarding Meg's employment status. Meg did not work at the time of the interview. She had tried taking jobs in the past but each time had quit because her husband--who babysat for her--could not get along with the children. Dan said he

thought it was all right for a woman to work as long as the children were not young. Dan did not indicate that he deliberately hindered Meg in her desire to have a job. However, Dan's inability to care for the children to Meg's satisfaction had caused her to leave jobs which she enjoyed. It is possible that he made no effort to help Meg in her attempts to work for pay.

Meg is an interesting case because she had a great deal of latitude over domestic decision-making which is consistent with traditional gender roles in the region. However, her ability to make domestic decisions at times seemed to come more from wresting decision-making abilities from her husband or protecting certain areas of life pertaining to her children from her husband's interference. It appeared to be an ongoing struggle for this couple.

Lynn was married to Mike, a bus driver. Lynn had primary responsibility for household care and decoration. The couple lived in a rustic home that Mike owned before they were married. Lynn revealed that life was a little difficult since they had to add plumbing and other amenities over the years but she knew her husband did the best he could to provide for her on a small salary.

Both Lynn and Mike had children from previous relationships who did not live with them. Many childrearing decisions were handled by the children's guardians. The couple had to negotiate their leisure time around Mike's

busy schedule. They both said this occasionally led to arguments about how much time and money was spent on each child. Mike asserted that they typically discuss any problem areas and resolve the issue until it arises again.

The couple indicated that they had some difficulties regarding leisure time. Lynn wished that the couple could spend more time alone. She lamented,

Why don't we spend more time together and do more together like we did when we first got married? Go up in the mountains and have picnics. Go swimmin' in the creek. We did stuff like that and we don't do that no more. That was just our first year of marriage [laughs]. Then all of it changes, which I figured it would. It usually does.

Mike was busy with college classes at night and worked during the day and tried to see children during their leisure time. He knew this was hard on Lynn, but he would tell her this state of affairs would not last forever. Eventually he would graduate. Mike had a plan to better himself and make more money for the family but his wife, who was more of a free spirit, appeared to chafe at times under the schedule he set for them both.

When asked about Lynn's employment status, the couple gave differing accounts of why she did not work. Lynn described how she had worked in the past and truly enjoyed working. She worked as a maid at a local hotel which allowed her to meet a wide variety of people. She quit in the past year. When asked why, she said,

Mike, he told me to. We weren't getting along good then and he was afraid I was goin' to see

somebody else. ...I told him, 'I've had guys ask me out and I told them I'm married.' I mean, He says, 'You stick with me and you wouldn't have to say a word.'

She explained that it was only when they were going through a rough period that they "fussed like that," but rather than have a big fight, she quit her job to alleviate the strain. She had hopes of going to school in the future to prepare herself for a job in the medical field. Mike said he did not mind if Lynn worked and the extra money was helpful when she did work. He did feel his role was to be the primary breadwinner for the family. Lynn commented several times that she did whatever her husband wanted her to do.

Although Mike did not specifically believe that a woman should not work, Lynn accommodated him when he did not like the job she had, just as she accommodated him in other areas of domestic decision-making that Mike was interested in.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that non-income-earning women will not be able to wield the same amount of leverage over domestic decision-making as income-earning women. They also predict that women's leverage over domestic decision-making is increased somewhat due to traditional gender norms giving women more responsibility for the home and childrearing. However, when the woman's spouse is particularly interested in an area of domestic decision-making, they predict that the man will have the final say-so (see Table 14). A comparison of the

non-income-earning women and income-earning women in the sample is useful at this point.

Table 14

Non-Income-Earning Wives and Domestic Decision-Making

Final Say-So Over Areas of Domestic Decision-Making				
Respondents	Home Decoration	Children	Wife's Employment	Leisure
Kay	Wife	Joint	Wife	Husband
Ann	Wife	Joint	Wife	Joint
Bonnie	Wife	Joint	Wife	Husband
Mary	Wife	Husband	Wife	Husband
Meg	Wife	Wife	Husband	Joint
Donna	Wife	Wife	Husband	Husband
Fran	Wife	Joint	Wife	Husband
Lynn	Wife	Joint	Husband	Husband

When asked about their beliefs regarding decision-making fifteen of the sixteen women in the sample said decision-making should be shared equally by a husband and wife. Only one income-earning woman said the husband should have the final say-so in the family. Thirteen men said decision-making should be shared equally. The remaining three men said the wife should be included but the man should have the final say over any decisions. Overall, attitudes regarding who should have the final say-so in the family were egalitarian.

When asked about their actual behavior, twelve of the sixteen women said decision-making was shared in their

households by the husband and the wife. One of these women later said she had the final say-so in her family. Four women said their husbands had the final say-so in their families. Twelve men said decision-making was shared in their families. Four men said they had the final say-so in their families. Three-fourths of the men and women in the sample believed decision-making was shared in their families. Only four men and three women believed decision-making followed a traditional pattern of the husband having the final say-so in their families. The relationship between the participants' beliefs about how decision-making should be handled in their families and their behavior in particular situations is explored next using Blumberg's and Coleman's theory as a framework for analysis.

For most of the women who did not currently earn an income, we see that it is true that men still had the final say-so over areas of domestic decision-making in which they had a particular interest. Child rearing decisions, vacations, and residential location are all areas where many of the men had final say-so. However there is a wide range of important domestic decisions in which non-income-earning women were equal partners in the decision-making process, and occasionally the women made decisions that were in opposition to their husbands' desires. In the case of Ann, who was a non-income-earning woman, she and her husband had

established a relatively egalitarian decision-making process regarding domestic decision-making. Kay influenced her husband to add an addition to their home when he was not positive that a loan would be a good idea. The non-income-earning women who showed the most influence in domestic decision-making had several things in common. These women had educational levels which far exceed their husbands'. These women had expectations to take jobs in the near future, which would make them primary contributors to their family's finances. Finally, these women held non-traditional gender role expectations and received at least partial support in these areas from their husbands.

The non-income-earning women with the least amount of influence in their homes were married to men who had traditional views regarding gender roles. The women also tended to have more traditional views regarding gender roles than the other women in the sample. Educational levels, future earning potential, and gender role ideology all affected non-income-earning women's ability to influence domestic decision-making.

It is appropriate at this point to discuss some of the structural and normative factors which affect women's decisions to enter or leave the work force. First the availability of work for women and men in the area must be considered. The structure of the job market in the Centerville region has changed dramatically in recent years.

The mining industry has declined significantly in recent years. Several men related that self-employment was the best way to earn a living in the area. However, traditional areas for men such as construction were highly competitive due to the lack of such work in the area. Most factory jobs and construction jobs require a forty to sixty minute drive to other towns which is difficult if the family does not own a car or their only vehicles are unreliable. Women on the other hand have a variety of employment opportunities available to them at local fast food restaurants, hotels, schools, sewing factories and medical facilities. The relative availability of jobs in traditionally female dominated fields in comparison to the number of jobs in traditionally male dominated fields acts as an impetus propelling women into searching for jobs and men accepting the need for their wives to seek employment.

In contrast, alternative forms of child care are limited in the area which caused many of the women in the sample to leave the work force when they had young children. There is only one day care center in Centerville. The center opened in 1982 with a maximum capacity of ten students. The center recently expanded and is now licensed to care for forty students. There is still a waiting list at the center during the summer months. Although the facility offers care on a sliding scale to accommodate families with low incomes, several couples in the sample

said the available day care in the area is too expensive for them to consider using. Other early child care facilities have opened and closed over the years in Centerville and the surrounding areas. A local Head Start program closed in 1990 and a rural day care facility for low income families closed in 1991 [Interview with Sister Mary Dennis, 6/2/93]. All of the women in the sample said they enjoyed working. Fourteen of the sixteen women in the sample said they worked when they had young children or had wanted to work but could not find adequate child care. Employed women with young children often commented on how lucky they were to have family members living nearby or unemployed husbands who were willing to care for their children while they work. However, the lack of day care facilities in the area was a significant deterrent for women with young children working.

In addition, norms held by the couples in the sample are similar to national norms which state that young children are best cared for by their own mothers (Mason & Kuhlthau, 1989). In answer to a question about when it was appropriate for a woman to work, eight of the women in the sample said women should be able to work whenever they wish. However, three women specifically stated that a woman should not work if her children are young and six women specifically stated that a woman should be able to work out adequate day care before working. Six men said women should not work when their children are young. One man said women

should work only if their husbands could care for the children because he did not believe in using baby-sitters. Another man said the wife should be able to work if she could find adequate child care. Seven men said the wife should be able to work if she wanted to without any stipulations regarding financial need, type of job, age of children, or child care arrangements. It is clear that women's labor force participation is widely accepted by the members of the sample. However, women have the primary responsibility for child care arrangements. When women are unable to locate adequate child care, their labor force participation is curtailed until their children enter school.

Employment opportunities, local norms regarding gender roles and availability of child care all impact women's decisions to work. These more macro-level factors are significant in determining how women work out their decisions regarding employment at the micro-level.

Decision-Making: Fertility

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women with greater economic power relative to their husbands will have more control over their own fertility patterns. Fertility choices include decisions regarding when to begin and end childbearing, spacing of children, and the methods the couple will use to control childbearing.

All of the couples in the sample who had children were asked if they planned the timing of the births of each of their children. If the couple planned their children, they were asked how this decision was made. In addition, all of the couples in the sample were asked about their plans for future childbearing, if the couple agreed about these plans, and what birth control measures they used if any.

Fifteen couples in the sample already had children, and the wife in the other couple was pregnant with their first child at the time of the interviews. Interestingly, only six of the sixteen couples planned their first child.

Five of the women who had not planned their first birth conceived prior to marriage (see Table 15). Only two of these women were using birth control at the time. Two were in high school and three were employed. Four of the women went on to marry their child's biological father. Three of these women had expected to marry the father even before they became pregnant. The primary reactions to news of the pregnancy was surprise and joy, mixed with some anxiety for these three women and their future husbands. Pregnancy simply served to accelerate marriage plans or in one case led to cohabitation and later marriage. The two young mothers who had used birth control were not as pleased when they learned they were pregnant. One of the women was employed at a low paying job at the time and cohabiting with the father. She said,

I was scared. All my life I never wanted any children. I was scared about how I would provide for it.

She quit work for a short period of time after the birth of her son. The father supported her and her son until she went back to work. The other woman responded in the following way when her physician told her she was pregnant.

I said, 'Pregnant?' Oh, about that time buddy I just bursted. I said (to the doctor), 'You're lyin'!' He shook his head no. ...I was sittin' there bawlin'..... I mean me pregnant, and I prayed. I prayed, 'I hope it's a boy. If it's a boy I'm not goin' to have anymore.' and I didn't, and I won't.

She had her child by herself and tried raising it on her own for a while. Eventually she gave custody to her parents because she couldn't provide for the child herself on the wages she made from her job.

Six of the couples were married at the time of first conception but were surprised to discover they were going to have a child (see Table 15). Only one of the six women was taking birth control at the time she conceived. This woman, who has been a housewife since she married, said, "I just got lazy about takin' the pill. I had taken the pill for three or four years and I just quit taking it." Her husband's feelings upon learning his wife was pregnant were, "It was too late." Two of the women had been told by their physicians they could not have children. These women and their spouses greeted the news they were going to have a child with joy and surprise.

Table 15

Unplanned First Births and Women's Marital and Employment Status

Woman's Employment Status	First Child Conceived Outside of Marriage	First Child Conceived in Marriage
Employed	3	4
Unemployed	2	2
Total	5	6

The rest of the six couples simply were not using any method of birth control (see Table 15). In most cases these couples took the view expressed by this man, "if she got pregnant that was fine, if she didn't you know,whatever." Parenthood was assumed to be a natural consequence of marriage for these three couples. Timing of the first birth was left to chance. One woman, who had worked throughout her marriage and was a cook at the time of the interview, reflected this view when she said laughingly of her four children, "I didn't plan none of 'em." There appeared to be a general feeling by both the men and the women that the women probably would not get pregnant right away but if they did, then the couple would find a way to get by financially. Only one of these women, who had held a variety of jobs throughout her marriage and at the time of the interview was a secretary, stated that she had considered using birth control. She asked her husband about

birth control when they married. She said, "He, you know, didn't really want me to start takin' the pill right away." She agreed to this plan.

The remaining five couples had planned the birth of their first child. Of these couples, only one woman reported that her husband was primarily responsible for deciding the timing of conception. This woman, a social worker, had concerns about the financial aspects of parenthood but when she weighed her age with her husband's desire to begin a family she said,

I gave in. ...He had wanted children longer than I did. You know, I just felt like puttin' it off. 'Come on. Let's just wait a little while longer.', and he wanted one so bad I think it made me want one. I'm real excited about it you know...but, he wanted it a lot more than I did, for longer than I did.

This decision is in keeping with her belief that the husband is the head of the household and should make the major decisions in the household. The remaining four women indicated their desires regarding when to have children had corresponded with their spouses wishes.

The timing and spacing of subsequent children was mitigated by a number of factors for these couples. Eight of the couples said the decision regarding whether to have more children and when to have them was mutual. Of these eight, three couples planned on having subsequent children at an undetermined date in the future. They were surprised when a second pregnancy occurred unexpectedly on the heels

of a previous birth. Five other couples revealed some dispute over how many children they would have and their spacing. Two women, both housewives at the time of second conception, said their husbands had not wanted additional children. They informed their husbands up front that they would no longer be using birth control so that they could get pregnant. One woman's husband started to use condoms but they failed. The other woman's husband accepted her decision. Both men were not happy at first with their wives' pregnancies but soon grew to accept the idea. A laid-off factory worker whose husband does odd jobs related that her husband wanted more children but she did not feel they could afford another at the time. He accepted her decision. Three women--two housewives and one secretary--said at the time of the interview that they would like to have another child but their husbands had told them no. One housewife said, "No, he don't want no more. He says after these are grown and raised, then I can have one but then I'd be too old." The other women's husbands had economic concerns about having more children and the women agreed that it was not the best time to have more children so they had reluctantly put off additional pregnancies (see Table 16).

Birth control usage is another area in which women can exercise control. An interview with a nurse revealed that a wide variety of birth control methods are available from the

Table 16

Fertility Decisions at First (Planned) and Subsequent Births

Primary Responsibility For Decision	Wife Employed At Time of Decision		Wife Not Employed At Time Of Decision	
	1st Birth	Subsequent	1st Birth	Subsequent
Wife's	0	0	0	3
Shared	2	3	2	4
Husband's	1	1	0	2

local hospital and medical clinic. She said that Norplant was growing in popularity, but the birth control pill was used most frequently. Women in the sample who had passed their childbearing years frequently opted for more permanent solutions to birth control. Most of the women who had concluded their childbearing had undergone tubal ligation. However, two women, one a housewife, the other a cook, had told their husbands to get a vasectomy. Although birth control was easily available in the area, one woman who used birth control at the time of the interview told that some of the women she knows did not. She said, "People around here think taking birth control is a sin." The high number of women in the sample who did not use birth control pills to regulate reproduction timing early in their marriage may have been responding to local norms which had traditionally kept local women from using birth control.

In summary, eight of the sixteen couples in the sample had young children in the household or were pregnant at the

time of the interview. These eight couples were still confronting fertility questions. The remaining eight couples had terminated childbearing. This section reflects responses to questions which refer specifically to the time in the respondents' life-span in which fertility questions were being resolved by the couple. Therefore, eight couples were reflecting on their memories of how fertility issues were resolved earlier in their lives. These recollections are subject to bias due to inability to accurately recall who said or did something in the past. For this reason the recalled information is less reliable than the responses given by the eight couples who were involved in fertility decisions at the time of the interview.

The timing and spacing of children was an area of contention for a minority of couples in the sample. Interestingly, four women without a current income exercised considerable independent control of their fertility. These women made the final decisions regarding whether or not to have more children and what form of birth control would be used. Four women, two of whom were employed at jobs which gave them high- and low-level incomes compared to their husbands, had allowed their spouses to play a primary role in limiting the timing and number of children the women will have. These findings indicate that among this sample of Appalachian women fertility appears to be primarily a shared decision regardless of women's' income level at the time of

pregnancy. Regional expectations regarding the number and timing of children and use of birth control help to shape the women's decisions. In addition, of the three women whose husbands played significant roles in determining their fertility patterns, family economics and belief in traditional husband and wife roles played a more significant role than the woman's income status at the time the fertility decisions were made.

It is important to address the question of women's choice regarding unwanted pregnancy. Each of the women in the sample who experienced an unplanned pregnancy were asked if they ever considered not keeping the baby. None of the women considered not keeping their child, including the women who were not married and had no source of income. Rather the unmarried women considered their family of orientation as a potential source of support. One woman said,

I wasn't really scared, uh, because we had planned to get married but it was sooner. ...[We] did not have to get married if we didn't want to. Both, well my Dad didn't know, but, Mom would have stood by me or you know, one way or the other we would have been alright, but we just went ahead and got married, just earlier.

Another unmarried woman gave custody of her child to her parents when she found she was unable to support the child. When persons were asked about the general feeling of people in the community regarding abortion, one woman replied "Abortion is a touchy subject. If you bring it up, some

people will just throw you out of their house." Most women in the community raise any child they conceive. If necessary they turn to government subsidies and/or family members for support rather than consider an abortion.

An interview with a nurse revealed that although prenatal care and a wide range of birth control methods are readily available in the area, abortion is not available in the immediate community. Women must travel sixty miles to the nearest urban area to obtain an abortion. In the last year, she could think of only one woman who had even inquired about abortion but the distance to be traveled is an obvious obstacle to any woman considering an abortion. This is a significant structural element limiting women's decisions regarding their fertility.

Sexuality

Another area in which women's net economic power is exhibited is in the area of women's sexuality. Blumberg and Coleman hypothesize that women's greater economic power relative to their spouses should convert into greater "sexual gratification" for women (Blumberg and Coleman, 1989, p. 242). Greater sexual gratification takes two primary forms according to this theory. First, women's pleasure in their sexual relationships with their husbands is a key issue to be explored. Women who have greater economic power should have greater ability to ask for and receive sexual gratification from their spouses. Secondly,

sexual double standards regarding women's engagement in pre-marital and extra-marital sex should be less pronounced when women participate in the labor force. In addition, Blumberg and Coleman note that women whose economic status within the family is in transition will not necessarily benefit from their new monetary power. The sexual relationship between the husband and wife can become an arena in which battles over new roles and balance of power within the relationship are extended. One way in which this power struggle might be manifested is in either spouse rationing sex or making excuses for delaying sex.

Women's sexual pleasure within the marriage relationship is discussed first. Due to the sensitivity of asking questions about sexual behavior each couple was read a story about a woman who was not being pleased sexually by her husband. When asked for advice, the woman's sister tells her if her husband "is a good man in every other way she should count her blessings and be content." The couples in the sample were asked for their reaction to this advice and then asked "How important is the sexual relationship to a marriage?", "Do you think it is equally important for the wife to enjoy the sexual relationship as it is for the man to enjoy the sexual relationship?", and they were asked if they agreed with the following statement: "It is a wife's duty to have sexual relations with her husband whether she wants to or not". Then each couple was asked a direct

question, "Do you and your spouse have what you would call a satisfying sex life?". At certain points in this section the use of names and identifying characteristics has been avoided to protect the respondents' privacy.

In response to the story question in which a woman was described as not enjoying sexual relations with her spouse, twelve of the sixteen women said the woman in the story should talk to her spouse about her feelings (see Table 17). As this working mother of two said,

She needs to get him to realize her feelings.
Talk with him...I would think that would be the main thing, is to let him know he is not satisfying her or pleasing her. Maybe some way to get him to help, you know. Just talk to him.

Several of these respondents felt the woman was not giving her husband the opportunity to help if she kept her feelings to herself. All twelve were clear in stating their belief that the woman had as much of a right to enjoy sexual relations as the man.

Women giving a differing response reflected a sub-set of attitudes regarding sexual relations. Jan and Ann, both housewives, and Sue, a professional woman responded with a strong statement that the relationship between the husband and wife was private and should not be discussed with the sister. Lastly, Hope and Carol, both in their thirties and forties and high wage earners, said the woman in the story should be content with her situation. One of these women said,

Well that advice is pretty good. ...[M]aybe it could be that she's selfish in a lot of ways. That she should look at his point of view besides her own.

These two women believed the woman should subordinate her own desires to her husband's needs; this reflects a more traditional view of women's sexuality than that held by most of the women in the sample. The twelve women who believed the woman should talk to her husband about her feelings appear to have internalized current mainstream beliefs which promote women's expression of their sexuality. Age seems to play a small role in the women's responses but women's employment is not associated with less traditional responses.

Men showed more variety in their responses to the story question (see Table 17). Seven of the male respondents said the wife should talk to her husband. One, a man in his forties, suggested that seeing a counselor might be useful. Another man in his twenties, who was married to a housewife, felt the relationship was already doomed. He said,

It'll never work out. Sex is a big chunk of a relationship for me at least, for me and (my wife). I don't think a relationship should be built around it but one-third of it is sex. If she's not satisfied then she's never going to be.

In contrast five men felt the wife should be content and count her blessings that the man was a good husband in every other way. Three of the men were married to housewives who had said the couple in the story question definitely needed to discuss their problems. Two of the men

were married to professional women. The older of the two men was married to a woman who had agreed that the wife should be content. The younger was married to a woman who had said sex is a private issue which should not be discussed with anyone. One of these men said,

Well, a person can't be perfect in every way. You know, you have to take the good with the bad. I know I personally think you know, that your sexual relationship does not a marriage make. It's certainly a very important part of it but, it's not the whole thing. You can't focus on that one point.

Another said, "As long as he or she isn't cheating on the other one, be happy." The remaining two men in the sample passed on the question.

The majority of men in the sample reflected the view held by the wives that women should enjoy their sexuality. However, five men--two of whom are married to professional women--held more traditional views on women's sexuality. These views can form barriers to women who wish to experience their sexuality.

Table 17

Responses to Story Question on Sexuality

Respondents	Traditional Response	Egalitarian Response	No Response
Women	1	12	3
Men	5	9	2

When the women were asked if they believed the sexual relationship was an important part of the marriage relationship, only one professional woman in her thirties said she did not believe it was important (see Table 18). She attributed her attitude to having passed her sexual peak. Interestingly, she was experiencing marital difficulties at the time of her interview and her husband had recently lost his job. Blumberg and Coleman predict that recent fluctuations in economic status within the marriage can result in power struggles being carried into the bedroom. The new status held by this wife could contribute to her lack of desire for sexual relations with her husband and resultant withholding of sex from her husband. She was also the only woman to state that she believed the sexual relationship is more important to the man than for the woman.

The remaining fifteen respondents said the sexual relationship was either important or critical to a marriage (see Table 18). A housewife and mother of two said,

I think sexual frustration is one of the major problems for women today. I know that from personal experience. Sexual frustration can do more damage to a marriage (than anything else). He enjoys it (but she doesn't). You start saying not tonight or going to bed before he does and pretending you're asleep. Sooner or later you go get somebody else or bite his head off (over something else).

Thirteen of the men agreed with these women (see Table 18). However, three young husbands in their twenties and thirties said they believed sex was important but not the

most important thing in a marriage. Fourteen men said they believed sex was equally important for the man as it is for the woman. One young husband thought it was more important for the woman because women attach more "emotion" to the sex act. The only man in the sample who said sex was "probably" more important for the man was married to the professional woman who had answered similarly. His answer reflects the status of the couple's current sexual relationship. The majority of couples in this sample reflected an egalitarian view regarding the importance of sex to the husband and wife.

Related to these issues of a woman enjoying her sexuality is the question of a husband's right to claim sexual favors from his wife. Each respondent was asked if they agreed with this statement, "It is a wife's duty to have sexual relations with her husband whether she wants to or not." Only two women and two men agreed with this statement (see Table 18). The two women were a high wage earning wife in her thirties and a housewife in her twenties. The men were both married to high wage earning women and were over 35 years of age. Both of the women were somewhat ambivalent in their answers. The older woman qualified her answer by saying, "...but there may be times she's not up to it." Her husband had also answered that it was the wife's duty to have sex with her husband. The younger woman said, "I agree with that because men are

different. Because I've done that but once you get started, who can resist." Although these two women held the traditional belief that the wife should be sexually available to her spouse at all times, both were clear in stating that they did not support the use of force by the husband to obtain sexual relations. Most of the women and men responded as follows:

"I don't think it should be a duty."

"I don't think anyone should unless they want to."

"I disagree! It's your body, not his."

Regardless of age or employment status most of the respondents echoed themes from the broader culture which emphasize the right of married women to control their own bodies.

Table 18

Attitudes Regarding Sexuality

Question	Wife's Response		Husband's Response	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Is Sex Important to a Marriage?	15	1	16	0
Is Sex More Important to the Man?	1	15	15	1
Is Sex the Wife's Duty?	2	14	2	14

In addition to attitudes, actual behavior was addressed in the interviews. Each participant was asked whether he or she had a satisfying sex life. Thirteen women responded in

the affirmative (see Table 19). Three of these women said they had problems when they first married because they did not know how to ask for what they wanted but these problems were overcome with time. One employed woman in her forties said,

It was a long time [before I enjoyed sex] and I think a lot of that has to do with the way you was raised. Now I was raised that sex was filth. ...I was supposed to keep my husband happy but I didn't know I was supposed to get anything out of it. ...I don't want my daughter raised like that. No, I mean I don't want her to be wild but I want her to use her head.

One employed wife in her thirties passed on the question when asked if her sex life was satisfying.

Two other women, a housewife and a high income-earning woman, said they did not have a satisfying sex life (see Table 19). These two women had on-going marital problems. The housewife said she could identify with the woman in the story question whose husband did not please her sexually. She said "Well, sex is a big part of marriage, but that sort of sounds like me too." Then she went on to say, "We ain't been to bed together in four years. We've had some bad experiences with that too." The couple's marital problems extended beyond the marriage bed. This woman saw this as just one aspect of a marriage fraught with problems. She was unhappy with their sex life but made the choice herself to manage her problems with her husband in this way.

Similarly the high income-earning wife chose to remove herself from sexual relations with her husband as often as possible. She stated,

My husband, he looks at [sex] as my way of showing him I love him. I could take it or leave it. After a long day at work I'd rather go to sleep. That's caused problems for us. He doesn't feel loved and desired. He's even asked me, 'Do you desire me?'. I said, 'Well, sure.'

As she made this comment, her face reflected her ambivalence. The lack of enthusiasm for sexual relations with her husband was tied to numerous long standing problems in this woman's marriage. She told,

"...[I]f I'd let him, he'd be a good lover. The romance has just gone out of our marriage. I don't know if we'll ever get it back."

She had experienced frustration in getting what she wanted from her husband in a variety of areas. Despite her economic strength and relatively high levels of power in other areas of her marriage, her frustration with her marriage spilled over into the marriage bed. These women's ability to gain sexual satisfaction appears to be less a factor of economic strength in the marriage than the overall well being of the marriage relationship.

When men were asked if they were satisfied with their sex life, there was more diversity in their answers (see Table 19). Ten men said they were satisfied with their sex lives. One man passed on the question. One young husband of a housewife said it had its "ups and downs" dependent on whether they were fighting or not at the time. Four men

said they were not satisfied. One young husband of a housewife said, "When she gets mad, I get shut out." This couple was involved in a disagreement which had lasted several weeks which did not appear to threaten their marriage but was leaving the husband less than happy about his sex life. Another young husband, and father of two, said he was dissatisfied with his sex life but did not care to comment directly on the reasons. There appeared to be a general lack of time for the couple to spend time together and occasional arguments contributing to his feelings. Another man who was a striking miner said the stress in his life had caused problems in his sex life recently. Lastly, a man whose wife had said she was not as interested in sex in recent years agreed with his wife that things were a little lacking right then. The men in the sample were more likely to be dissatisfied with their sex life than their wives. However, for each of these men their problems appeared to be linked entirely to the wife's feelings or outside circumstances.

Table 19

Satisfaction With Sex Life

Respondents	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	No Answer
Women	13	2	1
Men	10	5	1

Double standards surrounding men's and women's sexuality is another dimension of the sexual relationship which is indicative of women's power relative to men's in Blumberg and Coleman's theory (1989). None of the women or men in the sample said they believed women should be treated differently than men in terms of pre-marital or extra-marital sexual activities. These egalitarian views should give the women in the sample a great deal of power in terms of sexual matters. However, 12 women and 12 men believed there was a double-standard in the broader community regarding women's sexuality. One man said regarding pre-marital sex,

Most people you talk to, you know, a man is different. They, you know, it's alright for a man to go out and do it but it's not for a woman. But I don't see that. It's no different.

A young woman who had lived with her husband before more marriage said,

A lot of people think women should be virgins when they go into marriage. I don't understand it though. A lot of men do anyhow but they fail to realize that they're doin' it with a woman.

A similar theme was found regarding women and extra-marital sex. One woman whose husband had an extra-marital affair early in their marriage said,

I think it hurts a man worse when a woman does it. I mean [my husband] told me, 'Well if you ever went out on me I'd kill you', and all that. ...I don't think a man could handle it.

Her husband said,

I think a woman is more understanding than a man. If the woman is the one that cheats, it is devastating for the man. I think it makes him feel weak. I think it hurts a man worse than it does a woman. Women forgive easier. She can't forget but if she loves the man enough she can forgive him.

Another young husband said that if a woman has an extra-marital affair, "Most men just beat the sh-- out of them." There are strict community norms in Centerville for women's behavior which can have real consequences for women's and men's behavior.

Several couples offered information about their pre-marital and extra-marital sexual behavior. Six of the sixteen women admitted that they had pre-marital sexual relations. Only two of these women had sexual relations with someone other than their spouse before marriage. Three of the women in the sample lived with their spouses before marriage. Men did not dwell on pre-marital sexual activity but were more likely to tell stories of past girlfriends who later caused problems for the couple or elicited jealous reactions from the wife. The men's tales were told with a great deal of laughter which indicated a more laissez-faire attitude regarding men's pre-marital sexual behavior.

Extra-marital activity showed similar gender divisions. Three men in the sample admitted to having extra-marital affairs over the course of their marriage. In each case the wife had stayed with the husband. One woman, a housewife,

had taken her two young children and moved in with her mother after a confrontation over her husband's affair. She returned to him several weeks later at his request and because she had no resources at the time to support herself. However, she questioned her decision every day for the next two years until the pain started to subside. At the time of the interview, she was happily married and attributed her husband's past infidelity to other problems he was experiencing at the time and to his youth. She said "everyone makes mistakes." Another woman income-earning woman said,

I've always used the kids to stay with him, which that was a sorry, sorry excuse, but really I love him and I put up with him. That's what it was, I loved him, then, ...if I didn't have kids I'd have left him in a heartbeat. I would. I don't know, cause he went out on me when we was first married ...and I put up with it. It must have been love.

None of the women in the sample were said to have had an extra-marital affair. Two men who were in their second marriages said they divorced their first wives because the women had extra-marital affairs. Only one young husband of a housewife suggested that he might stay with his wife if she was unfaithful to him but he said he would seriously consider leaving her. Six of the women specifically stated that they would tolerate a "mistake" but the man would have to change his behavior after that.

Tied to the differing reactions of women and men to pre-marital and extra-marital sexual activity are

respondents' attitudes regarding appropriate behavior for men and women in public places. Several women commented that women who went into the local bars or pool halls were viewed as being more sexually available than women who did not. One young housewife said that she would only go to specific bars owned by friends and she always went in the company of a number of her female friends. Another young housewife exclaimed that she would not go into "those places". According to one man,

If a woman's seen out by herself, even if she's just downtown getting a soda pop, then people start fussing and talking that she's doing something wrong. That's the way people are around here.

Four women said that their husbands had become jealous of men who paid attention to them at grocery stores, work or school. One woman hid a sexual offer from a male teacher for fear her husband would make her quit school even though she never saw the teacher again. Two of the men confronted other men who they thought paid too much attention to their wives. One woman had quit her job because of her husband's concerns about male co-workers. Although two women had confronted women who paid similar attention to their husbands, none of the men reported restricting their activities because of advances by females. However, several men enjoyed telling the stories to the researcher and their wives. While most of the men and women in the sample did not hold the same double standard as the people in their

community, the general feeling was that local mores restricted women's behavior in ways that men's was not.

In conclusion, in the Centerville community women's sexuality is restricted by a double standard. Normative restrictions are placed on women's pre-marital and extra-marital activities which are not placed on men's. In addition, local norms have traditionally restricted women's ability to go into certain locations such as bars or pool halls in the name of protecting women's purity. However, the majority of women and men in the sample expressed opinions indicating a belief that women and men should both enjoy sexual relations within marriage. A few men and women held more traditional beliefs, but most respondents expressed opinions reflective of the more egalitarian views found in the mainstream American culture. Blumberg's and Coleman's (1989) expectation that the greater a woman's income relative to her spouse the greater her ability to receive sexual gratification was not borne out with this sample. The majority of women in the sample, employed or not, said they were satisfied with their sex life. Several women, including both recently employed women and housewives, withheld or delayed sex as a way of managing arguments with their husbands. None of the men withheld sex from their wives. It was found that men were more likely to hold traditional views of sexuality than were the women. The researcher hypothesizes that the widespread distribution

of sexual information and viewpoints regarding women's and men's sexuality via television and popular books have caused more egalitarian views of women's and men's sexuality to penetrate the Appalachian culture. The media is more likely to reach women than men due to housewives having more opportunities and proclivities to watch talk shows or read information of this nature.

Parity in Household and Child Care Labor

Another key area in which spousal leverage is exhibited is in the arena of household and child care tasks. Blumberg and Coleman (1989) hypothesize that women with high levels of economic power relative to their husbands' are better able to gain some degree of parity in carrying out housework and child care. Blumberg and Coleman note that a plethora of research shows that women in the United States receive relatively little aid from their husbands with household and child care tasks, whether or not the woman works (Pleck, 1983; Leslie, 1987). However, the number of hours men devote to these tasks has increased in recent years. It is hypothesized that women who earn a greater income relative to their spouse receive more aid in these areas than those women who earn little or no income compared to their spouse.

Blumberg and Coleman also note that several intervening variables must be addressed in any assessment of women's economic power and men's performance of household chores or child care labor. The couple's gender role ideology, the

urgency of the task involved, the relative "nastiness" of the task, and "the extent to which the woman does not want the man to undertake these tasks" (Blumberg & Coleman, 1989, p. 243). For example, a task which is considered a "dirty" or repetitive job by the individual, such as changing diapers or scrubbing the bathtub, receives more weight than a "nicer" task such as keeping the children occupied for a period of time by playing with them. In addition, a wife who does not want her husband's help because she would rather do these tasks herself does not gain in bargaining power. Blumberg and Coleman believe the wife must ask for and receive help with domestic tasks which the husband does not normally do before she can be said to have gained any bargaining power in the relationship (1989, p. 243).

Each of the men and women in the sample were asked a series of specific questions regarding household and child care labor. Couples were asked whether or not the wife ever asked the husband to "help with the housework and child care" and how the husband responded when asked to help. If the husband responded positively, the couples were asked which tasks the husband did perform, if there were tasks he would not perform, how many hours both the husband and wife put into housework and child care each week, and if the division of labor had changed over the years. Couples were also asked if they felt more wives today ask for help with household and child care activities than was the case

with their parents' generation, and how they felt about this. The degree to which income-earning women received help with household and child care labor is explored first. Women who did not earn an income are addressed last.

Household Labor: Income-Earning Women

Three of the income-earning women said they did not ask for help with household chores. These were three of the older women in the sample, Opal, Jan, and Hope. These women were married to men who were disabled. Hope did not ask her husband for help, but she did say that, because she worked nights, her husband and son did the dishes and cleaned up at night. She did all of the household chores during the day. Hope estimated that her husband, Lyle, did approximately thirty minutes of housework a week. Lyle also said Hope never asked him to do any household chores. Other than occasionally picking something up, he did not do any housework. He revealed that his son was the one who did the dishes in the evening. They both said Hope put in a full week of housework, probably thirty or forty hours a week.

Jan, who was disabled, was very similar to Hope in her expectations regarding household labor. Both Jan and her husband, Sam, said that she did not ask for help. When her husband and son would ask if she needed help, she would tell them "no" because she preferred to do these tasks herself. Sam said he did the majority of their yard work with his son.

In contrast, Opal's husband Hank said his wife did ask him to help with household chores at times and he had responded positively. In addition, Hank said he did routine tasks such dishes, clothes and cooking. Opal said of her husband, "He hardly does anything in the house." When asked what tasks he did do, she said her husband occasionally did the dishes. Opal and Hank both said he did not do any mopping or vacuuming because of a back injury. Hank took primary responsibility for traditionally male areas of domestic chores such as yard work. When asked how much housework her husband performed, Opal estimated that Hank did no more than an hour of housework a week. Hank estimated that he did four to five hours of housework a week, whereas his wife did about sixteen hours a week. A similar incongruence in the husband's and wife's answers was seen in a number of the couples in this sample. This can be attributed to a variety of factors. Unfamiliarity with how much housework one spouse performs while the other spouse is at work can cause underestimation of how much time the other spouse spends in these activities. In addition, husbands tend to inflate the amount of time they spend doing housework in comparison with their spouses due to incognizance of how much time wives routinely devote to housework.

The first three couples with income-earning wives maintained a fairly traditional division of household labor.

It is interesting to see how these couples arrived at their division of labor. Opal and Hope became important contributors to their families' finances when their husbands became disabled some years into their marriages. Hope had become the primary wage-earner in her family in the year prior to the interview. Opal had always worked, earning slightly less than her husband for some time. However, neither of these women took advantage of their economic leverage to receive help with household tasks. Hope did not ask for help because she felt one of her primary responsibilities as a wife was to "take care" of her husband. She did this by keeping a neat home and preparing meals for him. This couple was comfortable with a traditional division of labor.

Opal on the other hand did not feel any such responsibility due to her position as a wife.

[N]ow when I was first married to him I did, you know, cook for him and wait on him. Which you know, that was the way I was raised, but I don't feel that way now. I mean, I work. I think, you know, I have just as much. He can wait on me just as good as I can wait on him. ...[W]hen I was first married to Hank, I mean, if he had said, 'Jump', I would have said, 'How high?' I mean that's just the way it was you know. I mean it wasn't where I was scared of him. It was just the way I thought it was supposed to be and I cooked for him, I waited on him, you know, I ironed his clothes. I just done everthing [sic] you know. It just got old. [I] said, 'Hey, I work.'

Opal said she came to this new understanding of her responsibilities in her marriage eight years prior to the interview when she realized her children were teenagers and

able to take responsibility for themselves. She was careful to say, "I'm not "lazy". She said she still did the wash and cleaned the house with the help of her daughter and her husband kept up with the yard. However, she said,

I don't wait on him. You can ask my kids. I don't cook for him. I mean, I do cookin' for a livin'. I say, 'Hey! I cook all day long. I'm not comin' home and cookin'."

Hank appeared to have accepted this change. When asked what he thought Opal's responsibilities were as a wife, he said he could not think of any; yet, he felt he should provide for his wife and give her "special time." Opal had adjusted her household responsibilities in the home after years of working. However, she did not use her economic leverage to try to elicit help from her husband Hank to gain more parity in household labor.

The rest of the income-earning women in the sample said they did ask their husbands for help with household labor. However, the frequency with which help was requested or received varied dramatically. Carol, a factory worker, was the primary breadwinner in her family at the time of the interview. She said that when she would ask her husband to help her he said, "I ain't goin' to do it. ...You have girls to help you." Her husband Al, a striking miner, said of times when Carol asked for help with housework, "I don't do it evertime [sic] she wants me to." Al said he occasionally helped with dishes or vacuuming. They both said Al would help when Carol was in a bind or had heavy

indoor work to do. He was primarily responsible for keeping up the yard and other outdoor work. Both Carol and Al had traditional expectations of their roles as a husband and a wife. They both felt that one of Carol's primary responsibilities was to provide Al with food, a nice home, and be a helpmate for Al. Al's main responsibility was to provide for the family.

Sue and Joe provide an interesting contrast to the previous couples. Sue, a social worker, was also the primary breadwinner for her family. Although Sue said she could not imagine not working outside the home, she still had fairly traditional expectations regarding gender roles in her marriage. She enjoyed spending her free time in the evenings and weekends cooking the family meals and cleaning the house. She did all of the housework and her husband, Joe, did the outside work until several months ago when Sue became pregnant and Joe lost his full-time job. They both said that when she became pregnant Joe began to fix Sue's lunch for her on days he did not have a substitute teaching job. He vacuumed because he enjoyed it more than Sue did, he folded the laundry for Sue to put away, and had recently started making the bed. The only things Joe would not do were the dishes and grocery shopping. Like many of the men in the sample, he did not even like going into a grocery store and he did not enjoy the task of washing dishes by hand. Joe thought he did about 50% of the housework but Sue

thought he did 20%. She estimated that he spent four or five hours a week on household chores, including his time spent doing the yard. Although Sue preferred to be in charge of the household tasks, she had found that when she asked for her husband's help, she was able to get help in most areas. Her husband had less traditional gender role expectations than did his wife; which aided Sue in using her potential leverage to gain help with household chores when she wanted to.

Emma, a nurse, also received a great deal of help with household chores from her husband. Emma's husband Lou had been laid off from his job as a factory worker for over a year at the time of the interview. Lou said, "Yeah, for a little more than a year now we've basically switched roles. I've done the housework and she's provided." Emma echoed Lou's comment when she exclaimed, "He does more than I do since he's been laid off." They remarked that since Lou was laid off from his job he always prepared dinner for the family and picked up "extras" at the grocery store. Emma and Lou both went on larger grocery shopping excursions. The couple had a woman come in to do the major cleaning in the house so that Emma only had to keep up with her ironing for work and did some cleaning on the weekends. Lou estimated that he spent ten to fifteen hours a week doing household chores and Emma did much less. Emma estimated that Lou did five to six hours a week of household chores

and she did two hours of household chores. Although Emma and Lou both mentioned that one of Lou's roles as a husband was to provide economically for the family, they both felt their primary responsibilities as husband and wife were to be an emotional support to one another. Their less traditional gender role expectations had helped them to adopt a more egalitarian division of labor than some of the other couples who found themselves in a similar situation in which the wife was the main breadwinner of the family and the husband stayed at home.

Peggy, a cashier at a fast-food restaurant, had devised a less egalitarian division of labor with her husband who was a truck driver. At first she said her husband helped with dishes and laundry on those occasions when she was sick and once when she went out of town. Later she said that when her husband was home he did approximately eighteen hours a week of housework compared to the twenty-four hours a week she performed. This seems to be a high number since she said most of the time he was on the road or trying to catch up on sleep when he was at home. Peggy also indicated that she, like Carol, believed her primary responsibilities as a wife included cleaning the house and cooking for her husband. She believed one of his primary responsibilities was to provide economically for the family.

Gail, who also earned a low level of income compared to her husband, reported a similar scenario in her home. Gail

and her husband Ernie both believed that caring for the home and cooking for the husband were part of Gail's primary responsibilities as a wife. Ernie was primarily responsible for providing an income for the family. They both said Gail did most of the housework. She occasionally asked him to help her out with something and he would help. Ernie responded with a blanket, "I don't care to do housework", when asked if he helped her. Neither one of them could quantify an amount of time Ernie spent doing housework since he helped her so infrequently. He did work in the yard and Gail helped because she enjoyed the outdoor work.

The responses of the income-earning women in the sample support Blumberg's and Coleman's hypothesis regarding women's leverage and parity in household labor (see Table 20). On average, women who earned a large income in comparison to their husbands received more help with household chores than did women who earned a low income in comparison to their husbands. In addition, the spouse's gender role expectations and the wife's willingness to ask for help with household chores also played a significant role in the amount of help the women received in household work which is in accordance with Blumberg's and Coleman's predictions. Next, parity in household labor for couples in which the wife does not earn an income will be explored.

Table 20

Income-Earning Women and Division Of Household Labor

Respondent	Amount of Help Received From Husband	Wife's Domestic Labor Ideology	Husband's Domestic Labor Ideology
High Income-Earning Women:			
Carol	None	Traditional	Traditional
Hope	None	Traditional	Traditional
Sue	High	Traditional	Egalitarian
Emma	High	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Middle Income-Earning Women:			
Jan	None	Traditional	Egalitarian
Opal	Limited	Egalitarian	Traditional
Low Income-Earning Women:			
Peggy	Limited	Traditional	Traditional
Gail	Limited	Traditional	Traditional

Household Labor: Non-Income-Earning Women

Interestingly, women who did not work for an income demonstrated a similar diversity in the division of household labor (see Table 21). Two housewives, Meg and Donna, both said they did not ask their husbands for help with housework. Meg, a woman in her thirties, was married to a man who was disabled. Although she did not ask for help, her husband did "pitch-in" with just about anything that needed to be done. She estimated that he did about two to three hours of housework during the week. Her husband, Dan, thought he did about ten to twelve hours of housework a week. They both agreed that Meg spent her entire day

cleaning something, cooking, or doing something for their three children. Dan said Meg cleaned "constantly" from the time she got up to the time she went to sleep.

Donna on the other hand received no help with housework. Her husband, Greg, who was a construction worker, said,

That would kind of be defeating its purpose... Normally I'm too tired. Uh, this was, well, before I started workin', I guess you'd say I was a little bit on the lazy side. I didn't do that much in the house, but now that I work I, I hadn't had the time. By the time I get home I'm tired.

Donna did not ask for help with the house. Even when her husband was laid off from his job for a long period of time and she had a part-time job as a maid she did not ask for help. When asked what she believed her primary responsibilities were to her husband, Donna said,

Basically to cook and clean. Just what I do. I honestly believe that it's a woman's job to do those things. Now, I don't take orders but I do a lot for him.

Donna's response was very similar to Meg's. Both husbands also answered this question in a traditional manner. These couples had divided up household labor in a manner which was consistent with their traditional expectations of husband and wife roles. The wives were responsible for the home and the husbands were responsible for providing an income and taking care of outdoor work. Dan deviated somewhat from this only since he had been disabled and found himself without his regular employment to occupy his time.

The remaining five housewives said they did ask their spouses for help with housework, with varying degrees of success. Fran said her husband would at times do the dishes or cook if she asked him, at times he would not. She estimated that he did thirty minutes of housework a week at most, whereas she put in three or four hours a day. Her husband Keith said, "When it comes to inside work, I don't do it." This couple had traditional expectations of women's and men's roles. Keith was perturbed by the fact that Fran did not always have his dinner waiting for him when he came in from a hard day of work. This had become a frequent source of friction for the couple.

Lynn and Mike had a similar division of labor. Lynn said that Mike helped with housework if he had time between his jobs and other activities. This might occur every couple of weeks or so. Mike said, "I do anything I can to lighten her load." Unlike Keith, Mike estimated that he did about a third of the housework. Lynn believed she did a great deal more housework than Mike. Lynn said she cooked, cleaned and did anything for Mike that he asked all day long. She then added that she liked it that way. Mike saw himself as the primary provider in the family. He saw Lynn's primary role as being his emotional support, not housekeeping. Lynn was possibly imposing on herself a more traditional role than her husband actually intended her to have. Possibly she was picking up on the actual

expectations her husband held but did not verbalize in the interview. The result was that Lynn, like Fran, did the majority of the household labor in her household while her husband focused on the provider role.

Mary, a housewife and part-time student, was married to a striking miner. Mary said her husband began helping her around the house occasionally when he went on strike. Although Mary and Steve both said Mary's primary responsibility as a wife was to care for the home, they both felt Steve should occasionally help her with household labor in addition to his primary role as provider. Steve, like many of the husbands, felt he contributed more to household labor than his wife believed he did. He said he did seven to eight hours of household labor a week and his wife did sixteen to twenty. Mary could not quantify how much her husband did but said he did less than she, with most of his labor being in the yard. She thought she did at most twenty-one hours of household labor a week. Prior to Steve's going on strike, Mary did almost all of the household labor unless she was ill.

Ann was also a student married to a striking miner. Ann and her husband Bill said that when he was younger he did not do much housework. Later in their marriage he began to do various jobs including cooking and picking up the house for Ann. He did not do dishes or make the bed. This was a matter of preference for Bill. The amount of work he

did was small compared to the amount his wife did but he consistently put in a little time with specific chores. He said, "I don't care to clean house." Ann did not mention cleaning the house as a responsibility she felt she should perform because she was married. Bill did mention "keeping the house clean" as a primary responsibility Ann should perform as a wife. The non-traditional circumstances Ann and Bill and Mary and Steve found themselves in seem to have propelled the men to participate in household work more often they would have otherwise. This has led to a less traditional division of household labor than is seen in other couples with a non-income-earning wife. However, the men tended to perform tasks which they saw as being less onerous which underlines their ability to pick and choose which household labor they want to do.

Two non-income-earning women said that, although they did the majority of household labor, they received a great deal of help from their husbands. Kay was a college student as well as a housewife. Her husband, Tom, was disabled. Tom said that since he has been disabled and Kay went to school, he had been doing at least ten to twenty hours of household labor a week and his wife did much more. Kay could not quantify the amount of time her husband spent on household tasks but said she did the most. They both said that when she had classes to attend Tom would frequently prepare meals for the family, do dishes or other chores

which needed to be done. Dishes and mopping were hard on Tom's back but he did do dishes occasionally.

Bonnie and Kris, a construction worker, also said that Kris did a great deal of the household labor. Bonnie said her husband did about fourteen hours of housework each week and she did forty-two hours a week. Kris said he only did about four hours of household labor a week when he was working and his wife probably did forty hours a week. Bonnie gave Kris more credit for helping with household labor than he gave himself because she included a recent period of time in which her husband was laid off from his job. Kris performed more household labor during that time than when he was working. Bonnie said,

...[I]f he's not working, then I expect him to help me in the house and help me with the kids or whatever needs to be done because that makes it where I don't have to do, you know, it makes it easier on me because when he's working I make it easier on him. I don't make him do anything. You know, because after he works all day, I don't expect him to do, I do expect him to take the trash out you know, but as far as that goes that's it. But he's good. He does just about anything I ask him to do. I know on weekends he'll let me sleep late. Here he's worked all week. He'll let me sleep late. He'll get up and fix breakfast, yeah. He'll sweep and he'll mop and he'll dust, you know.

Kris was more modest in his description of the amount of housework he did saying he was often tired after a long drive back and forth to work where he does manual labor. He did say that he came from a large family in which all the children had been put to work around the house at an early age. He thought it was good that modern women were

receiving more help from their husbands around the house.

He went on to say about helping with household labor,

I mean it don't bother me. A lot of people might talk, you know. 'That guy's helpin' their wife,' and stuff but I don't care you know.

Kris and Bonnie and Kay and Tom hold non-traditional expectations about husband and wife roles. Although both men felt they should provide economically for their families, they both saw their wives' roles primarily as being an emotional support. Both couples were in their twenties. This could be an indication that some younger couples are incorporating non-traditional gender role expectations which translate into a non-traditional division of labor, despite the fact the women did not currently work for a wage. It can also be noted that both women had obtained a higher level of education than their husbands. Both women had some college education and worked at some point in their marriage. Their potential for economic leverage and educational advantages may give them added ability to solicit aid from their husbands. Also, exposure to non-traditional ideas about household division of labor could play a role. Kris helped his mother in the house when he was a child. Both Kay and Bonnie lived away from Centerville at some point in their lives and attended schools where they may have been exposed to non-traditional ideas about household division of labor.

Table 21

Non-Income-Earning Women and Division Of Household Labor

Respondent	Amount of Help Received From Husband	Wife's Domestic Labor Ideology	Husband's Domestic Labor Ideology
Non-Income-Earning Women:			
Kay	High	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Ann	Limited	Egalitarian	Traditional
Bonnie	High	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Mary	Limited	Egalitarian	Egalitarian
Meg	Limited	Traditional	Traditional
Donna	None	Traditional	Traditional
Fran	Limited	Traditional	Traditional
Lynn	Limited	Traditional	Egalitarian

There is some indication that traditional norms regarding household labor are changing. Seven women, both employed and unemployed, specifically said "I don't wait on my husband". These women distinguished themselves from their mothers and other women in the community who jumped to meet every whim of their spouses. They told of women running to get their spouses glasses of water, changing television channels, and a variety of simple tasks meant to cater to their husbands so the men would not have to get out of their chairs. These women believed this was outdated behavior which was unfair to women. Only two non-income-earning women and one income-earning woman specifically said they liked to "wait on" their husbands. Each of these women had more traditional views of gender roles than the other women in the sample.

All of the men and thirteen of the women in the sample said they believed modern women asked for more help from their spouses than women did a generation ago. Seven men felt this was a good thing. Six thought it was both good and bad. Three men did not know how they felt about these changes. Only one woman saw the move toward women asking for help with household labor as being bad. She was an employed woman in her forties. The remaining women believed these changes were a good thing. It is apparent that the strict division of labor with women responsible for the household and men for outside work is beginning to break down in the Centerville area.

Blumberg and Coleman do not anticipate that so many husbands of non-income-earning women participate in household labor. Educational differences can be hypothesized to give housewives additional ability to gain help from husbands, either in the form of additional clout in the relationship or by socializing persons to have non-traditional gender role expectations. The housewives who received little to no help with household labor either held more traditional views regarding the division of household labor, or their husbands did. Therefore they did not receive as much help in this area. This is consistent with Blumberg's and Coleman's theory regarding division of household labor.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman hypothesized that as women increase the amount of income they earn relative to their husbands, the amount of help with housework will increase. Eleven men in the sample said they helped their wives with housework. Six of the eleven men said they increased the amount of housework they did when their wives had full-time jobs. However, it should be noted that only two of these men had full-time jobs when they increased their household labor as a result of their wives' employment. In addition, only one husband of a woman with a part-time job said he increased his household labor due to his wife working. It is apparent that the husbands' lack of full-time employment or other activities to take them away from the home is a critical factor in their decision to aid their employed wives in household labor. This is more important than the wives' actual employment.

In addition, the husband's age and the couple's gender role ideology are important factors associated with men's participation in household labor. Younger men and men with non-traditional gender role expectations did the most household labor. Overall, men did not perform a great deal of household labor. Men on average reported doing 1.8 hours of household labor a week compared to 32.5 reported hours a week of household labor done by their wives in a week. Wives are more generous, reporting that their husbands did 3.4 hours of household labor a week compared to 25.2 hours for

themselves. It is clear that the women in the sample did the majority of household labor. For some of the women this labor was extensive due to the family not having indoor plumbing and labor saving devices such as washing machines and vacuums. Nonetheless, men who were unemployed or young were more likely to help their wives with domestic work than fully employed husbands or older husbands.

Child Care Labor

Child care follows a different pattern. Blumberg and Coleman predict that income-earning women will receive more help with child care than non-income-earning women. Although the women in the sample did most of the care for infants, husbands were frequently given credit for doing a large portion of the child care once the children were out of diapers. Eleven of the sixteen men said they preferred doing child care to doing housework. Two men said they had no preference and only two men said they preferred doing housework to taking care of the children. The last man in the sample did not yet have children but expected he would prefer child care. These findings are consistent with Blumberg's and Coleman's (1989) prediction that men are more likely to participate with child care than with housework.

In regard to actual time spent doing child care, most couples were reluctant to put a time period on this activity. If the children were young, the couple tended to view child care as a constant activity for both parents as

long as they were at home. If the children were older, the couples said, "they pretty much take care of themselves" or "Just watching out for them" was all that was involved. Twelve wives said over the years they had been primarily responsible for child care. Only one employed woman said that both she and her husband, who was disabled, had been equally responsible for their children over the years. There were two women with no children in the home who did not answer. Three men felt they and their wives had shared the child care equally over the years. Twelve men said their wives did the majority of the child care from the time the children were born to the time of the interview.

The fact that wives were more involved with early childcare was reflected in the respondents answers to a question regarding difficulties associated with having children. Fourteen women said there were difficulties as well as joys associated with having children. All fourteen women mentioned feeling tied down after the birth of their children, whereas, seven men felt there were no difficulties associated with having children. Only three men mentioned feeling "tied down" as a difficulty associated with having children.

It is important that nine wives, with children over three years of age, said their husbands were equally involved with child care whenever they were at home and/or frequently cared for the children while the women worked or

went to school. Working wives and wives who were in school received the most help with child care.

Only one couple, which included a housewife and a man who was disabled, said the husband did not enjoy taking care of the children. This wife did not like to leave her children alone with her husband for a long period of time. She had even left a job because of her concern over his ability to handle the children on his own.

Each of the respondents were asked what tasks the husband did for the children. Child care in the form of babysitting or supervising the children were tasks the men performed most frequently. Putting children to bed, getting children things they need, and playing with the children were tasks performed by all husbands with children, at least part of the time. Changing diapers, bathing children, and other tasks associated with infants and small children were most frequently the wives' responsibility. Many of these tasks were considered "dirty work". Several fathers said, "I don't do diapers." or "I don't bath [sic] the kids." Only three fathers said they did a wide range of activities for their children. Fathers who were unemployed, had a working wife, or a wife in school did more child care tasks than fully employed fathers.

Blumberg's and Coleman's expectation that income-earning wives receive more help with child care than non-income-earning wives is supported. Child care was more

equally divided between husbands and wives in the sample than household labor tasks. However, on the whole wives still did the majority of child care tasks, particularly when small children were involved. This indicates that traditional gender roles in the arena of child care are still being followed for the most part in this sample.

Conflict Resolution Strategies

A final area which Blumberg and Coleman (1989) list as an area of concern for any study of gender relations and power is conflict resolution strategies. They adapt their ideas regarding conflict resolution from Janet Chafetz (1980). Chafetz lists four strategies of conflict resolution: authority, control, influence, and manipulation. It is hypothesized that a wife with little net economic leverage in her marriage uses manipulation to get her husband to do what she wants. More straightforward means of gaining his cooperation are not available to her due to her lack of power in the marriage. The potential costs to the woman are high when she uses manipulation because the subtlety of the method's nature can result in her efforts being ignored by the husband. In addition, the husband's detection of her efforts to manipulate him can be viewed as underhanded, resulting in his wrath being directed against her instead of her gaining her goal.

As women gain leverage in their relationship they move to the use of influence which is the direct use of reasoned

statements of one's own position and feelings and willingness to negotiate a workable agreement for both parties. This is a far more egalitarian means of gaining the husband's cooperation. In turn, the husband uses his authority to resolve conflict with an economically dependent wife. He is able to rely on his position as "head of the household" to justify any decision he makes which his wife might oppose. If his wife begins to gain economic power by increasing her income relative to his own, he begins to rely on more blatant control to gain her cooperation. For example a man who believes that his authority is being undermined by a newly employed wife might use threats or physical force to gain her cooperation. Eventually he learns to relinquish his superior position in the relationship and will also use influence to resolve conflict.

Each person in the sample was asked if there were any issues the couple tended to disagree about or argue over. The seriousness of these disagreements and resolution strategies used to resolve the disagreements were explored with each participant. It is hypothesized that the wage earning women in the sample use influence to resolve conflicts and their husbands use control or influence strategies depending in part on how long the wife has worked. Housewives tend to use manipulation and their husbands use authority strategies to resolve conflicts.

Conflict Resolution Strategies: Income-Earning Women

Conflict resolution strategies used by the high income-earning women and their husbands are explored first. Hope, a hospital worker, was one of the older women in this subsample. She and her husband had been married twenty-six years. Hope said of her disagreements with her disabled husband Lyle,

We don't do too much fussing. ...Mainly he let me do the choosin' when we first got married. Now we discuss everthing [sic]. Sometimes we have to discuss things longer. You have to discuss things if you're going to get along. We've had our hard times, like most couples I suppose. It takes some adjusting. We had our hard times but we didn't run away from them. Some hit a rough time and they get a divorce. They make it too easy. We never did consider divorce. We fight, but we work it out. ...Sometimes he will get mad at me. I'm not too even tempered and that makes him mad sometimes. I'll say something the wrong way sometimes and it hurts his feelings. He goes out to his chickens for a while so we can calm down. We apologize then. I do most of the apologizing because it's mostly me that says things wrong.

Like many of the couples in the sample who had been married for a long time, this couple did not have many arguments. Over the years they had settled into a pattern of life which kept the number of arguments to a minimum. Hope described an egalitarian situation in which each influenced the other through discussion of any disagreements. The arguments Hope and Lyle did have primarily resulted from Hope's direct manner of speaking when her temper was roused. Like many of the husbands in the sample, Lyle controlled the situation by going outside until things calmed down. Before long Hope

would apologize. Lyle's behavior can be seen as a technique to minimize conflict when Hope is inconsiderate or it can be seen as manipulation. Possibly, Lyle elicits an apology from Hope by taking his presence away from her when she wants to settle some issue. Rather than settling the disagreement, she apologizes for her behavior. The matter is settled in Lyle's favor.

Carol, a factory worker, and her husband Al, a striking miner, had been married eighteen years. Like many husbands in the sample, Al claimed the couple did not disagree on many things. However, Carol said they did argue about how the children should be handled at times. They both said their worst arguments occurred early in their marriage. Carol recalled that the serious disagreements occurred when their oldest child was a baby. Al explained that they talked things out when they did disagree. Carol on the other hand said they went in opposite directions for a while until things smoothed over. Al believed the man should have the final say over important matters in the family. Although Carol had worked for the entire eighteen years of their marriage and at the time of the interview out-earned her husband, she submitted to her husband's authority. This worked to minimize the number of disagreements the couple had.

Emma, a nurse, and Lou, a laid off factory worker, had been married for fifteen years. Both revealed that they had

been having marital problems for a long time. Emma said of their first years of marriage,

It was hard. Lou was used to his grandmother and his mother doing everything for him. They still try to. He would leave his socks in the middle of the floor. He wouldn't pick up after himself. He was also used to spending so much time with his friends. That was a problem for us. ...He was used to coming and going as he pleased. I wanted him home with me. I was left alone at home a lot. ...Our marriage has been like a roller coaster. We have had a lot of marital difficulties. I told him one time, 'I don't remember any good times'. We've had good times. It's just I tend to remember the bad things. There hasn't been a turning point. It will just be okay for a while and then it won't be okay for a while.

Lou agreed that he and his wife had been having problems for a long time. He said that after the couple married, their house became a hangout for his friends. After he put a stop to that he was involved in other community activities which kept him away from home in the evenings on a frequent basis. However, Lou felt that his quitting a good paying job at a local bank made things worse for him and his wife.

Well, I was without a job, and, uh, ...didn't have, you know, other than her income and we couldn't do things we wanted to do without working things out at the present time.

Emma believed their difficulties were due to her and her husband's contrasting personalities, which made it hard for the couple to communicate. She said, "He's a very quiet, introverted person and I'm not." Whereas Lou didn't feel the couple had any serious arguments, Emma said some of their arguments had been very serious. Communication,

money, and in-laws were regular areas of contention. They both said they talked out any areas of disagreement. Emma said,

There's never been any violence. Maybe verbal violence but no physical violence. Eventually we calm down. We apologize. We talk about it. We reason it out.

Emma had read numerous self-help books and the couple had recently attended marital counseling sessions. Emma complained that she was the one to be the "ice breaker" in the sessions; she noted that, by the end of the sessions, she had run out of things to talk about, and that this made her uncomfortable. The couple continued to have difficulties.

Over the years, Emma's frustration with the communication aspect of their marriage appeared to have resulted in a disinterest in sexual relations with her husband and anger over feeling that she had to carry the load for the couple in decision making. This couple was able to use their mutual influence to resolve less explosive problems. However, the critical issue for Emma was communication. The result was a long-term standoff with Lou unable to understand Emma's concerns or unwilling to make the changes necessary to satisfy her. Emma drew on her net economic power in the marriage to confront her husband, however, she continued to be frustrated in her efforts, and as a result she withdrew sexually.

Sue, a social worker, and Joe, a substitute teacher, had only been married three years. This couple found it difficult to identify areas of argumentation or disagreement. They disagreed regarding politics and other matters which they considered to be minor. After some commentary on the state of world affairs, they left one another to their viewpoints. Sue said she felt the husband should have the final say and added, "If you just keep arguin' about something, like it's just going to cause more problems". Joe said the couple talked out any disagreements and tried to reach a compromise. He said his wife did believe the man should have the final say in decisions and "forces that role" on him. He liked to get her opinion first.

Joe also revealed another aspect of their conflict resolution strategy when he said laughingly,

She gives me the silent treatment. I usually give in. You women are very effective with the silent treatment.

The use of the silent treatment can be viewed as a manipulative maneuver on Sue's part. It is possible that due to her belief that the husband should be the head of the household she is uncomfortable with a more direct confrontation with her husband. Her economic status would indicate that she could potentially wield a great deal of power in her family. However, she chooses a more

subordinate manner of gaining what she wants when her husband opposes her on an issue.

None of the four women who earned a large amount of income compared to their husbands were completely effective in the use of influence to settle disagreements with their husbands. In the case of Carol and Al, Al used the authority he held by virtue of being the head of the household to settle any disagreements which occurred. The remaining three husbands were less likely to use authoritative means to settle an argument. Lyle appeared to use manipulative methods at times to gain his wife's compliance. Emma was at a stand-off with her husband and Sue was unwilling to use her potential influence. The patterns found between Lyle and Hope, Lou and Emma, and Joe and Sue can be explained in part by recent shifts in the economic balance of power within their relationships. Each of these women had only recently become the primary breadwinner in their families. Also, all four couples' conflict strategies appeared to hinge on beliefs about men's and women's roles within the marriage and the community at large.

The two women who earned incomes equal to their husbands or only slightly less than their husbands were Jan and Opal. Their methods of settling disagreements are explored next. Jan and her husband of fourteen years, Sam, were both disabled due to injuries on the job. Jan was

taking college classes at the time of the interview and wanted to work. Both Sam and Jan said they don't remember the last time they argued. Sam said,

We pick at each other but we've never had a big fight that I remember. I don't like a lot of fussing and fighting. If I go home and my brothers are fighting and fussing then I walk right back out.

Both added that if they did disagree they talked it out. The couple did disagree several times while the researcher was visiting over minor matters. This led to adamant statements of each one's stance. The comments were part of the ongoing repartee between the couple which is peppered with saucy jokes and lively commentary about their lives and the world around them.

Interestingly, when Jan and the researcher met again a few months later she said she and her husband had recently had their first fight in fourteen years of marriage. She said,

I was sitting at the table working on the checkbook and he said, 'I want a glass of soda.' and I said, 'Well, you know where the glasses are. You know where the pop is. Go get it yourself.'

Later she heard Sam tell their son something was wrong with his mother and relate what had happened between them. She quoted their son, who was still in grade school:

Well Dad, she's always doing things for us and we need to do some things for her sometimes. Mom's getting liberated and she's not going to do everything for us anymore and I don't think she should have to.

Two things are evident from this story. First, Sam has probably held more authority in the relationship than either was consciously aware. Jan's past acceptance of the way decisions were handled worked to mitigate conflicts between the couple. Jan admitted that she would occasionally hide certain things from her husband which would be considered by most people to be quite innocent but she was afraid her husband might become upset. She had manipulated situations to keep an argument from occurring and still be able to do what she wanted. Secondly, as Jan begins to see herself moving toward a professional job, she is starting to exert her potential influence. In the future the couple could see more confrontations occurring from the upcoming shift in Jan's economic power.

Opal and Hank had been married twenty-six years. Hank was injured at work several years prior to the interview. Even so, Opal earned slightly less at her cooking job than Hank received from his disability check. Hank said he and his wife did not argue much. When they argued in years past, it was because of his "drinking and running around." Opal on the other hand said they had serious disagreements about their kids and her desire for Hank to spend more time with her. Hank said he had to "explain" to Opal about their son sometimes because he thought she was too hard on him. He appeared to have the final say in their disagreements about each of their children.

In regard to Hank's not spending time with her, Opal complained,

I'm on him constantly. You know, sit down and talk to me. He don't do that. Give me the time of day. ...I mean he has time for somebody else but he don't ever have time for me or the kids. ...Well, you know I've asked him to leave and he won't leave. I said, 'You've got somewhere to go Hank. I don't. You've got a mother.'

Opal felt that she and her husband could benefit from a separation. She thought it would help them see how they felt about each other because, after so many years of marriage they took advantage of each other, however, her husband would not try this.

Well, I think it's just to the point with me and Hank, we don't know if we're mad at each other or not. We actually could be mad at each other all the time. We never speak to each other so we don't know if we're mad at each other or not [laughs] and then finally we just forget about it. ...He pouts when he don't get his way or something. ...[H]e'll get mad and stay mad two or three days and then gets over it....

Opal wanted to take action regarding her disagreements with her husband. To this point in their marriage Hank had been able to use the authority of his position as head of the household to resolve things in the way he felt was best. It appeared that he was unaware of exactly how frustrated his wife felt. Communication had broken down between the couple.

Jan and Sam had not had as many confrontations as Opal and Hank, but the male's authority position had been used to silence disagreements between both couples. Opal's ability

to use her influence gained by a paycheck was limited by her lack of a support system of relatives and by the fact that Hank's income was slightly larger than her own. If Opal continued to exert herself with her husband she might find herself more successful in gaining his cooperation when she enters full-time employment.

Lastly, conflict resolution styles of the two women who earned the lowest income compared to their husbands is explored. Gail, a secretary, and her husband of nine years, Ernie, who was a factory worker, said they argued over a variety of minor topics. When asked how they resolved their disagreements Ernie said, "Well, we maybe fuss for a few minutes and just forget it." Gail said,

Oh, we just have to sit down and talk it over and work it out. It has to be worked out before bed-time or I can't go to bed if I'm mad. I can't stand that.

This couple appears to have settled easily into a pattern of using their mutual influence to resolve any disagreements which arise.

Peggy worked at a fast-food restaurant. She had been married to her husband, who was a truck driver, for sixteen years. When asked if there were any topics about which she and her husband tended to disagree, Peggy said,

I don't think we disagree anymore. We don't even fight. I don't know. We just have our spats on some things, but, nothing major. Now when we were first married we used to have some doozies. I mean, his Mom predicted we would last six months.

Peggy lived in a different state for a period of time when she was a child. She met her husband after her family moved back to Centerville when she was in high school. Peggy said that local norms regarding gender roles caused problems for her and her husband early in their marriage.

...[A] lot of husbands do their thing on weekends and work all day and give the wife the check. They go and get drunk. Go out to bars and stuff and gone on weekends and [the wives] do their thing and for a long time he was used to that and I just said you either take me or else....

After the birth of their first child this became an issue again for Peggy and her husband. At one point she had considered divorce because she was so angry with him for taking off and leaving her. She blew up at her husband several times and he began to include her and the children in his outings on weekends. Peggy said she was still angered by the lack of a family orientation among many of her friends and relatives in the area, but she and her husband had left these issues behind.

According to Peggy, the couple's arguments were currently less divisive. She said that, when the couple disagreed:

Usually we'll both holler at each other. The one of us will shut up and usually that's me and that makes him madder. Cause I'm always the one that has to have the last word and I've got to the place where I shut up fast and keep my mouth shut and he can't stand it.

Unlike the other low income-earning woman in this sample, Peggy and her husband had experienced significant conflicts

during their marriage. Whereas Gail and Ernie used their mutual influence to resolve arguments, Peggy and her husband had more head-to-head confrontations. After an explosion, Peggy would put her foot down or cut off conversation abruptly to get her way. The need to do this shows that Peggy is less able to use her potential influence with her husband than is Gail with her husband. However, despite Peggy's occasional need to use manipulation or make demands to get her way, both of these women had been better able to resolve their conflicts with their husbands than Opal or Emma, who earned more money relative to their spouses. Gail was the only wage-earning woman to consistently use her influence on an equal footing with her husband.

In conclusion, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who earn a large income in comparison to their husbands will have greater ability to use influence as a means to settle disagreements than women who earn less than their husbands. It is also predicted that conflict will tend to escalate between couples if they experience a transition in the family, such as one or both spouses leaving or entering the work force. The escalation in conflict stems from the most powerful partner (typically the husband) trying to hang onto his or her position in the family. Among the income-earning women in the sample there is a diversity in the level of conflict for the couples and in the means used to resolve conflict. The patterns used by

these couples do not always follow the predictions of Blumberg and Coleman (see Table 22).

Table 22

Conflict Resolution Strategies of Income-Earning Women

Respondents	Conflict Resolution Strategy
High-Income-Earning Women:	
Hope	Influence/Manipulation*
Emma	Authority
Carol	Authority
Sue	Authority/Manipulation
Mid-Income-Earning Women:	
Jan	Authority
Opal	Authority
Low-Income-Earning Women:	
Gail	Influence
Peggy	Influence/Manipulation

*Husband uses manipulation.

Gail demonstrates the best ability to use her influence over disagreements despite the fact that she earns significantly less than her husband. The couple established an egalitarian relationship early in their relationship. It is hypothesized that Gail's superior education is the main factor which allows her to exert so much influence in her family since the couple has a mix of egalitarian and traditional viewpoints regarding gender relations. Three women--Carol, Sue, and Peggy--had relinquished the ability to influence decision-making in their families, preferring to submit to their husband's authority. Each of these women

and Carol's husband held traditional gender role expectations which allowed the men to assume this position.

There is a great deal of conflict evident among three of these couples. Opal, Emma, and Jan had all experienced or anticipated experiencing a significant shift in the economic balance of power in their relationships. As predicted by Blumberg and Coleman, the women were beginning to make more demands in their relationships. The degree to which they had their demands met was hindered to varying degrees by their husbands differing levels of embeddedness in the traditional male sub-culture in the Centerville community.

Conflict Resolution Strategies: Non-Income-Earning Women

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that non-income-earning women will not have the ability to use mutual influence to resolve conflicts to the same degree as income-earning women. It is predicted that instead these women must rely on manipulation to resolve conflicts in their favor or they must simply submit to their husbands authority. The conflict resolution strategies of non-income-earning women is examined next.

Ann, who was a college student and homemaker, and her husband Bill, who was a striking miner, had been married eighteen years. Like many of the couples who had been married for some time, Ann and Bill said they did not argue much. Bill explained,

I don't like quarreling. I hate it. I don't like to be around another couple that's quarreling. If we did, she'd go her way and I'd go another.

Ann agreed with Bill that their disagreements were confined to occasional spats over minor matters. Ann said that Bill insisted that they wait to talk things out until they could be "civilized" about things. Bill would just drop the matter unless she brought it up again, then they talked until the matter was resolved. Some topics she avoided because Bill was touchy about them and refused to discuss them.

Both, Ann and Bill said that when they were younger they had serious arguments about Bill's running around, which led to a temporary separation during the seventh year of their marriage. Ann said,

He got so he didn't want me to go anywhere with him. I thought he'd found himself someone else. I told him it's either me or whatever else he wanted. That's when I left. I couldn't take it any more.

Ann took their two children and went to live with her mother for a short period of time until Bill asked her to come back to where "[she] and the kids belong". Ann said the incident had been building up for two years. She believed the fact that Bill was unemployed at the time and had recently lost his father contributed to this crisis in their marriage. After Ann came home, Bill was more prepared to take on family responsibilities. It took the couple some time to smooth things out, but since that time Ann and Bill had

relied more on their mutual influence to resolve their conflicts.

Problems between husbands and wives over the husbands' spending too much time away from home and drinking with their friends were common among the sixteen couples. Kay and Tom had a similar problem. Tom said he and Kay had not "really planned" the birth of their first child. They married soon after Kay discovered she was pregnant. At the time Kay was working but Tom was unemployed. Over the years Tom dealt with sporadic employment, unsatisfying work conditions, and eventually a work-related injury. Kay, who quit her job after their first child was born, was a college student at the time of the interview. Tom still wanted to provide well for his family, so he took part-time jobs whenever he could to supplement their government subsidies. At one point in their marriage Tom said,

I would take jobs at night after I got off work so I was leaving at nine in the morning and was gone till nine at night. That lasted three or four years. I took on so much; that's one of the reasons my back is the way it is. There never seemed like there was enough money. It came to a point, we lived here then in this same house, that we separated. It was my fault. I thought she should understand that we needed the money for the kids.

Tom had difficulty telling Kay about his concerns. He wanted to provide and spend as many daylight hours as he could with their children. This caused him to work late at night. On the other hand, Kay did not think Tom should be so concerned about the provider role because the family was

able to get by and she did not like to be left home alone at night. Kay, upset by their growing lack of communication, even considered a divorce.

I told him, 'I'm not taking this any more. I'm not raising my kids by myself with you living right here. I will leave.' He finally realized that he could lose everything, me and the kids.

The couple still had arguments regarding similar situations. When an argument began Tom would go outside which made Kay mad but they talked things out when they had cooled off.

Bonnie and Kris had argued over similar issues. Early in their marriage Kris spent a good deal of time out drinking with his friends. Bonnie was upset by Kris risking his life driving around with his single friends when he drank. She was also upset because she wanted equal time away from home. She said,

When we got married, he wasn't used to the idea of women needing something else besides family, home, because his mother always stayed home. She raised ten kids and I told him I need space. I need time to myself. He didn't understand that and it took a lot. I mean I did everything I could think of and he still had his space. You know, he still [with] his friends went here and went there and finally it took me taking off, not telling him where I was at, leaving him home with the kids to babysit for him to realize that, you know, that I needed time alone without the kids.

Kris said one time Bonnie was so upset she became physically violent.

At the time of the interview, Kris had adjusted his behavior such that he still went out, but he did so less frequently. Bonnie said they "agree to disagree" on this

matter. Kris said the couple occasionally argued for a few days and then everything went back to normal. Bonnie, like Ann and Kay, was moved to extreme measures to gain cooperation from her husband. However, unlike Ann, Bonnie and Kay still must occasionally fight the same battle over again.

Donna and Greg had been married four years. The first two years of the couple's marriage they had arguments regarding Greg's old girlfriends. Family members started rumors which caused Donna to feel she had to confront her husband. After a potentially violent confrontation in which Greg walked out, Greg was able to convince Donna he was not being unfaithful. Donna and Greg said they now argue over Greg "messin'" the house up unnecessarily and Greg spending too much time away from home. Greg said he stayed away from home more often a year prior to the interview when he was going through a "three year itch". This led to a number of serious arguments. After they talked about the situation, Greg slowly started to spend less time away from home. Both Donna and Greg said they had a tendency to "blow up" at each other. Donna would turn things around by grabbing her husband and kissing him. They used sex to release the tension but never resolved the problem. Greg's behavior did not change, thereby revealing how little influence Donna had in resolving their conflicts.

Mary and her husband Steve, who was a striking miner, had been married twelve years. This couple also said they had more serious arguments early in their marriage. The couple argued over Steve's friends, his not spending enough time with their son, how to raise their son, and Steve making plans without notifying Mary first. They both said Steve currently spent more time with their son. They still argued about how to raise their son and over Steve making plans without notifying Mary. She recalled that Steve recently scheduled a trip and she had to rearrange plans she had made with her family. They both said they dropped any arguments and the problem would blow over quickly but Steve said he did get cut off sexually sometimes. This couple had trouble using influence to handle their conflicts. Steve appeared to determine the outcome of most arguments which caused Mary to resort to the withholding of sex to resolve their conflicts.

Lynn and Mike, who was a bus driver and farmer, had been married for four years. It was the second marriage for both of them. Mike felt that most of their arguments revolved around the visitation of their children by their previous relationships. Mike's child lived with his ex-wife and Lynn's child lived with her parents. Negotiating time and expenses for the children had caused recurring problems. Although the arguments had become heated at times, Mike did

not feel they had any serious problems. He discussed how they would resolve these conflicts.

...[W]e'd sit down and talk about it. Normally it's not really any matter that's serious at all. It's just one word leads to another. One disagreement brings in another. ...[W]e decide that whatever the argument originally started to be, we're plumb off course and just, you know, drop it and just start all over today and not worry about yesterday.

Lynn was able to identify more areas of conflict. When the couple first married, Mike's first wife frequently came to their house wanting Mike to take care of their child or help her out in other ways. Lynn said, "Any time she said squat, he'd do it. I mean I can say squat and it ain't goin' to be done."

In addition, the couple had struggled financially to start up their farm and put Mike through college at the same time. Mike took a job driving a bus and Lynn took a job as a maid at a hotel to make ends meet. Lynn told that they would come home from their jobs only to work in the fields.

I would be so tired and Mike would be so irritable. I'd say, 'You're goin' to be irritable, you goin' to be here all by yourself.' and he'd hush.

The combined pressure caused the couple to have frequent arguments. Mike became concerned Lynn would meet someone at work so she quit her job. Lynn explained that this had increased their arguments over money.

I guess what get's so aggravatin' with the disagreements see, if I had a little like when I worked, if I had extra money, I'd take it and blow it. But, see he didn't know I took twenty dollars back out of that. Yeah, and uh, he'd turn

around, 'Well, what you do with all your money?'. I'd say, 'Well look. I bought you a new coat, new pair a' shoes.' So every two weeks when I got my paycheck I'd buy him a new pair a clothes and then when I'd go buy me something, I mean he'd look at me. He'd make me feel about that high, like I shouldn't buy that. 'You better not', he'd say. 'Honey, you better hold onto your money.' I'd say, 'Sure. I'll hold onto some of it', I said, 'but, I'm goin' to spend some of it on myself too.' and that goes on.

Lynn and Mike were asked how they typically resolved their conflicts. Lynn responded in the following way:

Like if you and your husband has a disagreement, you know it really hurts the woman. Especially if the man raises his voice at you. I mean I'm very soft-hearted and it don't take much to make me cry and he knows it and he, and he can just, within a minute he can be out like a light and snorin' and me there, laying there. [I] can't sleep after we had a disagreement and crying my eyes out. ...I mean like it doesn't bother him. He says, 'I ain't goin'. I just ain't goin' to worry about it.' I says, 'Well, that's fine and I'm goin' to cry till I go to sleep.'

In the past she apologized whenever they argued. She said, "I decided I wasn't goin' to do that any more." Recently her husband had begun to apologize when they argued and she had mixed feelings about it. She did not understand why he was apologizing to her.

Lynn described a situation in which her husband listened to her to a point and then made the decisions about how things were to be handled. He used the authority of his position to make the final call as to how the situation would be resolved and when the argument would end. Lynn said that "whatever he says goes" and she liked it that way

but she also was left feeling that her concerns had not been addressed.

Meg and Dan, who was disabled, had been married sixteen years. Dan said the couple did not argue. Meg said the couple argued when they first married because Dan was never at home. Currently, the couple had frequent arguments about their children. Meg had left Dan multiple times. When asked why she came back, Meg said, "He kept comin' after me." She added that if it weren't for the children she would have been gone for good long before. Rather than resolve their conflicts the couple had a tendency to go to separate rooms. A recent round of arguments regarding their children had caused Meg to push for the couple to see their minister for counseling. At the time of the interview Meg still felt her issues were unresolved. Dan was able to use the authority of his position as head of the household to settle arguments until Meg felt she could not take it any longer and left again. However, it was not long before the couple was reunited and fighting the same battle.

Fran and Keith have been together for four years. This couple had extensive problems which had led to multiple separations. Keith felt their problems started when Fran became pregnant. Keith said they did a lot of "cussin' and fightin'" over everything, including when meals would be served, both of their work situations, and Keith spending too much time away from the family. When asked how they

resolved their disagreements Keith said "I wouldn't speak to her and she'd always come back".

Fran said the couples' worst problems had revolved around a period of time when Keith had an affair with another woman as well as her belief that Keith should spend more time with their son. When asked how they have resolved these disagreements she said,

Sometimes he'll just leave and we'll talk about it when he calms down. Sometimes we'll talk it out then. Sometimes it's got physical. Sometimes it will escalate till we're arguin' and then it will calm back down to where we can talk it out.

She had left her husband several times. Fran said it was her determination that the family would not break up that had kept her from leaving Keith permanently.

Fran was not the only woman in the sample to experience physical abuse by a male. One housewife revealed that her husband had pulled a knife on her before they married. She took it away from him and told him she would leave him if anything like that happened again; that was the last time he attempted such a thing. Another housewife was physically abused in a previous relationship. Two men and three women talked of physical violence in marriage relationships of their friends and relatives. Social workers and police officers were contacted regarding the amount of domestic violence in the area. Statistics are not tabulated at the local or county level for wife abuse. A local social worker said she tended to be optimistic and hoped that the amount

of domestic violence was declining. However, a police officer said he was certain that the number of domestic violence calls investigated by the police had increased in recent years. The police and several people in the sample said domestic violence is widespread in the area. There are no shelters in the immediate area. Women have to travel at least sixty miles to get to the nearest metropolitan area with a crisis shelter. Many women who find themselves in a violent relationship do not have the resources to make such a trip. They must rely on family or friends for support if they choose to leave the relationship. If abused women do not have family or friends who will help them or are unwilling to ask for the help of those close to them, they may find themselves without any resources to improve their situation.

The non-income-earning women in the sample reiterate themes heard in discussions with income-earning women (see Table 23). One recurring theme is the women's frustration with norms in the community which allow men a great deal of freedom to visit friends, drink heavily, and even engage in extra-marital affairs. For most couples these problems subside as the men age. However, even when a man settles into the responsibilities of the marriage relationship, the long-lasting effects of these problems can continue to trouble the women. The pain of infidelity and the breakdown

in communication caused by the early power struggle can be hard to repair, as with Opal and Emma.

Table 23

Conflict Resolution Strategies of Non-Income-Earning Women

Respondents	Conflict Resolution Strategy
Non-Income-Earning Women:	
Kay	Authority
Ann	Influence
Bonnie	Authority
Mary	Authority/Manipulation
Meg	Authority
Donna	Authority/Manipulation
Fran	Authority/Force
Lynn	Authority/Manipulation

A second theme is that housewives and working women frequently found it necessary to take drastic measures to resolve a conflict in their favor. Leaving a spouse for a period of time, serious threats of leaving, and physical attacks were seen. One woman who earned an income comparable to her husband's income, one woman who earned a low income compared to her husband's, and six housewives had resorted to such measures at some point in their marriage. The fact that none of the women who earned a high level income compared to their spouse had similar dramatic episodes in their marriages is an indicator of their better ability to avoid such confrontations. One high-income-earning woman had recently seen a marriage counselor. Because of the lack of such services in the

immediate area and local norms which say what goes on between a husband and wife are their own affair, this action can also be seen as a dramatic attempt by a wife to gain some control in her marriage. It is interesting that only one low-income-earning woman and one housewife have developed relationships in which the use of mutual influence is the primary method of conflict resolution within the marriage. Age cohort does not seem to impact the use of various conflict resolution strategies among the couples in the sample.

A third and final theme found among the couples, whether the wife earned an income or not, is that men were more likely than wives to say the couple did not argue or that the arguments were not serious. Due to the men's ability to use their authority to determine the outcome of any disagreements, men were often unaware of their wives' feelings of frustration. The fact that men's behavior was the most frequently cited area of contention between couples only serves to highlight the degree to which men are able to exercise control in their marriages. These three themes indicate that men's authority position in this sample was quite secure. Women frequently bent to their husband's will. Women who wanted to see changes in their marriage, such as income-earning wives Opal and Emma, found themselves "running into a brick wall". The fact that the wives earned incomes which were larger than or comparable to their

spouses' incomes has not resulted in an escalation of problems for these women nor has it aided their ability to negotiate. Husbands who find themselves being confronted by a wife may manipulate their wives into doing their will, as seen with Hope and her husband Lyle. Other men, who often have more resources compared to their wives, can ignore their wives' requests. Lastly some men try to control their conflicts with their wives through the use of violence.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION: THE APPLICABILITY OF BLUMBERG'S THEORY

The primary question this study addresses is "What factors affect the balance of power in Appalachian marriages?" Blumberg and Coleman (1989) hypothesize that the balance of power between marital partners can be determined first and foremost by looking at the wife's overall economic power. Overall economic power is determined by the wife's absolute earnings; the husband-wife earnings ratio; and the wife's independent control over earnings, especially surplus earnings. Once the wife's overall economic power (OEP) is determined, a number of discount factors must be subtracted from her OEP in order to arrive at her net economic power (NEP). Discount factors at the macro-level include: (1) male domination of higher levels of the political-economy; (2) social ideology; and (3) birth cohort, social class, and ethnicity effects. Discount factors at the micro-level include: (1) commitment of each partner to the marriage or the principle of least interest, (2) relative attractiveness of each partner, (3) personal gender ideology, (4) perception of need for the wife's income by the husband, and (5) recent transitions in the economic balance of power of the couple. Once these

discount factors are taken into account, women's net economic power can be analyzed. Women's net economic power is demonstrated by women holding high levels of over all say-so in their marital relationship, including the specific areas of fertility, economic decision-making, and domestic decision decision-making. Women's net economic power is also demonstrated by women having greater control over their own sexuality, receiving greater parity in household and child care labor, and women's ability to use influence as a means of conflict resolution. Each of the elements of Blumberg's and Coleman's theory are discussed in detail as they relate to the findings for the sample of Appalachian couples from Centerville, beginning with women's overall economic power.

Overall Economic Power

The first element of women's overall economic power is the wife's absolute earnings. Eight of the sixteen women in the sample were employed on a regular basis. It is predicted that these eight women will exercise more power in their homes than the non-income-earning women.

Next, the women who earned more money relative to their spouses than their counterparts are predicted to exercise the most power in their households. Four income-earning women in the sample (Sue, Carol, Emma, and Hope) earned slightly more than their spouses. These women are predicted to wield greater power in their marriages than the other

women in the sample. Two income-earning women (Jan and Opal) earned the same or slightly less than their spouses. Two income-earning women (Gail and Peggy) earned less than their spouses. It is predicted that as women's earnings relative to their spouses decline, so will their ability to exert power in their households, such that those women who did not earn an income will wield the least power in their marriages.

Lastly, women's control over their earnings must be added to the equation of overall economic power. According to Blumberg and Coleman (1989), women who exercise more control over their earnings are predicted to benefit more from earning an income. Control of earnings can be measured along a continuum in which sole control by wife and sole control by the husband act as two poles. Joint control by husband and wife can be located between these two poles. Joint control of earnings is considered to be better for women than a situation in which the husband has sole control of earnings. In addition to this continuum, a distinction must be made between subsistence earnings and surplus earnings. Blumberg and Coleman attach the greatest importance to surplus earnings as a means to power in the marital relationship. Women who earn money beyond the subsistence needs of their family and maintain control over how those surplus earnings are spent are predicted to have the most secure base for wielding power in their marriages.

The Centerville women's independent control over their earnings is addressed below.

The findings from the interviews with the sixteen couples indicate that, of the eight income-earning women, six women maintained joint checking accounts with their spouses. The rest of the income-earning women and their spouses did not have bank accounts. The couples simply used their money as it came in for bills and immediate needs. All but two of the income-earning women were actively involved in any monetary decisions in their family. Frequently these six income-earning women balanced the family check book and made decisions about the family budget. The other two women--Peggy, a low-income-earning woman, and Carol, a high-income-earning woman--did not have as much say over their families' budgets; their husbands determined the family budget. These two women used their own paychecks for groceries and daily needs, while their husbands' paychecks were used for big bills and purchases. The men consulted with their wives on large purchases but had the final say-so over these decisions. This arrangement diminishes the women's ability to benefit from earning an income by relegating their primary purchasing power to the area of subsistence needs. Similarly Sue, a high-income-earning woman, was in charge of her family's checking account but, she and her husband had developed a

similar division of purchasing requirements which also worked against her overall economic power.

Surplus earnings is another area of concern for women's overall economic power. Only two income-earning women, Sue and Emma, said their family had substantial surplus earnings. Sue's husband's earnings were considered surplus in her family, but the money was kept in a joint savings account. Emma's earnings were used as surplus and were also kept in a joint savings account. Both couples made decisions about the use of surplus earnings together, but Sue allowed her husband to have final say over these matters. Emma stood to benefit the most from the presence of surplus earnings in her family due to her greater voice over how the money was allocated.

In addition to income, property must be considered when discussing women's overall economic power. Property was held jointly by most couples with income-earning wives. However, two top-earning women--Sue and Emma--lived in homes which were in their husbands' names or their husbands' families names, which acts as a potential discount to the women's power in their families.

In summary, of the top-income-earning women, Hope and Emma had more control over their own earnings than Sue and Carol. Peggy, a low-income-earning woman, had the least control over earnings of the remaining women who earned an income. The rest of the income-earning women maintained a

high degree of equity with their spouses in the area of control of earnings for their families (see Table 24).

Table 24

Women's Rankings Based On Overall Economic Power

Overall Economic Power	Income-Earning Women	Non-Income-Earning Women
High	Hope Emma	
Medium	Sue Carol Jan Opal Gail	
Low	Peggy	Kay Ann Bonnie Mary Meg Donna
Lowest		Fran Lynn

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) state that the total equation of overall economic power for women includes women's actual earnings, the husband-wife earnings ratio, and women's control of earnings. The women in this sample can now be ranked in terms of their expected ability to control various life options when their overall economic power is addressed independently (see Table 24). High-income-earning women Hope and Emma are expected to have the most influence in their families due to their high level

of earnings in comparison to their spouse and their ability to control those earnings. These women are followed by high-income-earning women Sue and Carol, mid-income-earners Jan and Opal, and low-income-earner Gail. These women's level of overall economic power is relatively equal when the amount of their paychecks is balanced against their control over their own earnings, the level of their husband's income, and property ownership. Last from the income-earning group is Peggy the female informant in the simulated couple. She earned a small percentage of her family's income and exercised little control over earnings for her family compared to the other women discussed in this section.

It is predicted by Blumberg and Coleman that the eight non-income-earning women will have the least leverage in their families. However, it should be noted that even among non-income-earning women, control over family earnings varied. Although women's own earnings should be considered to be most important in determining overall economic power, family earnings must also be addressed. Most couples in this sample adopted a common property philosophy regarding any in-coming earnings. Most couples with non-income-earning wives kept joint accounts or did not have a checking account. The couples handled their money jointly, with the wife oftentimes taking care of the bookkeeping for the family. Most of the couples also had

their property listed in both names. However, Fran and Lynn were not as well off in the area of control of family earnings as the other non-income-earning women. Neither woman had her name on the deeds to their homes. Rather, their homes were in their husbands' names. In addition, Lynn did not have her name on the family checking account. These two women are expected to demonstrate the least say-so of any of the women over various life options due to their low levels of overall economic power (see Table 24).

Leverage in Household Power

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) propose that a number of variables, grouped together as measures of women's "greater leverage in household power," can be used to measure how well women are able to capitalize on their overall economic power after taking into account both micro- and macro-level discounts to arrive at women's net economic power. These areas of greater leverage in household power (also known as "life options) include: (1) say-so in the marriage relationship, (2) say-so over fertility decisions, (3) say-so over economic decisions, (4) say-so over domestic decisions, (5) control over the woman's sexuality, (6) parity in household and child care labor, and (7) ability to use mutual influence as a conflict resolution strategy. The Centerville women's expected ability to exert leverage in each of these areas and deviations due to micro- and macro-level discount effects are discussed below.

Say-so in Marriage Relationship

Say-so in the marriage relationship is expected to be greatest for the high-income-earning women and lowest for women who do not earn an income. Both income-earning and non-income-earning women exhibited a wide range of ability to influence say-so in their families. The women who exhibited a high level of say-so in their marriages are discussed first.

Only two income-earning women, Hope and Jan, demonstrated consistently high levels of say-so in their families. The women's behavior is consistent with expectations regarding the relationship between overall economic power and household leverage. Gail a low-income-earning woman also demonstrated fairly high levels of say-so in her family. This unexpected finding stems from Gail's and her husband's egalitarian views regarding decision-making.

Emma is predicted to be able to have a great deal of influence in her family based on her overall economic power; however, this prediction is not confirmed by the evidence. She was unable to influence specific areas of decision-making in her family which were important to her such as the use of leisure time. In addition, Emma had to assume responsibility for certain areas of decision-making she thought should be shared by her and her husband. Due to her husband's lack of interest, she reluctantly took the

leadership position in these areas. The struggle over who should have final say-so in various areas of family life had led to significant confrontations between Emma and her husband. Furthermore, Emma was hampered in these arguments by her recent assumption of the primary breadwinner role. At the time of the interview she had been the sole breadwinner in her family for less than a year. Mid-level earner, Opal, was confronting a similar situation in her family. She lacked say-so over the use of leisure time in her family and the rearing of her son. Both Emma and Opal found their leverage in terms of overall say-so discounted by broader cultural expectations that men should have control over final say-so regarding the raising of male children and disposal of their own leisure time.

Similarly, Sue--a high-income-earner--exhibited low levels of influence over final say-so in her family. However, her abilities were discounted by her own traditional gender role expectations, which gave her husband final say over important decisions in the family. Sue's level of control over say-so in her family is similar to one of the low-income-earning women, Peggy. Peggy, the female informant in the simulated couple, is predicted to have the least influence over say-so in her family. This prediction is confirmed by the evidence. Peggy relinquished final say-so over a wide variety of family decisions to her

husband. As seen with Sue, her own gender role expectations supported this arrangement.

Blumberg and Coleman predict that non-income-earning women will have the least ability to influence say-so in their families. Two non-income-earning women did demonstrate a low ability to influence say-so in their families. As predicted, Lynn and Donna demonstrated less ability to influence say-so than the other non-income-earning women in the sample. These women were affected by their own traditional gender role expectations, as well as their husband's strong employment and educational resources compared to the women. Non-income-earning women Mary, Meg, and Fran were active participants in many areas of decision-making in their marriages, except for a few contested arenas. In these areas it was clear that the husband was best able to have the final say-so. Kay and Bonnie had yet higher levels of say-so but Ann had the most say-so of any of the non-income-earning women. Ann, who was obtaining a college education and was married to a striking miner, demonstrated leverage comparable to the strongest income-earning women in determining say-so. Ann's own non-traditional gender role expectations combined with her education-based earnings potential to act as resources for her to draw upon to influence say-so in her family.

Economic Decision-Making

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that the greater a woman's overall economic power compared to her spouse, the greater will be her ability to influence economic decisions. Of particular importance is the ability to influence relatively more expensive and non-domestic purchases. As predicted, high-income-earners Hope and Emma had the greatest influence over this area of marital decision-making. Although not so powerful in other areas of decision-making, Emma was so powerful in her ability to influence economic decisions that she was able to delegate to her husband one of the traditionally female dominated areas of economic decision-making: grocery shopping. As predicted, Peggy was one of the least influential women in the area of economic decision-making. High-income-earning women Sue and Carol diminished their influence in this area more than expected since the women typically let their husbands make final decisions on large purchases. Gender role expectations of these three women and their husbands were the most important factor influencing how the couples arrived at this means of handling economic decision-making.

According to Blumberg's and Coleman's prediction, non-income-earning women should have the least influence over economic decisions due to their lack of economic power. Contrary to expectation, non-income-earning women Kay, Ann, and Bonnie were highly involved in economic decision-making.

These women were comparable to Hope in their ability to influence economic decision-making for their families. Lynn was the only non-income-earning woman to have relatively little influence over economic decision-making, which could be predicted due to her low level of participation in family finances. Most of the non-income-earning women were similar to the income-earning women in their ability to influence economic decision-making. All couples revealed egalitarian behavior regarding the purchasing of large items for their families. This was due to the generally accepted norm that husbands and wives should consult with one another before purchasing any of object of considerable expense.

Domestic Decision-Making

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women who earn a high-level income compared to their spouses will have the greatest ability to influence domestic decisions in their families, while non-income-earning women will have the least. The results suggest that domestic decision-making is an area in which all of the women in the sample had a great deal of influence due to the traditional relationship between women and these areas of family life. However, when men were particularly interested in specific domestic decisions their influence was brought to bear in this area.

As predicted, seven of the eight non-income-earning women in the sample demonstrated little ability to sway their husbands' opinions regarding domestic decisions if the

couple was in disagreement. Only one non-income-earning woman, Ann, had a high degree of influence over all areas of domestic decision-making. Kay was struggling for greater influence in this arena. These two women were expected to be the primary breadwinners in their families in the near future. This is influential in the women's ability to gain greater influence in domestic decision-making.

The income-earning women demonstrated greater influence over domestic decisions than the non-income-earning women. However, certain discount factors constrained some of the women's ability to influence particular domestic areas as much as their overall economic power would predict. Hope, the primary breadwinner for her family, had the highest level of control over domestic decisions of all the women in the sample. This is consistent with predictions based on her overall economic power. Sue, another high-income-earner, had a great deal of power over domestic decisions except in those cases in which she could not make a decision and gave final say-so to her husband. Emma's and Opal's roles as major breadwinners in their families gave them a great deal of influence in this arena except in a few contested areas in which they and their husbands were actively struggling regarding who would have the final say. Carol and Jan--who were high- and mid-level income-earners--were constrained in their ability to influence certain domestic decisions due to their own or

their husbands' gender role ideologies which gave the men the final say over important family decisions.

Interestingly, Gail and Peggy, both low-income-earners, had as much control over domestic decisions as Hope, a high-income-earner. The reason appeared to be the lack of interest or confidence by their husbands in matters concerning many areas of domestic decision-making.

Say-so in Fertility Decisions

Say-so over fertility is expected to be greatest for income-earning women. Most of the women in the sample, both income- and non-income-earning, had equal or greater say in their families over their fertility in terms of the number of children desired. While four women had allowed their spouses to play the largest role in determining the number, and/or timing of the births of their children, among the other twelve couples in the sample, gender roles did not appear to be as important as economic pressures in these decisions. Only one woman, who was not employed, appeared to be in complete disagreement with her spouse over her fertility. She had submitted to her husband's wishes to curtail childbearing. Timing of births was affected by cultural factors for most of the women. Many of these women said that at least one of their pregnancies was unplanned. Local norms do not emphasize the use of birth control as a means of planning the spacing of children. Rather, much of the initial timing of births is left to chance. Permanent

means of birth control are then used to terminate childbearing.

Sexuality

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women with greater overall economic power will have greater ability to control their sexuality than non-income-earning women. Most of the men and women in this sample held egalitarian views regarding women's sexuality. A few of the more traditionally oriented women and men maintained more traditional views regarding the husbands' right to sexual relations with the wife. These more traditional couples included both income-earning and non-income-earning women. The two women who described their sexual relations with their spouse as being unsatisfactory include a woman who recently became the primary breadwinner for her family and a non-income-earning woman. The transitional status of the income-earning woman could be important to sexual relations as an area of contention for the couple. However, long-term marital quality appears to be more important to sexual relations than overall economic power.

Parity in Household Labor and Child Care

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) predict that women with greater overall economic power will be able to achieve greater parity in household labor and child care. It is predicted that high-income-earners, Hope and Emma, will have the greatest amount of parity in these two areas due to

their high levels of overall economic power. As expected, Emma received the most help in this area compared to the other fifteen women in the sample. Hope on the other hand did not receive much help with household work. She and her husband believed that housework was her responsibility. However, she did receive considerable help with child care. Child care was an area in which many of the husbands in the sample helped in their free time. Working women with an unemployed husband received the most help with child care. The men's participation in household labor was more restricted. The women's or men's traditional gender role expectations influence household labor participation more than with child care.

Contrary to expectation, certain non-income-earning women received a considerable amount of help with household labor and child care. Kay, Bonnie, and Ann received the most. Interestingly, each of these women was pursuing a college education at the time of the interview or had taken college classes in the past. In addition, each woman had held jobs in the past and two of the women were expecting to find high paying jobs, relative to community standards, in the near future.

Conflict Resolution Strategies

The last area of leverage addressed by Blumberg and Coleman (1989) is conflict resolution strategies. It is predicted that women who have high overall economic power

will be better able to use mutual influence to resolve conflicts with their spouses. Women with low overall economic power will rely more on manipulation or submit to their husbands' authority. Couples in which the balance of economic power for the couple is in flux will be more likely to experience the use of force by the husband to try to maintain his position in the family.

Emma and Hope are predicted to be best able to use their influence in order to resolve a conflict. However, Emma, as well as Opal and Jan, found themselves fighting frequently with their spouses. These women had recently, or would soon, experience changes in the amount of money they brought into the household. Emma in particular was actively struggling to change certain things in her marriage at the time of the interview. Hope found her husband using manipulation to get his way when she chanced to disagree with him. The couple's recent reversal of roles could be causing him to feel that his authority position is diminished by the importance of his wife's paycheck. As predicted, Lynn and Fran--the two women with least overall economic power of the women in the sample--were least able to settle arguments with their spouses to their satisfaction.

Summary and Analysis of Women's Leverage in Household Power

It is predicted on the basis of the women's overall economic power that income-earning women, Emma and Hope,

would exhibit the highest amount of leverage in household power of all of the women in the sample. However, Emma frequently did not realize her full potential in these areas and Hope did not in the area of household labor and conflict resolution. Emma is affected by her recent assumption of the primary breadwinner role. Both women are affected by their own and their husbands' ambivalence regarding traditional versus non-traditional gender roles. This is consistent with Blumberg and Coleman's predictions regarding potential discounts to women's overall economic power.

Based on their overall economic power, income-earning women Sue, Carol, Jan, Opal, and Gail were expected to exhibit medium amounts leverage in the household. However Jan and Gail exhibited greater amounts of leverage than expected in terms of overall say-so and Gail was high in domestic say-so. For these women, both the husband's and the wife's egalitarian gender ideology appear to be most significant in giving these women greater control than expected in these areas of their lives. Another important factor influencing the women's leverage in the household is the husbands' educational level relative to their wives'. Sue and Carol did not wield as much say-so over economic decision-making as expected. Sue was also low in overall say-so. For these women, the traditional gender role ideology of the wife and/or husband caused them to relinquish some of their potential leverage in the household.

Peggy was expected to have the least amount of leverage in her household of the income-earning women based on her overall economic power. Peggy exhibited behavior consistent with this prediction except in one area: domestic decision-making. However, her free reign in this area appears to stem from her husband's frequent absences from home rather than power gained from earning a paycheck.

In the final analysis, income-earning women's ability to use their potential leverage in the household yields a ranking as seen in Table 25. The new rankings are based on the Centerville women's ability to exercise leverage in the seven areas of household power outlined by Blumberg and Coleman (1989).

Table 25

Income-Earning Women's Rankings Based On Leverage In The Household

Net Economic Power	Income-Earning-Women
High	Hope Gail
Medium	Emma Carol Jan Opal
Low	Sue Peggy

Emma and Sue both exerted less influence in their families than predicted. Gail exerted more leverage in her household than expected. The different ranking of the women than

expected from their overall economic power is clearly related to various discount factors discussed by Blumberg and Coleman (1989). Personal ideology was the most important factor seen as a discount to the Centerville women's power. Recent transitions in breadwinner status was also a frequent cause of struggle for many of the women in the sample. Level of commitment to marriage, attractiveness, perception of the need for the wife's income and birth cohort all played more subtle roles in determining whether certain income-earning women tried to exert leverage in various arenas of domestic life. Other potential discount factors such as social class and male domination of higher levels of the political-economy can not be determined from this analysis.

Based on Blumberg's and Coleman's predictions (1989), all of the non-income-earning women should have less leverage than the income-earning women in their households. It is predicted that due to their exceptional lack of overall economic power, Fran and Lynn will have the least leverage of any of the women in the sample. An examination of the responses of the non-income-earning women reveals a wide range of behavior among this sub-group of the sample.

Interestingly, non-income-earning women Kay, Ann and Bonnie were able to wield more leverage in their families than expected in several areas of family life. Blumberg's and Coleman's materialist assumptions only partially address

these anomalies. It is suggested that these three women are unique in several ways. All three women had held paying jobs in the past. All three women were taking, or had taken in the past, courses at the college level. None of the women's husbands had more than a high school degree. Two of the women were married to men who were disabled or on strike. Job history, education, and earnings potential are not addressed by Blumberg and Coleman (1989).

In addition, these women demonstrated strengths in areas which Blumberg and Coleman associate primarily with income-earning women's leverage in the household. Kay, Ann, and Bonnie had high levels of control over family earnings, strong personalities, and egalitarian gender role expectations. It is submitted that control of family earnings, gender role expectations, and individual personality can benefit non-income-earning women as well as income-earning women, but these factors are not as important as economic power. Therefore, it is most probable that Kay's, Ann's, and Bonnie's high levels of education relative to their spouses and the women's resultant potential for earning a high level income in the future are the primary factors allowing these women to wield greater than expected leverage in key areas of family life. Their power puts them in the ranks of the income-earning women in terms of how much power they were able to wield. However, the lack of an actual income keeps these women from exerting as much

leverage in the household as high-income-earners Hope and Gail.

Blumberg and Coleman (1989) do not discuss education as a source of women's leverage in the family. However, in modern society, including post-mining Appalachian society, education is very important not only to obtain a high paying job, but also to carry on many daily activities such as handling family finances, filling out forms, or understanding written communications from others. The wives' higher educational achievements are a resource on which several men in the sample must at times depend upon. This gives some women--such as Kay, Ann, and Bonnie--leverage the other women in the sample do not possess. Due to the higher number of female high school graduates in the community and the larger number of women in the community who pursue college educations, women's educational levels can be assumed to be a significant resource for women to draw upon in the Centerville community.

Moreover, Blumberg and Coleman (1989) do not discuss women's potential earnings compared to their spouses as a potential source of leverage in the family. Leverage in the household is dependent upon current earnings according to Blumberg and Coleman. Interestingly, several women in the sample who were expected to become significant contributors to their families' incomes wielded more power in their

households than expected. Kay and Ann had specific plans to take professional jobs in the near future. Kay's husband was disabled and Ann's husband was involved in a long-standing strike. At the time of their interviews, the women were expecting to become the primary breadwinners in their families in the coming year. As the couples anticipated the women's transition, the husbands possibly had begun to adapt to the idea that their wives would wield more power in the family. The time the women were spending training for their future jobs acted as a transition period for the men. The men had time to readjust their thinking regarding husband and wife roles. The couples commented that this had not been easy for the men. Depression on the part of the men and obvious friction between one of the couples had been the result. However, the women's earning potential provides them with leverage which Blumberg and Coleman have not considered.

From the findings, it can be surmised that Blumberg and Coleman are correct in their assumption that income-earning women have the highest potential leverage in the household and non-income-earning women have the least. However, potential discounts to leverage such as gender role ideology may also enhance women's power in the household. Therefore, the majority of non-income-earning women exhibited levels of power similar to the income-earning women. An overall ranking is seen in Table 26.

Table 26

Women's Rankings Based on Leverage in the Household

Net Economic Power	Income-Earning Women	Non-Income-Earning Women
High	Hope Gail	
Medium	Emma Carol Jan Opal	Ann Kay Bonnie
Low	Sue Peggy	Fran Donna Meg Mary
Lowest		Lynn

This ranking is based on the amount of leverage the income-earning and non-income-earning women are said to exhibit in their own households. As noted before, income-earning women Emma and Sue wield less power in their families than originally expected. Income-earning wife, Gail is more powerful in her family than expected. Ann, Kay, and Bonnie wield more power in their families than expected for women who do not earn an income. Non-income-earning wife, Fran had more leverage in her home than the prediction based on her overall economic power would anticipate. This ranking illustrates the overlap between income-earning and non-income-earning women in the levels of actual leverage exerted. The women are ranked on

the basis of their own and their husbands' statements about the couples' behavior in the seven areas of leverage in the household. The groupings of high, medium, low, and lowest are merely a device to aid in the analysis. The women's behavior in the various areas of household leverage is fluid, the subtleties of which are difficult to categorize. Although there is no way in which to measure the distance between the amount of leverage wielded by any two women in the sample, this subjective classification summarizes the key elements of the women's behavior in relationship to Blumberg's and Coleman's theory.

Overall, Blumberg and Coleman are correct in their assumption that overall economic resources minus the various discount factors is an adequate predictor of Central Appalachian women's overall leverage in their marriages. Income-earning women Hope and Gail exhibit more power in their marriages than any of the other women in the sample. Lynn, a non-income-earning, wife exhibits the least power. The women who did not earn an income at the time of the interview frequently referred to reductions in the amount of control they had over their lives which were the direct result of their leaving paid employment. Income-earning women on the other hand remarked that taking paid employment had given them more power in certain areas of their marriages or had been a stimulus for them to ask for changes in their marriage. In this respect the Centerville women

behave much as predicted. An important exception to Blumberg's and Coleman's theory is found in the non-income-earning women who draw upon educational and potential economic resources. These women exhibit far more power than would be predicted based on their overall economic power. Including these two variables in Blumberg's and Coleman's theory would add explanatory power to their model.

Comparison With Existing Literature

The existing literature indicates that recent changes in the Appalachian economy are having a profound impact on the Appalachian family. Theorists who studied the Appalachian family during the ascendancy of the coal industry found a connection between the economy and the family form of the region. Many researchers suggested that the male dominated coal industry led to a strict division of labor within the Appalachian family. Men were the primary breadwinners and decision-makers for their families and women were responsible for the care of the home and children (Shifflet, 1991; Shwarzweller, 1971; Lewis, 1970; & Weller, 1965). Many of the respondents in the Centerville sample recalled that when they were growing up during the coal boom, their families approximated this model.

Research since the decline of the coal industry indicates that changes in the economy have resulted in basic changes in Appalachian family life. Several theorists

indicated that men's loss of the primary breadwinner role had resulted in a decline in men's authority in the Appalachian family since the 1960s (Collins & Finn, 1976). The respondents from Centerville indicate that relatively few families believed that the husband should have sole say-so over major decisions in the family. The majority of couples practiced shared decision-making with a only three men and two women citing traditional gender role expectations as leading them to allow the man to have the final say-so. This research project cannot speak to change over time in this arena but does confirm that Centerville men are similar to the Collins and Finn sample in showing that men do not have sole authority in most households.

Stephenson (1965) suggested that the majority of changes had occurred among white-collar families in Appalachia. Blue-collar families and families living below the poverty line had retained the traditional division of labor. Hennon and Photiadis (1979) suggested that county seats in Appalachia had witnessed more changes in men's roles than the more remote areas. In remote areas men had turned to government assistance and the male sub-culture when they lost their jobs. The Centerville sample does not conform to these studies' findings. Despite Centerville's remote location, there is a variety of responses ranging from highly traditional to highly egalitarian among the respondents. It must also be noted that the two couples who

generated a surplus income, Sue and Joe and Emma and Lou, demonstrated both traditional and egalitarian behaviors much as did many of the other couples in the sample. The large number of institutions of higher learning, employment status of wives, or inculcation with general values from television could all contribute to the variety of answers found in this sample.

Judith Fiene (1991, 1990, & 1988) reported that low-income Appalachian women continued to expect to follow and value the traditional division of labor in their families. Even when these women did work they put family roles first. Margaret Perry (1987) found that a group of sixty-seven Appalachian women still had primary responsibility for domestic and child care and little work experience. However, the women were highly involved in decision-making and had high levels of personal freedom. On the other hand, Christine Medlin (1987) and Thomas Collins and Clata Finn (1976) found that Appalachian women, particularly young women, had high levels of labor force participation. Most of the women held jobs in the secondary labor market. The Centerville sample does parallel Fiene's and Perry's findings in that women were still primarily responsible for the care of the house and children. However, the Centerville men were very much involved caring for older children; moreover, men were somewhat involved in housework, particularly if they were unemployed. In terms of labor

force participation, the Centerville sample more closely resembles the findings of Medlin and Collins and Finn. All of the female respondents from Centerville had worked for at least a short period of time at some point in their married life. Centerville women also tended to be employed in the secondary labor market.

Medlin (1987) reported that most respondents in a sample of Appalachian women thought women should be allowed to work if they wanted to, but said that young children were better cared for with the wife at home. Collins and Finn (1976) found that working women had broken away from local norms requiring them to submit to male authority but continued to value norms which said mothers were the best caretakers of young children. Similarly, the women in the Centerville sample mirrored Medlin's sample in the belief that women should be allowed to work but young children are best cared for by the mother. However, the male respondents in the Centerville sample add another dimension to this response. Men in the Centerville sample were more likely to put restrictions on the timing and type of work women did than the women. The husband's influence is of particular importance in couples that have adequate income from the husband's employment. In addition, the Centerville sample is different in the degree to which women have thrown off male authority than was found by Collins and Finn. There was not a simple one-to-one relationship between women's

employment status and egalitarian behavior for the Centerville sample. Rather personal ideology and educational background were important factors in determining the degree to which Centerville women submitted to their husbands' authority.

In conclusion, these observations must be tempered by the limitations imposed by the sample and interview schedule. Only sixteen couples participated in the study. Traditional couples, housewives married to fully employed men, were under-sampled. It is not certain that a larger sample would have provided the same results. In addition, the sixteen couples were selected through purposive sampling techniques. The method of drawing the sample, combined with couples who refused to participate when contacted about the possibility of doing an interview, indicates that persons who were interviewed had certain personality or situational characteristics that would not necessarily be shared by all members of the community.

The interview format was another source of potential bias. A semi-structured interview was used to gather the data. This format allows for a high degree of subjectivity in the responses. It is difficult to discern the difference between what respondents say they do and their actual behavior. As for the portions of the interview in which the questions were more structured, sufficient variation in responses may not have been adequately explored.

Respondents may not have felt comfortable with providing their own response when confronted with a selection of prepared answers by the interviewer thereby limiting the information obtained. These limitations are balanced by various strengths of the research project. The depth of information provided by conducting face-to-face interviews and the inclusion of both husbands and wives in the sample provides more detailed information than could be obtained using other research formats. The final conclusions must be evaluated with these limitations and strengths in mind.

The Centerville sample shows interesting similarities and contrasts with the existing literature. The responses of the participants confirm the prediction that traditional gender roles are not uniformly typical of this Appalachian community. Rather, a complex intermingling of non-traditional and traditional patterns are followed by the various couples in the sample. Husband and wife employment status, personal ideology, educational status, current earnings, potential earnings, and to a lesser degree various other factors interact to create these patterns. The economy has created significant changes for the Centerville community. Most women are required to seek work at some point in their lives and many men have had to relinquish their primary breadwinner role. The women appear to be making bigger and faster changes in their beliefs about husband and wife roles than the men. The men, as suggested

in Hennon and Photiadis (1979) do appear to be trying to ride out the economic storm. The male sub-culture is a refuge for them, however, this is a primary source of contention for many of the couples in the Centerville sample. The husbands' retreat into stereotypical, macho, male leisure activities is a source a irritation for wives who are faced with supporting their families economically. Many of these women would like to have more egalitarian gender roles in their families to reflect the shifts in their responsibilities. The changes which have been noted do not show a clear and concise pattern. Traditional gender role expectations are embedded in the culture, particularly among certain religious groups. It is more accurate when discussing Appalachian gender roles to focus on the mosaic of behavior found among the men and women of this region rather than portray them with simple stereotypes of traditional or non-traditional behavior.

APPENDIX

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Subject's Code: _____ Tape Number: _____

Subject's Name _____

Subject's Address _____

Telephone No. _____

Record of Appointment Calls and Callbacks

Calls	Date	Time		Notes
		<u>Began</u>	<u>Finished</u>	
1				
2				
3				

Place of

Interview: _____

Directions: _____

Date of Interview: _____ Time: _____

Interview: _____ Complete _____ Incomplete

_____ Tapes Labeled

CODE NUMBER _____

READ:

I'D LIKE TO GET TO KNOW YOU BETTER BEFORE WE GET INTO THE MAIN QUESTIONS IN THE INTERVIEW. IF YOU ARE READY I WOULD LIKE TO START BY ASKING A FEW STATISTICAL QUESTIONS ABOUT YOURSELF.

Q 1 Could you tell me your age?

Q 2 Are you currently employed? For whom?

Q 3 How long have you lived in _____?

Probe: Did your parents come from here?

Q 4 How long have you lived in your current home?

Q 5 How many persons live here in the house with you?

Probe: These are all your (husband/wife) and children?

Probe: Have any relatives or friends lived with you in the past? I'm trying to get a feel for the size of your family over the years?

THIS CONCLUDES THIS SECTION.

READ:

[MARRIAGE]

SINCE THIS STUDY IS INVESTIGATING FAMILY ROLES, I'D LIKE TO BEGIN THE MAJOR PORTION OF THIS INTERVIEW BY ASKING YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR MARRIAGE.

Q 6 First, could you tell me what year were you married?

Probe: How old were you then?

Probe: Was this your first marriage?
Your (Husband's/Wife)?

IF NO:

Probe: How old were you when you married
the first time? and How long did
it last?

Probe: Could you tell me a little about
your first marriage?

Q 7 I'd like for you to think back for a few minutes to the time when you first met your (husband/wife). How old were you when the two of you first met?

IF KNOWN EACH OTHER FROM CHILDHOOD ASK Q 8

Probe: Could you tell me about that first meeting?

Q 8 What first attracted you to (him/her)?

Probe: So what happened next?

Probe: How long was it before you thought you might like to marry (him/her)?

Probe: How long was it before you married?

Q 9 How did you decide this was the person you wanted to marry?

Probe: Why did you marry (him/her)?

Probe: Were you in love?

Probe: Did you both feel the same way?

Q 10 So you were married in _____. Can you tell me a little bit about your wedding?

Probe: Was it a small affair or a big wedding?

Probe: Who came? (Look for support for marriage).

Probe: How did your family feel about your marrying your spouse?

Q 11 Tell me a little bit about your early years of marriage.

Probe: Let's start with where you lived right after you were married?

Probe: What did you do those first years? new jobs? any babies? how did you get along?

Q 12 What types of adjustments and changes did you have to make because you married?

Probe: Were any of these a surprise? What adjustments were you expecting to have to make because you were getting married?

Q 13 Over time, have there been any major turning points or changes in your marriage relationship?

Probe: High points or low points?

Probe: What brought these on?

Q 14 Let me ask you a general question about marriage. What do you think your main responsibilities to your (wife/husband) are as a (husband/wife)?

Q 15 What do you think (names) responsibilities are to you as a (husband/wife)?

Probe: Do the two of you fulfill these responsibilities?

Q 16 Would you describe for me a typical evening in your family? Why don't we try a weekday.

Probe: Is it different on weekends?

Probe: Is there some time that the two of you have for yourselves, to talk things over and find out how you feel about things?

Q 17 I AM NOW GOING TO ASK YOU SOME SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT DECISION-MAKING IN MARRIAGE. AS A CHANGE OF PACE I WILL READ TWO STATEMENTS TO YOU. THEN I WILL ASK YOU WHICH ONE YOU AGREE WITH MORE.

(a) "Men should make the really important decisions in the family?"

or

(b) "Marriage is a 50-50 proposition, both the husband and the wife should have equal say in important matters and the like".

WHICH DO YOU AGREE WITH MORE?

Probe: Is this how decisions tend to be made in your family?

Q 18 Can you tell me about a recent decision that was made in the family? (Big purchase, visit relatives, children)

Probe: Who played the biggest part in deciding on the outcome?

Q 19 So, who do you think typically has the final say-so in your family?

Probe: Does it depend on what type of decision is being made?

Probe: What happens if (weaker partner) says no to a decision made in the family? How do (you/spouse) respond if (he/she) says no?

Q 20 LETS LOOK AT SOMETHING A LITTLE MORE SPECIFIC. Many couple's decisions revolve around the spending of money. Can you tell me who manages the money in your family?

Probe: So then, (you/partner/both) decide how the money will be spent?

Probe: What was the last big purchase you or your spouse made. Can you tell me how the decision to make that purchase was made?

Probe: What about smaller purchases, such as clothes shopping or small household items. Who makes those decisions?

Probe: What about grocery shopping?

Q 21 NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT JOBS AROUND THE HOUSE. (Do you/Does your wife) ever (ask your husband/you) to help with the housework and child care?

Probe: How (does he/do you) respond:

Probe: About how much housework (does he/do you) do during a week? Can you tell me in terms of hours.

Probe: And how many hours (do you/does your wife) put in?

Probe: What kinds of tasks (does he/do you) do around the house?

Probe: Are there any (he/you) won't do?

Probe: What about the Car? Yard?

IF THE COUPLE HAS CHILDREN:

Probe: Would (he/you) rather help with housework or child care?

Probe: How many hours a week (does he/do you) help with caring for the children?

Probe: What tasks will (you/your husband) do for the kids? Are there any (you/he) won't do?

FOR THE COUPLES WITH OR WITHOUT CHILDREN:

Probe: Has the way you divide up the tasks always been the same or have there been changes over the years? Why?

Q 22 Do you think the average housewife demands more help with housework than was the case a generation ago?

IF YES:

Probe: What do you think about that?

THIS CONCLUDES THIS SECTION.

READ:

NOW I WILL ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMUNICATION:
AS A CHANGE OF PACE I'D LIKE TO READ A SHORT STORY TO YOU
ABOUT ANOTHER COUPLE. WHEN I AM DONE I WILL ASK YOU TO
COMMENT ON THEIR SITUATION.

Q 23 A couple has been married for seven years. The wife says her husband is a good provider and a good man, but still she complains to her mother about her marriage. She says he comes home, reads the paper, watches TV, but doesn't talk to her. He says he doesn't like to talk just for the sake of talking. But she says he is not companionable and has nothing to say to her. What do you think of this couple?

Q 24 How about your (husband/wife), is (he/she) an easy person to talk to?

Probe: Do you wish you could talk MORE about some things with your (husband/wife)?

IF NO SKIP TO Q 25:

IF YES:

Probe: What might these be?

Q 25 How does your (husband/wife) show (his/her) appreciation for you?

Q 26 Are you two the type who say I love you often?

Probe: Do you think being in love is necessary for a marriage to work?

Q 27 Tell me, do you think women in general have more need for heart-to-heart talks than men do?

Q 28 Do you think it is usually hard for a woman to understand a man? For a man to understand a woman?

Q 29 All marriages have their ups and downs. Could you tell me if there is anything the two of you tend to argue or disagree about?

Probe: Have any of these
(disagreements/arguments) been very serious?

Probe: Have you ever considered separating or divorce?

Q 30 When you and your (husband/wife) disagree over something, how do the two of you usually settle your disagreements?

THIS CONCLUDES THIS SECTION

READ:

THE NEXT COUPLE OF QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT SEXUAL RELATIONSHIPS IN MARRIAGE. IF YOU ARE UNCOMFORTABLE ANSWERING ANY OF THE QUESTIONS JUST LET ME KNOW. THE FIRST ONE IS ANOTHER STORY THAT I WOULD LIKE YOU TO RESPOND TO.

Q 31 John and Barbara have been married for a year. Barbara's older sister lives near by and the women have a very close relationship. One day Barbara tells her sister that John is a good man, but she doesn't enjoy intimate relations with him. He never pays attention to the way she feels and he doesn't understand what she likes or doesn't like. Her sister says if John is a good man in every other way Barbara should count her blessings and be content. What do you think of the sister's advice?

Probe: How important do you think the sexual relationship is to a marriage?

Probe: Do you think it is equally as important for the wife to enjoy the sexual relationship as it is for the man to enjoy the sexual relationship? Why?

Q 32 Do you and your (wife/husband) have what you would call a satisfying sex life?

Q 33 After _____ years of marriage do you still find your (husband/wife) to be attractive?

Q 34 What do you think of this statement? "It is a wife's duty to have sexual relations with her husband whether she wants it or not?"

Q 35 What do you think of this statement? "It is OK for a man to have sexual relations before marriage but its not OK for a woman."

Probe: Do you think it is important in your community that women be virgins when they marry? Why?

Probe: Is it different for men? Why?

HOW DO YOU RESPOND TO THIS STORY?

Q 36 Sally has discovered that her husband is having an affair. She is devastated but she decides to stay with her husband because she doesn't want to disrupt her children's lives. What do you think about Sally's decision?

Probe: Would it make a difference if the couple didn't have any children?

Probe: Would it make a difference if the tables were turned and it was the husband who discovered that his wife was having an extra-marital affair?

NOW I'D LIKE TO ASK SOME MORE GENERAL QUESTIONS ABOUT YOU AND YOUR (HUSBAND/WIFE)

Q 37 What kind of (man/woman) is your (husband/wife)?

Probe: Could you tell me (his/her) best quality?

Probe: How would you change your (husband/wife) if you could?

Q 38 Do you think you are lucky that your (husband/wife) chose to marry you?

Q 39 How committed would you say you are to making sure your marriage lasts? Very committed/committed/not very committed.

Probe: Is there anything that might make you consider leaving this marriage.

Probe: Were something to happen to your marriage such as a divorce, do you think you could get along?

Q 40 What is the best thing about being married?

THIS CONCLUDES THIS SECTION

READ:

IF HAVE NO CHILDREN SKIP TO Q 53

IF HAVE CHILDREN

I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT CHILDREN?

Q 41 Could you tell me your children's names and ages and maybe just a little about each one of them so that I can get to know them better.

Q 42 How old were you when you found out you were going to have your first child?

Q 43 What were your feelings when you heard the news?

Probe: Were you planning on having a baby then?

IF YES

Probe: How was this decision arrived at?

Probe: Were you using birth control at the time?

Probe: Were you married at the time?

Probe: Did you ever consider not keeping the baby?

Q 44 How did you feel when the baby came?

Q 45 What kinds of adjustments did you have to make when you had your child?

IF NO MORE CHILDREN SKIP TO Q 50

IF HAVE MORE CHILDREN

Q 46 What about with your next child? How old were you when (name) was born? and (others)?

Q 47 How did you feel when you heard the news that you would be having another baby? and the next?

Probe: Had you (and your (husband/wife/other)) planned on having these children when you did?

IF YES:

Probe: How was this decision arrived at?

Probe: Did you and your (husband/wife/partner) take precautions against having more children?

Probe: Were you married at the time?

Probe: Were there any adjustments you had to make?

Q 48 Do you and your husband have plans to have more children?

Probe: Are your husband and you in agreement?

Q 49 Can you tell me what some of the joys have been for you since becoming a parent ?

Q 50 What are some of the difficult things you have encountered being a parent?

Probe: Sacrifices?

Q 51 Can you tell me some of the things you do on a typical day to care for your kids. Start from the time they wake up and work your way through the day.

Probe: Who does most of the child care in your family?

Probe: Who disciplines the children in your family?

Q 52 Can you tell me about your hopes for your children. What do you want for your children when they grow up? Let's start with (child(ren) of same sex)? (Child(ren) of opposite sex)?

Probe: What about school?

Probe: Would you like your (same sex child) to follow in your line of work (shoes)? (opposite sex child)?

Probe: What would you like to see (him/her) doing?

Probe: Would you like to see him/her stay in the area?

IF COUPLE HAS ADULT CHILDREN SKIP TO 54:

IF COUPLE HAS ALL YOUNG CHILDREN SKIP TO 55:

IF THE COUPLE HAS NO CHILDREN:

Q 53 Are you planning on having children at some later date?

Probe: Adoption? Foster Care?

Probe: How was this decision arrived at?

IF COUPLE HAS NO ADULT CHILDREN SKIP TO Q 55:

Q 54 IF HAVE ADULT CHILDREN: How often do you see your (grown children/Children from a previous relationship)?

Probe: Do they help you or do you help them out with things that may be needed such as money or work?

Probe: How have your responsibilities to them changed now that they are adults?

THIS ENDS THIS SECTION

READ:

I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR RELATIVES?

Q 55 Are both of your parents living?

Q 56 Do they live near you?

Q 57 How often do you see mother? father?

Probe: Speak to them on the phone?

Q 58 Can you tell me a little about your relationship with your parents now that you are an adult?

Q 59 Do you feel that you can depend on your parents for financial support if necessary?

Probe: What about help with the kids or chores that need to be done?

Probe: Emotional support?

Q 60 And vice versa? Have you given your parents financial aid recently? work around the house?

Q 61 What about your in-laws? Are both of your (husband's/wives) parents living?

Q 62 Do they live near you?

Q 63 How frequently do you see your in-laws?

Q 64 How do you get along with your in-laws?

Q 65 Do you feel you can depend on your in-laws for financial aid if necessary?

Probe: What about help with work around the place or child care?

Probe: Emotional support?

Q 66 Are there any others, brothers, sisters, or other relatives whom you see on a regular basis?

Probe: Do they live in the area?

Probe: Do they help out when there is a need?
How?

Probe: Do you ever help them out?

THIS ENDS THIS SECTION

READ:

[LEISURE]

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT YOU DO WITH YOUR LEISURE TIME.

Q 67 When you have some free time, what do you like to do?

Probe: Are there other things you like to do?
Read, sports, see movies, travel, visit
friends, play with the kids, talk with
spouse?

Probe: Do you have any hobbies?

Probe: Do you keep a garden?

IF YES:

Probe: Who does most of the
gardening in your family?

Probe: sewing? hunting? fishing?
woodworking?

Probe: Do you have many opportunities to do these
things?

Probe: Who do you like to do these things with?

Q 68 How often do you visit with friends/neighbors?

Q 69 Do you ever have a night alone with just friends?

Q 70 In what ways do you rely on your friends?

Probe: Emotional support?

Probe: Confidant?

Probe: Help you out with chores or child care?

Probe: Loan?

Q 71 The Wilkes couple has been married for 5 years. They have 2 small children. Every Monday the husband goes hunting with his buddies and every Thursday he plays cards with his friends. His wife says that twice a week is too often to leave her alone with the kids. It isn't the money--it is just that she doesn't like to be alone. She is after him to give up one night a week. What do you think about this couple?

Q 72 Do you belong to any organizations or clubs or participate in any community events?

IF NO SKIP TO Q 73:

IF YES:

Probe: Do you hold an official position?

Probe: Is this an important part of your life?

Q 73 Do you attend a church?

IF NO SKIP TO Q 74:

IF YES:

Probe: Are you active in the church?

Probe: How big of a role does the church play in your life?

Probe: Do you hold any positions in your church?

Q 74 If you had 2 more hours in everyday, how would you like to spend them?

THIS ENDS THIS SECTION

READ:

[EMPLOYMENT]

NOW I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT WORK.
YOU SAID BEFORE THAT YOU (ARE NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED/
ARE EMPLOYED BY _____).

IF NOT EMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 82:

IF EMPLOYED:

Q 75 How long have you been employed by _____?

Q 76 Could you tell me a little about the work you do
there?

Probe: Is your job full-time? How many hours do
you put in a week?

Probe: What position do you hold?

Probe: On a typical day what do you do?

Q 77 How did you come to choose this particular job?

Q 78 Overall, how do you feel about your job?

Probe: Does this job give you a sense of
satisfaction? do you dislike it?

Probe: What is the best thing about having this
job? The worst?

Q 79 Does your (wife/husband) take an interest in your job?

Probe: In what ways does (she/he) show their interest?

Probe: Do you ever talk to her about your job at the end of the day?

Q 80 Do you have any hopes for a different job or position in the future?

IF NO SKIP TO Q 81:

IF YES:

Probe: Will this require more training?

Q 81 Have you had other jobs before this one?

IF NO SKIP TO Q 96:

IF YES:

Probe: Could you tell me a little about them?

Probe: What position did you hold there?

Probe: How long were you there?

Probe: Have there been any other jobs?

IF EMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 94:

IF NOT EMPLOYED:

Q 82 YOU'RE NOT CURRENTLY EMPLOYED. Have you ever worked for pay?

IF YES SKIP TO Q 84:

IF NO:

Q 83 Would you ever consider getting a paid job if you had the opportunity? or do you prefer not to work?

IF YES:

Probe: Are you currently looking for work?

Probe: What has kept you from taking a job before now?

IF NO:

Probe: Could you tell me a little bit about why you prefer not to work?

Probe: Do you think life would be better for your family in any way if you did work?

Probe: In what ways do you think life would be worse if you worked?

IF NEVER EMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 94:

IF YES:

Q 84 Could you tell me a little bit about what you did at your last job?

Probe: Was it full-time work?

Q 85 How long did you have that job?

Q 86 Did you like the job?

Q 87 How was the pay?

Q 88 What happened that you no longer work there?

Q 89 Did you ever hold any other jobs?

Q 90 Are you currently looking for work?

Q 91 Can you tell me what types of changes you have made in your life since you quit working? Lifestyle? How do you spend your time?

Q 92 How does your family get by financially now that you no longer have that income?

Q 93 How do you feel about not having a paying job? Do you think your life is better/worse?

ALL RESPONDENTS ANSWER:

Q 94 Lets change subjects for a minute and think back to when you were growing up. When you were a child thinking about the future, what did you hope to be when you grew up?

IF NOT CURRENT JOB:

Probe: Did you ever pursue this? What happened?

Q 95 The jobs we take as adults are often related to the type of education and training we have received. Could you tell me how far you went in school?

IF DROPPED OUT OF SCHOOL:

Probe: What caused you to leave school?

IF CURRENTLY IN SCHOOL:

Probe: Can you tell me a little about your continued schooling and why you've gone back?

Q 96 What did you do when you (graduated from/left) school?

Probe: Did you ever go back to school or take an additional training program?

IF UNEMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 97:

IF EMPLOYED:

Probe: Did anyone act as a role model for you or encourage you to choose the type of work you do? Parents? others?

LET'S TALK A LITTLE BIT ABOUT YOUR HUSBAND/WIFE.

Q 97 Is your (husband/wife) employed?

IF NOT EMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 101:

IF EMPLOYED:

Q 98 When your (husband/wife) comes home from work, how often does (he/she) tell you about things that happened there?

Q 99 Does your (husband/wife) seem to be pleased with their work situation?

Q 100 What do you think about your (husband's/wife's) work?

Probe: Would you rather see (him/her) doing something else?

IF SPOUSE EMPLOYED SKIP TO Q 102:

IF NOT EMPLOYED:

Q 101 Do you enjoy having your (husband/wife) at home?

Probe: What are some of the positive things about having (him/her) at home?

Probe: Are there any negatives?

I'D LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME SPECIFIC QUESTIONS ABOUT WOMEN WORKING:

IF WIFE DOES NOT WORK SKIP TO Q 105:

IF WIFE WORKS:

Q 102 (FOR WOMEN) How do you feel about working?

Q 103 (FOR MEN) How do you feel about your wife working?

Probe: (FOR MEN AND WOMEN (Do you/does your husband) think it is necessary for (your wife/ you) to work?

Q 104 IF HAVE KIDS: Do you wish sometimes (you/your wife) could stay at home with the kids more? What do you think (your/your families) life would be like if you could?

or

IF DON'T HAVE CHILDREN: If you and your (husband/wife) had kids would you want (your wife) to stay at home with the kids?

FOR ALL RESPONDENTS: I'D LIKE TO READ YOU ANOTHER STORY AND GET YOUR RESPONSE.

Q 105 Mr. and Mrs Allen have 2 young children. Mrs. Allen heard of a part-time job and would like to take it. Her mother is willing to stay with the children in the afternoon and Mrs. Allen will be back at 5 o'clock to take over. Mrs. Allen wants the job for the extra money and also to get out of the house, but her husband doesn't like the idea. He likes her mother and how she treats the kids, but he believes a mother's place is in the home and they should get along on what he makes. What do you think?

Probe: Under what circumstances do you think it is appropriate for a woman to work?

Probe: Do you think a wife's employment reflects negatively upon her husband's social status?

Q 106 Do you believe women should compete equally in the job market with a man?

Probe: Do you believe women should get equal pay for equal work?

THIS ENDS THIS SECTION

READ

RELATED TO OUR WORK OF COURSE IS HOW MUCH MONEY WE MAKE.
HOW MUCH MONEY YOU MAKE DETERMINES WHAT KINDS OF LIFE
CHOICES
YOU CAN MAKE. THE NEXT COUPLE OF QUESTIONS WILL DEAL WITH
THE FAMILIES INCOME AND ACCOUNTS:

Q 107 I am going to show you a card with different income
brackets listed on it. I'd like for you to tell me as best
you can which income bracket you fell into last year.

CARD: 50,000 or above
40,000-49,999
30,000-39,999
20,000-29,999
10,000-19,999
9,999 or below

Probe: How much did your wife bring in last year?
And yourself? 50-50? 60-40?...

Probe: In your community, can you distinguish
people who live in different social
classes?

IF YES:

Probe: Where do you fit in?

Probe: Is this about what you have always
made?

Probe: Is this plenty of money for your family to
get by on or do you ever feel strapped for
money?

Probe: Have you ever had help from government
subsidies?

Q 108 Do you and your spouse have joint accounts or do you keep separate accounts?

Probe: Do you keep back some money for your own expenses?

Probe: How do you spend the money you make? In other words does it go to pay off the bills, for essentials, or for the special things such as a college fund for the children or special trips? or is this your only source of income?

Q 109 Do you and your (husband/wife) own any property? Your home? cars? land?

Probe: Do you have joint ownership or is only one of your names on the deed?

Q 110 The economy in this area has been in transition for a number of years now. Mining in particular has undergone some major transformations. Do you believe these changes have impacted your life in some way?

Probe: How? work opportunities, life style, family life, future plans?

Q 111 I'd like for you to imagine just for a minute what you'd do if you suddenly inherited a \$11,000. A million dollars?

THIS ENDS THIS SECTION

READ:

[FUTURE]

I WOULD LIKE TO FINISH BY ASKING YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT
HOW YOU ENVISION THE FUTURE.

Q 112 Where do you hope to be in 10 years?

Probe: Retired, Different job, New home, other
accomplishments?

Q 113 Do you think you would ever move away from this area?

IF YES:

Probe: For what reasons would you move away?

Probe: Is there any where in particular you would
consider moving?

IF YES:

Probe: Why there?

THIS CONCLUDES OUR INTERVIEW

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- The Appalachian Land Ownership Task Force. (1983). Who Owns Appalachia?: Landownership and Its Impact. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Arcury, T. A., & Porter, J. (1985). Household Composition in Appalachian Kentucky in 1900. Journal of Family History, Summer, 183-195.
- Batteau, A. (Ed.). (1983). Appalachia and America: Autonomy and Regional Dependence. Lexington, KY: The University of Kentucky Press.
- Beaver, P. D., & Purrington, B. L. (Eds.). (1984). Cultural Adaptation to Mountain Environments. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Beaver, P. D. (1986). Rural Community in the Appalachian South. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Blee, K. M., & Billings, D. B. (1986). Reconstructing Daily Life in the Past: An Hermeneutical Approach to Ethnographic Data. The Sociological Quarterly, 27, 443-462.
- Blumberg, R. L. (Ed.). (1991). Gender, Family, and Economy. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Blumberg, R. L., & Coleman M. T. (1989). A Theoretical Look at the Gender Balance of Power in the American Couple. Journal of Family Issues, 10, 225-250.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1988). Income Under Female Versus Male Control: Hypotheses from a Theory of Gender Stratification and Data from the Third World. Journal of Family Issues, 9, 51-84.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1984). A General Theory of Gender Stratification. In R. Collins (Ed.), Sociological Theory (pp. 23-101). San Francisco: Bass Publishers.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1978). Stratification: Socioeconomic and Sexual Inequality. San Diego: Wm. C. Brown Company Publishers.

- Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1983). American Couples. New York: William Morrow.
- Brown, J. S. (1988). Beech Creek: A Study of a Kentucky Mountain Neighborhood. Berea, Kentucky: Berea College Press.
- Brown, L. A. (1966). Dimensions of Change in East Tennessee, Tennessee, the South, and the Nation: A Comparative Analysis, Monograph No. 2, July, The Institute of Regional Studies, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee.
- Bryant, F. C. (1981). We're All Kin: A Cultural Study of a Mountain Neighborhood. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.
- Campbell, J. C. (1921). The Southern Highlander and His Homeland. Lexington, KY: The University Press.
- Caudill, H. (1983). Theirs Be the Power: The Moguls of Eastern Kentucky. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Caudill, H. (1963). Night Comes to the Cumberlands: A Biography of a Depressed Area. Boston: Atlantic Monthly Press Book; Little, Brown & Company.
- Chafetz, J. (1980). Conflict Resolution in Marriage: Toward a Theory of Spousal Strategies and Marital Dissolution Rates. Journal of Family Issues, 1, 397-421.
- Coles, R.; M.D. (1971). Children of Crisis (Vols. 2-3). Boston: Little, Brown & Co..
- Collins, T. W., & Finn, C. L. (1976). Mountain Women in a Changing Labor Market. The Tennessee Anthropologist, 1, 104-111.
- County Census Summary: Campbell County, Part II (November, 1972). East Tennessee Development District, 1810 Lake Avenue; Knoxville, Tennessee 37916.
- Cowan, R. S. (1983). More Work For Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave. New York: Basic Books, Inc..
- Dennis, Sister Mary (June 2, 1993). Personal interview with director of local day care center.

- Eller, R. (1979). Land and Family: An Historical View of Preindustrial Appalachia. Appalachian Journal, 6(2), 83-109.
- Employment and Earnings. (1994). U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.
- Fetterman, J. (1970). Stinking Creek: The Portrait of a Small Mountain Community in Appalachia. New York: E.P. Dutton.
- Fiene, J. I. (1991). The Construction of Self by Rural Low-Status Appalachian Women. AFFILIA, 6(2), 45-60.
- Fiene, J. I. (1990). Snobby People and Just Plain Folks: Social Stratification and Rural, Low-Status, Appalachian Women. Sociological Spectrum, 10, 527-539.
- Fiene, J. I. (1988). The Social Reality of a Group of Rural, Low-Status, Appalachian Women: A Grounded Theory Study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Fraser, W. J., Jr., Saunders R. F., Jr. & Wakelyn, J. L. (Eds.). (1985). The Web of Southern Social Relations: Women, Family, and Education. Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press.
- Gas, G. Z., Nichols, W. C., Jr., & Rutledge, A. L. (1969). Family Problems in Upgrading the Hardcore. The Family Coordinator, 18, 99-106.
- Gaventa, J. (1980). Power and Powerlessness: Quiescence and Rebellion in an Appalachian Valley. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- Hall, J. D. (1986). Disorderly Women: Gender and Labor Militancy in the Appalachian South. Journal of American History, 73, 330-354.
- Haraven, T. K. (1976). The Last Stage: Historical Adulthood and Old Age. Daedalus, 105, 13-27.
- Hennon, C. B., & Photiadis, J. (1979). The Rural Appalachian Low-Income Male: Changing Role in a Changing Family. The Family Coordinator, 28, 608-615.
- Hood, J. (1983). Becoming a Two-Job Family. New York: Praeger.

- Huber, J., & Spitze, G. (1983). Sex Stratification: Children, Housework, and Jobs. New York: Academic Press.
- Justice, B. (1976, March). 'They're Sure Going To Hear From Us'. United Mine Workers Journal, pp. 24-27.
- Kahn, K. (1973) Hillbilly Women. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company Inc..
- Kogan, M. (1988, July/August). D.C. Project Helps Groups Flower. New Directions For Women, p. 3.
- Leach, Judy (July 20, 1993). Personal telephone interview with administrative official at Duckhead Apparel.
- Lewis, H. M., Johnson, L., & Askins, D. (Eds.). (1978). Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.
- Lewis, H. M. & Knipe, E.. (1978). The Colonialism Model: The Appalachian Case. In H. M. Lewis, L. Johnson, & D. Askins (Eds.), Colonialism in Modern America: The Appalachian Case. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.
- Lewis, H. M. (1970). Occupational Roles and Family Roles: A Study Of Coal Mining Families In the Southern Appalachians. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Kentucky, Lexington.
- Lewis, R. L. (1993). Appalachian Restructuring in Historical Perspective: Coal, Culture and Social Change in West Virginia. Urban Studies, 30, pp. 299-308.
- Maggard, S. W. (1992). Gender Constraints and Political Mobilization Among the Working Poor: An Historical Case Study of Health Care Workers in Appalachia. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, Regional Research Institute, Morgantown.
- Maggard, S. W. (1990). Gender Contested: Women's Participation in the Brookside Coal Strike. In G. West & R. Blumberg (Eds.), Women and Social Protest, (pp.75-98) NY: Oxford University Press.
- Mason, K. O., & Karen Kuhlthan (1989). Determinants of Childcare Ideals Among Mothers of Pre-school Aged Children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, pp. 593-603.

- Matthews, E. M. (1966). Neighbor and Kin: Life in a Tennessee Ridge Community. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Medlin, C. (1987). The Influence of Significant Others, Fertility and Gender Role Attitudes of the Educational and Occupational Processes of Low-Income Women From Rural Appalachia. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Obermiller, P. J., & Philliber, W. W. (Eds). (1987). Too Few Tomorrows: Urban Appalachians in the 1980's. Boone, NC: Appalachian Consortium Press.
- Page, B. M. (Ed.). (1986). Campbell County: Its Cities, Towns and Points of Interest: As of 1940-Updated 1986. Lake City, TN: Bonnie Page.
- Page, B. M. (Ed.). (1986). Clearfork and More: (History and Memories). Lake City, TN: Clinton Courier-News, Inc..
- Perry, M. S. (1987). A Study of Marriage and Divorce in a Sample of Rural Appalachian Women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Piore, M. J. (1977). The Dual Labor Market and Its Implications. In D. M. Gordon (Ed.), Problems in Political Economy: An Urban Perspective (2nd ed.). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Powell, L. W. (1966). Who Are These Mountain People?: An Intimate Historical Account of Southern Appalachia. New York: Exposition Press.
- Shackelford, L., & Weinberg, B. (Eds.). (1977). Our Appalachia: An Oral History. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Schwarzweller, H. K., Brown, J. S., & Mangalam, J.J. (1971). Mountain Families in Transition: A Case Study of Appalachian Migration. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sherman, M., & Henry, T. R. (1933). Hollow Folk. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.
- Shifflett, C. A. (1991). Coal Towns: Life, Work, and Culture in Company Towns of Southern Appalachia 1880-1960. Knoxville, TN: The University of Tennessee Press.

- Simmons, B. (1984). Daughter of the Appalachians. Columbus, GA: Brentwood University Press.
- Skein, Larry (August 4, 1993). Personal telephone interview with police officer at Campbell County Sheriff's Department.
- Stephenson, J. B., & Greer, L. S. (1981). Ethnographers in Their Own Cultures: Two Appalachian Cases. Human Organization, 40(2), 123-130.
- Stephenson, J. B. (1983). Families of Shiloh; A Typology. In B. Ergood & B. E. Kuhre (Eds.), Appalachia: Social Context Past & Present (2nd ed.). (pp. 259-278) Dubuque Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Co..
- Tennessee Community Data. Jellico, Tennessee; June 1992.
- Tennessee Government Officials Directory (1993). M. Lee Smith Publishers & Printers.
- Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1991. (1991). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Center for Business and Economic Research, Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Tennessee Statistical Abstract 1992/93. (1993). The University of Tennessee, Knoxville Center for Business and Economic Research, Knoxville, Tennessee.
- Terrill, T. E., & Hirsch, J. (1978). Such As Us: Southern Voices of the Thirties. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Tickamyer, A. R., & Tickamyer, C. H. (1988). Gender and Poverty in Central Appalachia. Social Science Quarterly, 69, 874-891.
- Thomas, J. (1942). Blue Ridge Country. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1990. 1990 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1980. 1980 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1970. 1970 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee.

- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1960. 1960 Census of Population: Social and Economic Characteristics: Tennessee.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1950. 1950 Census of Population: Tennessee.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1988. Current Population Reports 1988.
- Walls, D. S., & Stephenson, J. B. (Eds.). (1972). Appalachia in the Sixties: Decade of Reawakening. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Watts, Theresa, (August 5, 1993). Personal interview with licensed nurse practitioner at Indian Mountain Clinic.
- Weatherford, W.D., & Brewer, E. D. C. (1962). Life and Religion in Southern Appalachia: An Interpretation of Selected Data From the Southern Appalachian Studies. New York: Friendship Press.
- Weller, J. E. (1965). Yesterday's People: Life in Contemporary Appalachia. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Wharton, M. C., M.D. (1972). Doctor Woman: Of the Cumberlands. Pleasant Hill, TN: Uplands.
- Webb, H. E. (1991). In Search of Christian Unity: A History of the Restoration Movement. Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard Publishing.
- Women Attack Discrimination in Mining: Coal Employment Project Reforms Industry Hiring Practices. (1979, July/August). Mountain Life & Work, pp. 10-16.
- Women Rally at National Conference. (1979, July/August). Mountain Life & Work, pp. 4-9.