Demographic, psychosocial, and situational correlates of married employed females' alcohol use

Rosemary May

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project

Part of the Gender and Sexuality Commons, and the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/335

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.
The present research examined a number of demographic, psychosocial, and situational variables and their relationship to ethanol use level in 94 married, long-term-employed females. The results indicated that approximately half of the variance in ethanol use level in this sample can be predicted from a combination of psychosocial and situational factors. In addition, employment situation variables such as the sex of one's supervisor were related to ethanol use level. Of particular interest is the counter-normative discrepancy score which suggests that a simplified gender-typed sex role approach is insufficient in explaining ethanol use level. Because women's life experience is not the same as men's, women's ethanol use (like many other phenomena) can perhaps best be predicted from variables separate from men's drinking parameters. This research suggested that more in-depth research regarding psychosocial and employment situation variables may prove useful in understanding married employed females' alcohol use and abuse.
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INTRODUCTION

The Need for Research

The study of alcoholism—its etiology, social consequences, and possible treatment modalities—has been addressed in the literature for many years. Relatively little research, however, has been conducted on female subjects even when study populations contained sufficient numbers of women for meaningful sex comparisons (Mulford, 1980). Miller (1976) provided one explanation. She suggested that in any society the dominant group, armed with status and power, has the greatest influence in determining a culture's overall outlook—its philosophy, morality, social theory, and even its scientific research. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that by 1970 only twenty-eight of the several hundred English-language alcoholism studies in existence specifically focused on the female sex (Sandmaier, 1980). That is, the vast majority of research and the predominant theories concerning the development of alcoholism have been based on the "male-as-normative" model and explanations were then generalized to women.

Approximately 100 million Americans are presently users of alcoholic beverages, and about ten percent of
that number are alcoholic or problem drinkers (Liska, 1981). Recently the staggering problem of alcoholism has been confronted in research circles by focusing on different subgroups of the drinking population: teenagers, American Indians and other racial and ethnic populations. The alarming incidence of problem drinking in the adult and teenage population of the United States is certainly a major reason a more diverse look at alcohol use has been mandated. Although it does not necessarily follow that early initiation into a lifestyle of alcohol consumption for psychological relief will increase the incidence of heavy drinking and lower the age of alcoholism onset, these two possibilities appear likely.

Other factors have given additional impetus to research regarding women and alcohol use. First, the incidence of females who drink has risen since 1940 (Liska, 1981). While estimates concerning the number of women problem drinkers vary from about 25% to 50% of the total alcoholic population (Al-Issa, 1980; Liska, 1981), it is clear that women now comprise a substantial portion of heavy and problem drinkers. Another factor that has brought about the more recent research efforts is the greater social focus on women. No doubt the feminist movement has in large measure encouraged research on a segment of the population long
ignored. Because approximately 45% of the current labor force in the United States is comprised of women (Waldman, 1983), the potential for lost work time due to women's alcohol abuse looms on the horizon. Finally, a rather general non-sex specific contributing factor in the redirection of research efforts is the advance in statistical analyses—specifically the use of multivariate analyses made possible by the computer revolution and easy access to large computer facilities.

Despite the higher incidence of female drinkers, the greater social focus on women, the potential for loss of work hours, and better methodological tools, there is a paucity of studies concerning women's use of alcohol (Metja, Van Verschot, & Vermillion, 1981; Sandmaier, 1980). Moreover, a major portion of extant research has been directed at females who are already identified as alcohol abusers. The functional woman's use of alcohol has received even less attention.

In 1980, Mulford theorized that no single factor made more than a weak causal contribution to one's becoming an alcoholic and suggested that influencing factors often interacted with each other. In a recent review of the literature regarding women and alcohol use, Gomberg (1981) expressed the opinion that a complex phenomenon such as alcoholism undoubtedly occurs as a result of interwoven psychological, and social factors,
and as a consequence of both individual vulnerability and situational circumstances and stress.

The Question

Lindbeck (1972) cited the identification of predictors of vulnerability to alcoholism in women as a particularly neglected area of research. A recent study by Johnson (1982) explored combinations of sociocultural characteristics that may place some groups of women at higher risk for alcohol abuse. Results from Johnson's analysis of 1,141 females, in a nationally representative sample of adults 18 years of age and older, showed that divorced women and women who had lost their employed-outside-of-the-home jobs had highest rates of alcohol consumption and problem drinking. However, married women who were employed had significantly higher rates of both problem and heavier drinking than either single employed women or housewives; that is, the interaction between being married and employed outside of the home was the strongest predictor of heavy alcohol use among those three groups. No similar relationship occurred for the 1,015 males in the sample. As Johnson stated, her finding raises the distinct possibility that this combination of statuses for women is associated with an increased risk of alcoholism.

Johnson (1982) concluded that a role stress
process, brought about by either role overload or by a clash between what people expect from women and what people expect from an employee, was a likely explanation for her finding that married employed females were at greater risk for alcoholism than either single employed women or housewives. Johnson offered the alternative idea that women in nontraditional roles are in an environment controlled by traditional male drinking norms to which they conform. This second explanation was deemed less likely because it would not account for the lower problem drinker rates for single employed women.

There were other results in Johnson's (1982) study which raised compelling questions. First, she did not find strong or consistent effects for the special role variables of nontraditional occupation, having children at home, or being the head of the household. Although the most important predictor in all equations for heavier and problem drinking by females was the interaction between being married and being employed, this finding could not be explained by socioeconomic status (SES). The relationship between being married, employed, and heavier alcohol use was, however, slightly stronger for women at middle and higher SES levels; thus, the implication was that stress from financial worries might not be a very strong explanatory
variable. Furthermore, neither age, race, religion, region of the country, residence, nor job satisfaction were strong predictors of female alcohol use level in Johnson's study.

The purpose of the present study, then, is threefold: (a) to maximize the predictability of alcohol use of married employed women based on certain demographic, psychosocial, employment situation, and alcohol situation correlates of alcohol use; (b) to provide descriptive data on the drinking practices of married employed females who are functional members of society; and (c) to investigate the relationship between power strategies (methods of influence) used by employed married females with their co-workers and intimate cross-sex partners as targets.

Relief Drinking

One of the most common findings in the literature on alcoholism concerns the use of alcohol for relief of stress (Beckman, 1973; Gomberg, 1981; Mulford, 1980; Wanberger & Horn, 1970). Inherent in the term relief of stress is the concept that alcohol is used as a solution to life problems long before alcohol use itself becomes the primary problem. Thus, Mulford (1980) theorized that because of the double standard, the process of learning to use alcohol for relief of stress is different for men and women. That is, society permits
and in many ways encourages young men, but not young women, to drink heavily. Heavy drinking, perforce, is considered manly but unladylike (Al-Issa, 1980; Mulford, 1980; Sandmaier, 1980; Schuckit & Morrissey, 1976). Thus, young men are freer to drink than young women and are able to drink repeatedly without strong social reaction. Mulford (1980) suggested that as a result of social norms and sanctions, drinking for psychological relief by males is learned through socialization processes over time; hence, males depend on alcohol to cope with day-to-day pressures. On the other hand, females, even if they have learned the psychological functions of alcohol early in life, are deferred from heavy consumption by rather harsh norms. According to Mulford's theory, relief drinking by women is delayed (in comparison to males) and is generally precipitated by crises or emotional stress. Several earlier studies supported Mulford's contention that female alcoholism or heavy drinking is likely to be preceded by a discrete stressful event rather than day-to-day pressures (Curlee, 1970; Fort & Porterfield, 1961; Lisansky, 1957; Wall, 1937; Wilsnack, 1973). Almost all of the early studies of the association between discrete stressful life events and alcohol problems in women were conducted with middle- to upper-middle class women as subjects. On the other hand, Morrissey and Schuckit (1978), who
employed a wider class spectrum of subjects, found no strong temporal associations between the occurrence of a discrete stressful life event (gynecological event, death of a close family member, depression, divorce, etc.) and the onset of alcohol problems.

In past research male and female alcohol users presented different clinical profiles. Studies by Rimmer, Pitts, Reich, and Winokur (1971), Wanberg and Horn (1970), and Winokur and Clayton (1968) reported that women begin drinking later in life, experience first intoxication later, develop alcoholism later, are less likely to report binge drinking, are more apt to drink at home, and come to facilities for treatment with shorter histories of alcohol use than do men. Such studies provide support for the contention of Wanberg and Horn (1983) that alcoholism is not a unitary phenomenon, and suggest that there are both between-sex and within-sex differences in the development of alcohol use. Clearly, then, previous research has suggested that for both sexes relief of stress is one motivation for drinking alcoholic beverages.

What Constitutes Stress?

A broad definition of stress provided by Lazarus (1966) proposed that stress refers to any condition that produces a threat or uncertainty about physical survival, identity, the ability to control one's
environment or avoid pain. In a review of the determinants of psychological disorders and how they develop, Marecek (1978) noted that stress may develop due to four categories of events: (a) physical events, such as chronic fatigue, poor nutrition, or illness; (b) relational events, such as the death of a loved one or marital crisis; (c) environmental events, such as low social status; and (d) psychological events, such as lack of identity, role conflicts, and feelings of powerlessness. With the previous definitions in mind, we turn now to a discussion of some stressful characteristics of the adult social (sex) roles of females. Before doing so, however, we note that one area of research most prominent in the study of female alcohol use is that of sex role factors.

Parker (1972) found that femininity of role-relevant preferences (conscious femininity) was lower, while emotionality (unconscious femininity) was higher in women alcoholics than in women moderate drinkers matched in age and education. Wilsnack (1976) maintained that alcoholic women may have problems being androgynous; that is, they may be unable to respond in ways other than stereotyped masculine or feminine behavior. Beckman (1977) found support for the idea that alcoholic women lacked sex role flexibility. Schuckit and Morrissey (1976) suggested that sex role confusion
may contribute to alcoholism for women who are more traditionally masculine in their life style and thus accept masculine drinking styles. The term sex role confusion alludes to women in nontraditional life styles who have conscious feminine values. These studies all suggest that some female alcoholism may arise due to stresses incurred as a result of socially defined sex roles.

**Sex Role Stress**

In Western society various role constellations, each with rather broadly defined sets of expected behaviors, exist for females. For example, a woman who is young, single, and employed lives a different kind of life and is subjected to a different set of expected behaviors than either an older, married, homemaker who is not otherwise employed, or an older, married, employed-outside-of-the-home female (Johnson, 1982). One example suggesting that this is so can be demonstrated by simply reflecting on the fact that society has deemed it necessary to differentiate adult females as unmarried (Miss) or married (Mrs.); no such differentiation exists for adult males. These labels provide not only response cues presumed appropriate in guiding interpersonal behavior, but suggest that society expects certain normative behaviors from females based on their specific role constellation. Thus, the use of
the term normative behavior in the present study refers not to maximal personal functioning, but rather indicates that certain behaviors are considered to be sex role appropriate by society in general. Therefore, when an adult female exhibits behavior that is considered by society to be counter-normative in a particular situation or to her specific role constellation she may encounter sex role stress. Stress inherent in a particular female role constellation, then, may give rise to different drinking patterns and different abuse rates (Johnson, 1982).

In the present study of married, employed females two potentially stressful social (sex) role processes are addressed—sex role conflict and sex role overload. Role conflict processes are defined as stemming from contradictory norms or expectations. Role overload is defined as increasing responsibility due to multiple roles.

**Role conflict: interrole and intrapsychic conflict.** Traditional (normative) sex roles prescribe that men should achieve occupationally and support a family; women, however, are expected to center their activities around the homemaker role (Stake & Levitz, 1979). With the development of industrialization, the small nuclear family, greater opportunities for formal education, and organized forces intent on equality for
women, the female social (sex) role is changing (Gove & Tudor, 1973). Although changes in women's roles have been accompanied by some legal and ideological change, several researchers have provided evidence that normative sex role expectations and prejudicial attitudes toward women have continued to permeate society (Beattie & Diehl, 1979; Gove & Tudor, 1973; Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, & Rosenkrantz, 1972). It is indeed ironic that in 1978, when 55% of all married women were employed outside of the home, employment and being married was still considered a nontraditional status for middle class women (Nieve & Gutek, 1981). As Darley (1976) so aptly stated the case, "Women who try to combine the traditional feminine role of wife and mother with a career are caught between two reference groups which have conflicting values and standards for self-appraisal of their members" (p. 95).

Theoretically interrole conflict results when a woman simultaneously holds two positions that have incompatible demands or expectations. For example, a wife who is employed outside of the home may face day-to-day conflict between her wife and employee role expectations. Intrapsychic role conflict may occur when the behaviors fitting the woman's identity and the behaviors called for by cultural norms are contradictory. For example, a woman whose personal
traits are generally considered by society to be masculine ones (e. g., directness, competence, or aggressiveness) may run into interpersonal conflicts when she expresses herself in a direct or aggressive manner.

**Role overload.** In 1975, Meissner, Humphreys, Meis, and Schue analyzed workday and weekend time budgets of several hundred married couples. The authors concluded that "the conduct of husbands remains insensitive to the cumulation of demands on the household, of wives' employment, extended job hours, and young children" (Meissner et al., 1975, p. 424). Other studies support the research of Meissner et al. Married women report that they and their spouses still divide tasks in a traditional or highly sex-stratified manner despite the employment status of the wife (Beckman & Houser, 1979). Moreover, in Robinson and Converse's (1966) study married employed women reported spending 4.6 hours per day performing household chores and family oriented services, although married employed males in that study reported spending only 1.9 hours per day in general household maintenance.

Studies concerning dual career families (Fogarty, Rapoport, & Rapoport, 1971; Poloma & Garland, 1971) found that even when wives were employed in high level professional positions, they still bore executive
responsibility for domestic chores. According to Poloma and Garland (1971) and Van den Berghe (1970) married career women changed their family life very little despite the addition of professional roles. Career women moved when their husbands found better jobs and accommodated their schedules to family and homemaking demands. One may easily conclude, therefore, that today's married employed female does not divest herself of the responsibility for domestic tasks that are traditionally incurred as a function of being female and married. What does occur is that she takes on the additional responsibilities and stresses of the employed-outside-of-the-home role. This notion of dual role overload is certainly consistent with the Newman, Whittemore and Newman (1973) position that stress from two major areas of life is worse than stress from one. Thus, maintaining many roles and relationships simultaneously (e.g., homemaker, employee, wife, mother, etc.) may constitute role stress and strain.

On the other hand, multiple roles may act as buffers to stress. Keith and Schafer (1982) noted that two roles, homemaker and employee for example, are two potential sources of gratification as well as stress. Thus, if a woman finds one role unsatisfactory or too stressful, she can focus her interest and concern on the other role. The negative aspects of work,
reflected in role overload or work-family stress and strain, may be counterbalanced by positive outcomes. Therefore, benefits from multiple roles such as status enhancement, financial security, ego gratification, and opportunity for personal achievement should be taken into account when examining potential stress. Keith and Schafer (1982) also noted that holding nontraditional sex role views failed to provide the same buffer against depression in the married employed females in their sample as it did for the single employed females in their sample.

The Need for Power

Previous alcohol research, employing only male subjects, focused on the motivational construct, the need for power. McClelland, Davis, Kalin, and Wanner (1972) undertook ten years of programmatic research on the psychological effects of alcohol consumption and the psychological states which motivate men to drink. Their analyses of men's fantasies before, during and after drinking in a variety of social settings pointed to power needs as important motivational factors in male drinking. Small to moderate amounts of alcohol were found to increase thoughts of social power (s Power), power for the good of others or a cause. Larger amounts of alcohol increased thoughts of personal power (p Power), power in the interest of
self-aggrandizement without regard for others. In two studies of working class men, subjects with histories of heavy drinking had higher Power scores when not drinking than subjects with histories of light drinking. Based on these and other studies, McClelland et al. concluded that "men drink primarily to feel stronger. Those for whom personalized power is a particular concern drink more heavily" (McClelland et al., 1972, p. 334). If a need for personal power has been suggested as one aspect of male drinking, it seems appropriate to speculate that some facet(s) of power may be prominent in the development of female use and abuse of alcohol.

Facets of Power. According to Kipnis (1976) power can be considered a central concept for any attempt to understand social behavior for most human beings like to feel in control of their actions and outcomes. Moreover, Kipnis (1976) and May (1972) suggested that persons who do not control or have access to power—that is, those who do not control or have access to material, social, or intellectual resources—are generally found by social scientists to act passively and to believe that luck or chance controls their fate. Conversely, control of power (resources) tends to make people more likely to have the last word, and provides them with greater life satisfactions. Hence,
Kipnis believes that most of the social issues of our time can be readily translated into issues of power.

**Interpersonal Power.** Johnson (1978) defined interpersonal power as the ability to get another person to do or to believe something he or she would not necessarily have done or believed spontaneously. Raven (1965) suggested that most social influence derives from one or more of six power bases: reward, coercion, expert, referent, legitimate, and informational power. These types of power are enforced through concrete or personal resources. Building on Raven's research, Johnson (1976, 1978) theorized that three considerations mediate social influence or strategy choice: (a) Will the strategy be effective and how much effort will it require?, (b) Is the choice consistent with one's prescribed sex role? and, (c) Is the choice consistent with one's needs and goals?

Johnson (1976, 1978) noted that the division of labor by sex accords very different types of power resources to women and men. She described three power dimensions along which men and women tend to differ and are perceived to differ: (a) the directness with which they influence others, (b) the resources with which they bargain, and (c) the degree of helplessness or competence they stress when trying to exert control.
Johnson concluded from her examination of power use that men are neither denied access to nor denigrated for using any of the six power bases. Moreover, society perceives male influencing agents as being direct, forceful, controlled, knowledgeable, and blunt. Females, however, are perceived as being indirect, emotional, helpless, and ingratiating. Thus, power and its expected use appear to be organized into norms for social interaction with women normatively being restricted to power based on personal, helpless, and indirect modes. Such a restriction places women in a double bind—a damned if they do, damned if they don't set of expectations (Johnson, 1978). If a woman conforms to the normatively assigned power bases, she may be judged weak and ineffective. If a woman behaves in a nonconforming manner, she may be subjected to negative evaluations from others and criticized for acting "out-of-role" (Johnson, 1978).

**Power and Status.** If, as previously suggested, males and females have employed different power strategies to get their way, one must ask why that is so. Two alternative, but not necessarily mutually exclusive, concepts seem likely—power (resource) differences between the sexes, and sex role socialization (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Thompson, 1981). In regard to power differences, Johnson (1976) proposed
that status, or the hierarchy of inferiority and superiority, may provide at least part of the answer. Other researchers have also suggested that sex acts as a master status channeling one into particular roles and determining the quality of one's interaction with others (Gove & Tudor, 1973). Rosaldo (1974) noted that maleness carries a higher status than femaleness. She suggested that simply belonging to the male group gives men an edge in status. Thus, a vicious circle effect holds; the edge at birth channels males into acquiring more education, more expert and more legitimate bases of power. In addition, legal and cultural norms regarding marital status confer power on males and block females from acquiring power (Gillespie, 1976). As a result males acquire more concrete resources than lower status females (Colwill, 1982). Because the actions of high-status individuals tend to be judged favorably (Hollander, 1958) males, in general, are able to exert power (influence) more directly than lower-status females. High-status individuals need not couch their methods of influence in indirect, helpless, or personal language because they are legitimately powerful (Colwill, 1982). As a group, then, women have historically lacked the built-in status of maleness and the power bases that being male generates. Gillespie (1976) stated the
powerlessness issue slightly differently when she proposed that men gain resources (power) as a class, not as individuals, and women are blocked as a class, but not as individuals.

In regard to sex role socialization and its effects on power or relative powerlessness, Henley (1977), an authority on nonverbal behavior patterns, noted that sex differences in such interpersonal behaviors as touching, self-disclosure, and verbal interruptions often mirror differences between the behavior of high- and low-power individuals. She contends that behaviors that arise from power differentials in our society can not be legitimately ascribed to gender. In Henley's view differential behaviors are not inherent in one's biological sex; rather, such behaviors are the result of ascribed social (sex) roles and differential access to power. An assumption of this thesis is that the "sex-appropriate" division of labor in society has accorded different types of power to women and men; as a consequence, relative powerlessness is inherent in the normative female social role. However, being employed outside of the home may ameliorate the relative powerlessness of the traditional social (sex) role of females due to the financial reward, greater self-esteem, greater perceived control, and other
potential benefits that may accrue.

**Direct and Indirect Power Strategies.** In a survey of married men and women on decision-making in marriage, Kipnis (1976) found significant correlations between authoritative and accommodative means of influence and decision-making power. No gender differences in decision-making power were found, however, suggesting that regardless of gender the more powerful person used more authoritative and less accommodative strategies.

A recent study by Falbo and Peplau (1980) generated a two-dimensional model of power strategies used in intimate relationships. The study also provided information regarding the associations between gender, sexual orientation, and power strategy use. The two dimensions concerned the extent to which strategies were (a) direct (ranging from direct to indirect), and (b) interactive (ranging from bilateral to unilateral). Strategy use differences were found among heterosexuals, with men more likely than women to report using bilateral and direct strategies in intimate cross-sex relationships. Falbo and Peplau suggested, however, that bilateral and direct strategies are not used on the basis of gender, but rather by individuals who perceive themselves as having greater power than their partner. Homosexuality was not associated with a distinctive pattern of power use in intimate relationships. In
their discussion Falbo and Peplau suggested that whenever the target or situation varied the type of power strategy might also vary.

Cowan, Drinkard, and MacGavin (in press) used the two-dimensional model constructed by Falbo and Peplau (1980). The Cowan et al. purpose was to examine directly the effect of power vis-a-vis the target; hence, power strategies reported by 6th-, 9th-, and 12th-grade students whose responses to the targets mother, father, and same-sex friend were examined. Friends differed from both parental targets in receiving fewer unilateral and indirect strategies. Fathers, hypothesized to have the most power, received fewer direct and bilateral strategies than mothers and friends. Weaker strategies were used more with parents and stronger strategies with friends. The Cowan et al. results supported the idea that power, not gender, has been the source of differential use of influence strategies.

To summarize, Johnson (1976, 1978) indicated that power strategy choice depends on its potential effectiveness, degree of effort the choice requires, consistency with one's prescribed sex role, and consistency with one's needs and goals. Additional research has suggested that both the target and situation affect power strategy choice, rather than
the gender of the target or the gender of the influence agent (Cowan et al., in press; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Kipnis, 1976). Nevertheless, the Falbo and Peplau (1980) study indicated that in intimate cross-sex relationships there is a significant probability that females will use indirect and unilateral strategies more frequently than males.

The present study was concerned with only the direct-indirect dimension examined by Falbo and Peplau (1980). The term direct power strategy refers to the use of methods of social influence that deal specifically (directly) with the issue at hand. Conversely, indirect power strategy refers to a method of social influence in which the target is manipulated or the issue itself is not dealt with in a straightforward manner.

Perceived Life Control

Support for the importance of power and control components in sex role identity is evident in the psychological literature. Broverman et al. (1972) identified a competency cluster associated with masculinity and a warmth-expressive cluster associated with femininity. The masculine pole of the competency cluster included such attributes as aggressive, independent, dominant, and not easily influenced. The feminine pole included such attributes as dependent,
easily influenced, submissive, and passive. The adjectives suggest that masculinity is associated with high competence, power, and control whereas femininity is associated with low competence, lack of power, and lack of control. If, as Johnson (1976) suggested, women's normative power styles are limited to indirect, personal, and helpless forms of power it is logically consistent for women, in general, to have relatively less belief in personal control than males.

Other areas of research have investigated the importance of perceived control in human behavior. In a recent study concerned with psychosocial correlates of depressive symptomology in females Warren and McEachren (1983) found that although demographic variables accounted for 11% of depression score variance in their sample psychosocial variables accounted for an additional 28% of depression score variance. Perceived life control by itself accounted for 21% of depression score variance. Warren and McEachren concluded that psychosocial factors may play a more important role in female depression than demographic factors which had received the bulk of prior research attention. Similarly, an assumption of the present research is that psychosocial factors may play a more important role in feminine alcohol use level than demographic factors. Warren and McEachren also pointed out that their
findings tended to reinforce the notion that an important source of learned depression susceptibility in women has been female sex role socialization.

The "Angry Woman Syndrome"

Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970) asked 79 practicing clinicians (clinical psychologists, psychiatrists, and social workers) to describe the characteristics of a healthy person of unspecified sex, a healthy adult male, and a healthy adult female. In general, personality characteristics which were deemed more desirable were ascribed more often to a healthy male and to a healthy non-sex specific adult than to a healthy female. That is, healthy non-sex specific people and healthy men were described as dominant, active, independent, and aggressive. Healthy women, however, were assigned these same characteristics far less strongly. The results found by Broverman et al. seemed to support the hypothesis that a double standard of health exists for women and men. Some repercussions of such a double standard can be seen in the psychiatric literature.

Rickles (1971) described some of his female patients who drank excessively, expressed anger openly, and displayed uncontrollable tempers as having "the angry woman syndrome." Their spouses were described as showing the opposite (traditional female)
characteristics. These women who drank and their spouses were considered abnormal because they exhibited a reversal of normative sex role behavior. Al-Issa (1980) pointed out that if one used norms applicable to healthy males or healthy adults (as defined by the Broverman et al., 1970 study) the females labeled as having the angry woman syndrome by Rickles had quite normal rather than abnormal personality traits. That is, Rickles described his heavy drinking female patients as successful in their careers, neatly dressed, attractive, and outwardly having well-organized personalities. Their main problem appears to be that they refused to conform ("adjust") to society's traditional standards for female behavior.

In sum, knowledgeable psychotherapists have tended to associate so-called masculine behavior in females with psychopathology; moreover, the psychotherapists' opinions (in the 1970 Broverman et al. study) closely reflected the opinions of college students who had previously been respondents to similar questions. It seems, therefore, appropriate to suggest that both society at large and the spouses of independent, aggressive, and direct females may also perceive such women as behaving in a counter-normative, sex-inappropriate manner. Societal and spousal expectations concerning the sex role appropriateness of female behavior may, then, be a
source of interrole or intrapsychic conflict for women. In addition, behaviors that are perceived to be sex role inappropriate for females (directness, independence, and aggressiveness, etc.) may be met with disapproval and the female may be evaluated and responded to negatively for acting out-of-role. Perhaps such a sex role conflict process and its concomitant stress are relieved by alcohol use.

**Summary and Hypotheses**

To summarize, there has been a lack of research concerning female use and abuse of alcohol—particularly in the identification of predictors of vulnerability. Relief of the stress encountered as a result of life problems is repeatedly cited as one motivation for using alcohol; another motivation suggested by the literature is the need for power. The most frequent approach to the development of alcohol problems in females is the study of sex role factors. Therefore, potential sex role stress processes (role conflicts and role overload), perceived life control, and various power issues have been reviewed. As previously stated, the relationship of such phenomenon to alcohol use in a population of functional, married, employed females was the impetus for the current research. In addition to the purposes previously described the following hypotheses were tested.
Hypotheses 1a, 1b

(a) Married employed females should report a significantly greater frequency of use of direct, as opposed to indirect, power strategies.

(b) Married employed women, however, should report a significantly greater frequency of use of indirect power strategies in their home setting with their spouse (or intimate partner) as the target than in their work setting with co-workers as the targets.

That married employed females will employ direct strategies more frequently than indirect strategies (1a) refutes the popular stereotype that females are in general manipulative, weak, helpless, and incompetent. On the other hand, hypothesis 1b is based on the theoretical work of Falbo and Peplau (1980) which suggested that in intimate heterosexual relationships females, in general, tend to respond as if they are less powerful than their spouses. Thus, there is a greater probability that females will use indirect methods of influence more frequently in their marital relationship. One implication of the Falbo and Peplau study is that females may frequently perceive their marital relationship as a "nonpeer" relationship.

Hypothesis 2

It is expected that a discrepancy in power
strategy usage should be a predictor of alcohol consumption. Behavior which is counter-normative to (discrepant with) traditional target and/or setting expectations should be an indicator of sex role conflict, and alcohol may be used to relieve the stress such conflict produces. The term counter-normative in this context, then, refers to (a) behavior which is traditionally considered sex role inappropriate for females, or (b) behavior which is inconsistent with previous research findings. For example, Cowan et al. (in press) found that there is a tendency for direct power tactics to be used with one's peers. In the present sample co-workers are considered peer targets. Directness with one's co-workers is deemed normative and expected behavior although indirectness in that relationship may be counter-normative. We also suggest that in terms of consistency with the task-orientedness of the employment setting itself direct strategies are more appropriate strategies and more expected strategies. This logical observation is supported by Key (1975) who implied that directness in the work setting is normative. Key proposed that male and female sex role language is discarded and becomes secondary to the occupational language of the work place.

In terms of the spousal relationship or home
setting, a different set of circumstances is presumed to exist. As mentioned previously, Falbo and Peplau (1980) found that females used significantly more indirect power strategies in intimate cross-sex relationships than males. This implied that females more often than males perceive their intimate partner as the more powerful person in the relationship; hence, excessive directness by females in intimate relationships may not only be counter-normative in terms of traditional female usage, but also not expected by the target (spouse). Conversely, a female's use of indirectness in her intimate relationship may not be perceived as inappropriate by her spouse because the stereotype of females is that they are indirect, weak, manipulative, and incompetent (Johnson, 1976, 1978).

**Hypothesis 3**

There should be a positive correlation between the stress measure and alcohol use. It is expected that the greater the subject's self-reported level of stress the greater the alcohol use level.

**Hypothesis 4**

There should be a positive correlation between powerlessness and alcohol use. In the present study powerlessness itself is viewed as a stressor (Marecek, 1978); hence, alcohol use level should rise as self-reported powerlessness rises.
Hypothesis 5

There should be a negative correlation between perceived life control and alcohol use. In the current study a lack of perceived life control is viewed as a stressor (Kipnis, 1976; May, 1972; Warren & McEachren, 1983). Therefore, alcohol use level should decrease as self-reported perceived life control increases.

Hypothesis 6

A positive response to the question, "If you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you would like for the rest of your life, would you continue to work?" should be an indication that employment for those subjects provided positive benefits that outweighed the negative aspects of being employed outside of the home. Thus, multiple role overload and stress from multiple relationships should be outweighed by greater ego gratification, greater status enhancement, or the achievement satisfaction provided by employment outside of one's home. This position is consistent with the idea that multiple roles provide alternative sources of satisfaction. Therefore, if intrinsically rewarding, the employment role would act as a buffer against the stress encountered in the homemaker role (Keith & Schafer, 1982). The logical implication of this position is that a "yes" response to the intrinsic reward question should be associated
with lower alcohol use.
METHOD

Subjects

The sample consisted of 94 currently employed business and professional women who had ongoing intimate relationships with a person of the opposite sex. All subjects resided in the area surrounding San Bernardino, California.

Measures

All participants completed a questionnaire (See Appendix A) that contained a demographic assessment, measures of several psychosocial variables, an alcohol consumption assessment and questions concerning the subjects' employment situation and alcohol use situation.

Demographic Measures. Participants were asked to report their age, years of education, annual family income, marital status, occupation, number of hours employed outside of the home each week, number of hours spent per day performing household chores or family oriented services, number of children in the family, and number of children currently residing at home (Appendix B lists the sample's occupational categories).

Psychosocial Measures. Seven psychosocial variables were assessed. Cronback's alpha coefficient,
an internal-consistency index, was used to determine the reliability of six of these measures.

1. Perceived life control (alpha = .86): Four items, rated on a 5-point scale, were used to measure perception of control over one's life (e.g., To what extent do you feel a sense of personal control over your intimate relationships?). Two of the original questions, numbered 51 and 52 in the questionnaire, were deleted from the perceived control scale due to confusion over the poorly stated response categories for each of these items. A number of participants indicated to the experimenter either orally or by writing comments on their questionnaires that they had difficulty understanding the stated responses to these two questions (See Appendix C).

2. Stress (alpha = .68): Six items, rated on a 6-point scale, were used to measure stress in one's personal life and employment capacity (e.g., How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your work responsibilities?) (See Appendix D).

3. Powerlessness: Two items, rated on a 6-point scale, were used to measure powerlessness in interpersonal relationships (How often do you feel powerless in your relationships with your co-workers?, and How often do you feel powerless in your relationship with your spouse or intimate partner?).
4. Power Strategy Measures. Four measures were employed to assess power strategy use with one's intimate cross-sex partner and with one's co-workers. The present study assessed only the direct-indirect power dimension reported by Falbo and Peplau (1980). The term direct power strategy refers to the use of a method of social influence that deals specifically (directly) with the issue at hand. Conversely, the term indirect power strategy refers to a method of social influence in which the target is manipulated or the issue itself is not dealt with in a straightforward manner. The same 6 direct items were asked in two settings, home and work: reasoning or logic, telling, discussing or talking, asking, stating the importance of an issue, and negotiating or compromising. The same 6 indirect items were asked in two settings, home and work: misleading or telling white lies, dropping hints, becoming silent or withdrawing, negative affect, positive affect, and helplessness.

(a) Direct power strategy use in intimate relationship (alpha = .73): Six items, rated on a 6-point scale, were employed (e.g., How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?) (See Appendix E).

(b) Direct power strategy use in relationships
with co-workers (alpha = .78): Six items, rated on a 6-point scale, were employed (e.g., How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your co-workers?) (See Appendix F).

(c) Indirect power strategy measure with intimate partner (alpha = .60): Six items, rated on a 6-point scale, were employed (e.g., How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?) (See Appendix G).

(d) Indirect power strategy measure with co-workers (alpha = .52): Six items, rated on a 6-point scale, were employed (e.g., How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with your co-workers?) (See Appendix H).

Two power strategy discrepancy scores were derived from the four power strategy measures. The normative power strategy score consisted of the summed scores of the direct power measure with one's co-workers as targets and the indirect power measure with one's spouse as the target.

The counter-normative power strategy score consisted of the summed scores of the direct power measure with one's spouse as the target and the indirect power measure with one's co-workers as targets.
Employment Situation Variables. Subjects were asked to report the sex of their co-workers, whether their job was supervisory in character, and to specify the sex of their immediate supervisor. In addition, subjects were asked to respond to the question, "If you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you would like for the rest of your life, would you continue to work?" This question was intended to measure (in part) whether subjects worked strictly for monetary gains or, the obverse, for the intrinsic rewards (ego gratification, status enhancement, self-esteem, etc.) associated with their employed-outside-of-the-home role.

Alcohol Measure. The alcohol measure employed was a modified version of that used by Harburg, Ozgoren, Hawthorne, and Schork (1980). Subjects were first asked the question, "Have you, within the last year, ever drunk wine, liquor, or beer?" If the subject's response was a positive one, further questions were asked regarding both quantity and frequency of use of three categories of alcoholic beverages--wine, liquor, and beer. This scale was selected because it met several criteria deemed important in the present study. First, the measure takes into consideration both quantity and frequency of alcohol consumption. Therefore, with this set of items the variable "ounces
of ethanol consumed per week," month, day, and so forth can be estimated for each subject by assuming certain Standard American Equivalents (See Appendix I). For example, a subject might reply that she drinks wine "1 or 2 times a week" (Question 55; Response Level 7; Frequency of Consumption) and usually drinks "3" glasses of wine per occasion (Question 56; Response Level 3; Quantity Consumed). This particular subject would have a wine consumption rate of 24 ounces per week which translates into 3.6 ounces of ethanol consumed per week via wine ingestion (i.e., 3 4-ounce glasses of wine times 2 occasions equals 24 ounces of wine--15% of which is ethanol). A similar computation, based on the Standard American Equivalents for beer (4% ethanol per ounce) and liquor (45% ethanol per ounce) would be conducted and all three scores summed to obtain the dependent variable, ounces of ethanol consumed per week for each subject. The upper limit of the frequency of use response level was used in all computations; that is, if the frequency of use response level indicated "1 to 2 times a week," 2 times a week (the upper limit of that response) was employed in the computation.

The second rationale for using the Harburg et al. (1980) scale is that it was developed for use with general population groups rather than populations
already in treatment for alcohol problems.

**Alcohol Situation Variables.** Respondents were asked to specify where they drank most frequently—at home or outside of their homes. Subjects were also asked with whom they drank most frequently—friends, family, or alone.

**Procedure**

A number of business and professional women's organizations in the San Bernardino, California area were contacted in an effort to acquire subjects. Five of the groups agreed to participate. The experimenter attended a regularly scheduled meeting of each of the five groups. All female attendees were given a "letter to participants" as they arrived for the meeting (See Appendix J). At a prearranged, subsequent point in the evening, the experimenter made a short verbal request for participants. The anonymity and voluntariness of the subjects' participation was stressed. All women agreeing to participate were given an opportunity to complete the questionnaire during that evening meeting. Sixty-three subjects were obtained in this manner.

An additional 31 subjects were acquired via mailed-in responses. The experimenter asked three of her acquaintances—a real estate broker, a city health nurse, and a high school teacher—to solicit subjects
from their respective employment milieus. Forty-four participant letters and questionnaires were distributed to potential subjects. Thirty-eight questionnaires were subsequently received by mail; 31 met the study's criteria. To be included in the analyses, all subjects had to have responded to four questions. Two questions, "Are you currently employed," and "Do you have an intimate relationship with a person of the opposite sex?" had to have positive responses. In addition, the questions regarding the sex of one's supervisor, and intrinsic reward had to be completed.

Research Limitations

Before presenting the results and discussion sections of this study it is important to note several limitations that bear directly on how the results can be interpreted. First, the research is correlational and does not permit one to unequivocally demonstrate the direction of causality. That is, the possibility that alcohol use influences the level of the independent variables rather than the reverse cannot be ruled out. A second limitation is that the sample size is at a minimum when considering the number of variables used and the type of analysis (i.e., multiple regression/correlation). Tabachnick and Fidell (1983) suggest, as a minimum, four or five times more cases than independent variables.
Caution should be used in making generalizations regarding the present results. The sample was a nonrandom one of predominately well-educated, long-term-employed females who cannot necessarily be considered representative of the general population. On the other hand, the sample's mean ethanol consumption per week closely parallels that of the females in the Harford and Gerstel (1981) study and is similar to the consumption rate of females who preferred wine as a beverage in the Rodin, Morton, and Shimkin (1982) study.

Whereas previous research regarding power strategy use employed essays soliciting responses to "How I Get My Way" with a specific target, the present study elicited responses about specific types of power strategies. Although the specific power strategy categories were derived from previous research (Falbo & Peplau, 1980), such specificity does limit the range of possible strategy response.
RESULTS

Three categories of analyses were planned. An in-depth description of the sample and subject's responses to certain situational questions have been provided at Level I. Level II consisted of the tests of the hypotheses, and the results of a hierarchical regression analysis were examined at Level III.

Level I Analyses

Sample characteristics and subjects' responses to situational variables were provided in Table 1. As can be seen, the participants ranged in age from 24 through 63 years ($M = 43.98$). The majority of the subjects were married (83%).\(^1\) Eighty-five percent of the sample had acquired some post high school education, with approximately 14% having completed baccalaureate degrees, and another 28% holding graduate degrees. An annual family income of $18,000 to $35,000 was reported by 28% of the sample; 67% of the subjects reported family incomes of more than $35,000. Of the 94 subjects, 22% had never had children.

\(^1\) Throughout the study the sample is referred to as married. Although this was not strictly the case, all subjects had a current intimate relationship with a male. The term married is used for brevity.
Table 1
Sample Demographic Characteristics and Responses to Situational Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 - 29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 63</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17+</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Married</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 1. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Family Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,000 or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,001 - $11,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,001 - $18,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$18,001 - $35,000</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,001 - $50,000</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001 or more</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children in family</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of children at home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 1. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years employed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 47</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean years employed = 19.7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hours per week paid employment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is your supervisor male or female?</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female supervisor</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male supervisor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic Reward Question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are your co-workers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal number of each sex</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you work in a supervisory capacity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant drinks with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drinks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant drinks most frequently:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never drinks</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Home</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of her home</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Places</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Table 1. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours spent in family tasks (per day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more hours per day</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean = 2.9 hours per day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 94
and 78% of the females had one or more offspring; 60% of the subjects reported having no children currently living at home.

The subjects' mean length of employment was 19.7 years. Only 4% of the females were employed less than 30 hours per week. Approximately 55% of the subjects indicated that they worked in a supervisory capacity. Seventy-one percent of the sample reported having male supervisors, and 29% of the subjects reported having female supervisors. In regard to the sex of co-worker question, 20% of the subjects reported that the majority of their co-workers were male; whereas 49% of the subjects had a greater number of female co-workers. The remaining 31% of the sample indicated that they had an equal number of male and female co-workers.

The present sample of employed females reported a mean of 2.9 hours per day spent performing household chores or family oriented services. In addition, 60% of the subjects responded positively to the intrinsic reward question.

Approximately 94% of the sample reported consuming some type of alcoholic beverage. The mean for the variable, ounces of ethanol consumed per week, was 3.42 which indicated that on average the females in the sample drank the equivalent of approximately 7
beers, or 8 drinks of hard liquor, or 6 glasses of wine per week. In quantitative terms, the beverage of choice of the sample was wine (M = 2.12 ounces of ethanol per week via wine ingestion). Of the 94 subjects, only 49% ever drank beer--8.6% drank two or more beers per week (M = .30 ounces of ethanol per week ingested via beer consumption). The mean for ounces of ethanol consumed per week via liquor consumption was 1.0.

In regard to the alcohol situation variables, 37% of the women drank most frequently with friends and 41% drank most frequently with family members. In addition, 39% of the subjects reported drinking most frequently in their own homes and 50% reported drinking most frequently outside of their homes.

**Level II Analyses**

**Hypothesis 1a, 1b.** Hypothesis 1a predicted that the subjects should report a significantly greater frequency of use of direct power strategies as opposed to indirect power strategies. Support was obtained for this hypothesis, t(93) = 12.60, p < .001 (M = 37.69, direct power strategies; M = 26.8, indirect power strategies). Hypothesis 1b predicted that married employed women should report a significantly greater frequency of use of indirect power strategies in their intimate relationship than in their
relationships with their co-workers. Support was obtained for this hypothesis, $t(93) = 9.51, p < .001$ ($M = 15.07$, indirect strategies, intimate relationship; $M = 11.72$, indirect strategies, co-worker relationships).

**Hypothesis 2.** Hypothesis 2 predicted that power strategy usage that is discrepant from traditional and theoretical target and/or setting expectations should be an indicator of alcohol use level. Support was obtained for this hypothesis from the multiple regression/correlation analysis. The counter-normative discrepancy score was zero-order correlated with the dependent variable, ounces of ethanol consumed per week ($r = .22, p < .05$). By contrast the normative discrepancy score was not significantly correlated with the dependent variable ($r = .01, p > .05$). The zero-order correlations for the four independent power strategy measures and the ethanol use variable were as follows: direct power strategies with one's intimate partner and ethanol use level ($r = .20, p < .05$), direct power strategies with one's co-workers and ethanol use level ($r = -.02, p > .05$), indirect power strategies with one's intimate partner and ethanol use level ($r = .04, p > .05$), and indirect power strategies with one's co-workers and ethanol use level ($r = .12, p > .05$).
Three levels of age, and above and below mean scores for the counter-normative discrepancy score were examined. In older age groups no significant differences in ethanol scores were found for levels of the counter-normative discrepancy score (M Age 40-49, low counter-normative discrepancy = 3.95; M Age 40-49, high counter-normative discrepancy = 5.80; t(28) = -.89, p > .38) (M Age 50-63, low counter-normative discrepancy = 2.54; M Age 50-63, high counter-normative discrepancy = 3.49; t(29) = -.52, p > .51). In the youngest age group a significant difference in ethanol scores was found for levels of the counter-normative discrepancy score (M Age 24-39, low counter-normative discrepancy = .77; M Age 24-39, high counter-normative discrepancy = 3.62; t(31) = -2.53, p < .02). The correlation between the counter-normative discrepancy score and the ethanol variable in the youngest age group (Age 24-39) was r = .56, p < .001. No significant relationship was found for the normative discrepancy score and ethanol level in any age group.

Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5. Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 dealing with stress, powerlessness, and perceived life control, respectively, received no direct support from the correlational analysis. That is, none of these variables were significantly zero-order correlated with the dependent variable, ounces of ethanol consumed.
per week. However, two interactions—stress with the counter-normative discrepancy score, and age with perceived life control—did contribute to the regression equation and results for these interactions will be presented in a subsequent section.

**Hypothesis 6.** Hypothesis 6 predicted that a positive response to the intrinsic reward question should be significantly associated with lower ethanol use level. In fact, the opposite was true; a positive response to the intrinsic reward question was significantly associated with higher ethanol use level, \( r = .19, \ p < .05 \).

**Level III Analyses**

As planned, a hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted. Five pre-ordered sets of variables were entered into the regression equation. Each set was tested against the null hypothesis that \( R^2 = 0 \) with the prior sets being held constant (i.e., partialled-out). Table 2 presents the variable intercorrelations for the 14 main variables entered into the regression analysis. Age, income, education, and number of children currently living at home represented the demographic set of variables. The normative and counter-normative power strategy scores, perceived life control scores, powerlessness scores, and stress scores comprised the five psychosocial
Table 2

Intercorrelations for the Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Home</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counter-Normative</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Control</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stress</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex Supervisor</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Int. Reward</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female Co-workers</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinks at Home</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinks-Family</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
(Table 2. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Home</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counter-Normative</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Control</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Powerlessness</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stress</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex Supervisor</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Int. Reward</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female Co-workers</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinks at Home</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinks-Family</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
(Table 2. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counter-Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Control</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.54***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stress</td>
<td>-.42***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex Supervisor</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Int. Reward</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female Co-workers</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinks at Home</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinks-Family</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
(Table 2. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counter-Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Int. Reward</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female Co-workers</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinks at Home</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinks-Family</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Child Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Counter-Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Normative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perceived Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sex Supervisor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Int. Reward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Female Co-workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Drinks at Home</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Drinks-Family</td>
<td><strong>.51</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
variables. The employment situation set of variables consisted of the sex of one's supervisor, the response to the question regarding intrinsic reward, and having females as co-workers. A fourth set, made up of two variables, concerned the subjects' situational use of ethanol. Drinking at home, as opposed to elsewhere, and drinking with one's family members, as opposed to others, were the two alcohol-situation variables entered into the regression equation.

As can be seen in Table 2, variable overlap occurred; twenty-three of the intercorrelations were statistically significant. Of the six demographic intercorrelations, only two were significantly associated. As could be expected, there was a negative association between subjects' age and the number of children currently living at home ($r = -.31, p < .001$). Education and income were significantly correlated even though income represented the joint earnings of the subject and her spouse ($r = .18, p < .05$).

Several of the psychosocial variables were related to the demographic, employment situation, and alcohol situation variables. The counter-normative power strategy discrepancy score was negatively related to age ($r = -.30, p < .01$) with higher counter-normative scores associated with younger age. As could be expected, the two discrepancy scores were positively
associated ($r = .62, p < .001$). Perceived life control scores were positively correlated with income ($r = .24, p < .01$), and powerlessness scores were negatively associated with income ($r = -.19, p < .05$). Perceived life control and powerlessness were negatively related ($r = -.54, p < .001$). Perceived life control scores and stress scores were negatively related ($r = -.42, p < .001$). The powerlessness variable was associated with the number of children currently living at home ($r = .22, p < .05$). Stress was negatively related to age with younger females reporting greater stress ($r = -.32, p < .001$). Stress was positively related to the number of children currently living in the household ($r = .37, p < .001$). The counter-normative discrepancy score was positively associated with stress ($r = .23, p < .01$), and the normative discrepancy score was also positively associated with stress ($r = .36, p < .001$); thus, higher overall power strategy scores were positively related to both stress and lower age.

In terms of the employment situation variables, intrinsic reward and income were related; that is, the higher the income the more likely the individual would continue working outside of the home even if she had enough money to live comfortably for the rest of her life without being employed ($r = .26, p < .01$). Intrinsic reward and the sex of one's co-workers were
related ($r = .22, p < .01$). That is, when subjects' co-workers were female the tendency was to respond positively to the intrinsic reward question. Having female co-workers and the counter-normative discrepancy score were positively related ($r = .20, p < .05$), and having female co-workers and the normative power strategy discrepancy score were positively related ($r = .18, p < .05$).

In regard to the alcohol situation variables, drinking at home and drinking with one's family were correlated ($r = .51, p < .001$). The drinks at home variable was positively associated with income ($r = .28, p < .01$). The drinks with one's family variable was also positively associated with income ($r = .20, p < .05$). In addition, subjects who drank at home had a tendency to respond "yes" to the intrinsic reward question ($r = .25, p < .01$).

Table 3 provides the correlations for the four independent power strategy measures with other variables in the study. As can be seen, ethanol was positively and significantly correlated with direct power strategy use with one's spouse ($r = .20, p < .05$). Age and direct power strategy use with one's spouse were negatively associated ($r = - .33, p < .001$), and age and direct power strategy use with one's co-workers were negatively associated ($r = - .21, p < .05$). The
Table 3
Correlations of Independent Power Strategy Measures with Other Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Spouse</th>
<th>Direct Co-workers</th>
<th>Indirect Spouse</th>
<th>Indirect Co-workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Spouse</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Co-workers</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Spouse</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Co-workers</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethanol</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Home</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
(Table 3. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Direct Spouse</th>
<th>Direct Co-workers</th>
<th>Indirect Spouse</th>
<th>Indirect Co-workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Supervisor</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Reward</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Co-workers</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.20*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks at Home</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks-Family</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Sex of Supervisor: male response equals a negative correlation; female response equals a positive correlation. Intrinsic Reward: a "no" response equals a negative correlation; a "yes" response equals a positive correlation. *p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.
four power strategy measures were interrelated. Direct strategies with one's co-workers and direct strategies with one's spouse were correlated ($r = .52, p < .001$). Indirect strategies with one's spouse were associated with direct strategies with one's spouse ($r = .24, p < .01$). Indirect strategies with one's spouse were correlated with direct strategies with one's co-workers ($r = .21, p < .05$). Indirect strategies and direct strategies with one's co-workers were associated ($r = .20, p < .05$). Indirect power strategies with one's co-workers and indirect strategies with one's spouse were associated ($r = .42, p < .001$).

Powerlessness and indirect strategies in both situations were positively associated; that is, powerlessness and indirect strategies with one's spouse were correlated ($r = .21, p < .05$), and powerlessness and indirect strategy use with one's co-workers were correlated ($r = .20, p < .05$). Stress was positively and significantly associated with three of the four independent power strategy measures. Stress and direct strategy use with one's co-workers were correlated ($r = .27, p < .01$). Stress was also positively related to indirect strategies with one's spouse ($r = .31, p < .001$), and with indirect strategy use with one's co-workers ($r = .27, p < .01$). Having a female supervisor was correlated with indirectness in both
situations—indirect strategies with one's spouse 
(r = .17, p < .05), and indirectness with one's 
co-workers (r = .19, p < .05). A "yes" response to the 
intrinsic reward question was correlated with direct 
power strategy use with one's spouse (r = .20, 
p < .05). Having female co-workers was positively 
associated with overall frequency of power strategy use 
at work. Thus, having female co-workers was correlated 
with direct strategy use with one's co-workers 
(r = .19, p < .05), and having female co-workers was 
also correlated with indirect power strategy use with 
one's co-workers (r = .20, p < .05). Drinking with 
one's family members was negatively associated with 
direct power strategy use at work (r = -.17, p < .05).

Table 4 presents a summary of the contribution 
of the individual variables and the five sets to the 
regression analysis. The final R was .73 indicating 
that the 14 main predictor variables and the 
interaction variables entering the equation accounted 
for about 53% of ethanol score variance. The overall 
F test for the analysis indicated F(24, 69) = 3.31, 
p < .05 (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 
1975, p. 335).

Five pre-ordered sets of variables were forced 
into the regression analysis in a hierarchical order. 
Set I contained four demographic variables--age,
Table 4

Individual Variable and Set Contributions to the Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Increment$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Set I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.414</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.115</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Home</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Dependent variable = ounces of ethanol consumed per week. $N = 94$.

Overall $F: F(24, 69) = 3.31, p < .05$. Set I: $F(4, 89) = .70, p > .05$.

$^a$The $R^2$ increment is the squared semipartial $r$ at that step and may be interpreted as the proportion of ethanol score variance accounted for by the given independent variable when the effects of the previously entered variables have been controlled.
(Table 4. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>(R^2)</th>
<th>(\text{Increment}^{a})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set II</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-normative score</td>
<td>(0.22^{*})</td>
<td>-0.406</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.055(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative score</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-1.297</td>
<td>0.336</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.297</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-2.023</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>0.171</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-1.986</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>0.174</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Set II: \(F(5, 84) = 2.91, p < .05\).

\(^a\) The \(R^2\) increment is the squared semipartial \(r\) at that step and may be interpreted as the proportion of ethanol score variance accounted for by the given independent variable when the effects of the previously entered variables have been controlled.

\(^b\) Variable is individually significant within that set.

\(\ast p < .05.\)
(Table 4. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>R² Increment&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set III</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Supervisor</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.221</td>
<td>.047&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Reward</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Co-workers</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.490</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks at Home</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.204&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinks-Family</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>- .047</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.443</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Set III: F(3, 81) = 2.37, p > .05. Set IV: F(2, 79) = 14.45, p < .05.

<sup>a</sup>The R² increment is the squared semipartial r at that step and may be interpreted as the proportion of ethanol score variance accounted for by the given independent variable when the effects of the previously entered variables have been controlled.

<sup>b</sup>Variable is individually significant within that set.

* p < .05,
(Table 4. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$R^2$ Increment$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Set V</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-normative with</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>.688</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age with Control</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>-1.580</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>.498</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness with</td>
<td>- .06</td>
<td>1.458</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative with Control</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>.721</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative with</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Set V: $F(10, 69) = 1.32, p > .05.$

$^a$The $R^2$ increment is the squared semipartial r at that step and may be interpreted as the proportion of ethanol score variance accounted for by the given independent variable when the effects of the previously entered variables have been controlled.
(Table 4. continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>R^2 Increment^a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Powerlessness with Control</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.725</td>
<td>.526</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age with Counter-normative</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-normative with</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.528</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative with Stress</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.529</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter-normative with Control</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.727</td>
<td>.529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ^aThe R^2 increment is the squared semipartial r at that step and may be interpreted as the proportion of ethanol score variance accounted for by the given independent variable when the effects of the previously enter variables have been controlled.

*p < .05.
income, education, and number of children currently living at home. Set II consisted of five psychosocial variables—the normative and counter-normative power strategy discrepancy scores, the perceived life control score, the powerlessness score, and the stress score. Set III was made up of three employment situation variables—sex of supervisor, female co-workers, and intrinsic reward variables. Set IV represented the two alcohol situation variables of drinking at home and drinking with one's family members. Set V originally contained eleven interaction variables. Due to the limited number of subjects, interaction variables had to be kept to a minimum; hence, only eleven interactions were examined. Because the focus of the research was the set of psychosocial variables, nine psychosocial interactions were examined. The remaining two—interactions—age with life control, and age with the counter-normative score—were investigated because the intercorrelation matrix appeared to indicate that age might be a suppressor or moderator variable.

Set I was entered as a block; then Sets II through Set V were forced into the analysis, respectively. Order of entry within Sets II through V was stepwise; hence, independent variables were entered only if they met established criteria (probability of F-to-enter of 1.0, and tolerance level of 0.001). Order of
inclusion within Sets II through V was determined by the respective contribution of each variable to explained ethanol variance. Thus, the variable with the largest partial correlation coefficient, within that specific set, entered the analysis first, the next largest second, and so forth.

None of the demographic variables in Set I showed significant zero-order correlations with the dependent variable. Together, however, the variables in Set I accounted for approximately 3% of the ethanol variance.

In Set II, only one of the five psychosocial variables was significantly zero-order correlated with the dependent variable. The counter-normative power strategy discrepancy score was positively correlated with the dependent variable ($r = .22$, $p < .05$). As can be seen in Table 4, the counter-normative discrepancy score contributed a unique amount of ethanol variance (5.5%). Powerlessness was marginally significant and contributed 3.6% of ethanol score variance to the regression equation. Altogether the psychosocial variables accounted for approximately 14% of ethanol score variance. Significance testing against the null hypothesis that $R^2 = 0$ for Set II, when Set I was held constant and using Model I Error (as specified in Cohen and Cohen, 1983, pp. 146-147), resulted in $F(5, 84) = 2.91$, $p < .05$. 
In Set III, all three employment situation variables showed significant zero-order correlations with ethanol scores. Having a female supervisor was positively related to ethanol level ($r = .23, p < .05$). A positive response to the intrinsic reward question was related to ethanol scores ($r = .19, p < .05$), and having female co-workers and ethanol scores were correlated ($r = .23, p < .05$). As can be seen in Table 4, having a female supervisor accounted for a significant and unique amount of ethanol variance in Set III (4.7%). Together the three employment situation variables accounted for approximately 7% of the ethanol score variance. Set III, however, contributed no unique $R^2$ increment when Set I and Set II were partialled-out, $F(3, 81) = 2.37, p > .05$. The lack of significance of Set III was a result of three factors. First, the psychosocial set (II) and the employment set (III) share a portion of ethanol variance. Second, although both intrinsic reward and female co-worker variables were significantly zero-order correlated with the dependent variable, they were also intercorrelated ($r = .22, p < .05$); hence, overlapped in terms of predicting ethanol variance. Third, the necessary allocation of degrees of freedom (13) diminished the sample size (from 94 to 81); therefore, Set III was not significant.
As can be seen in Table 4, Set IV contributed the greatest amount of ethanol variance at a single step (20%). This step was minimally intercorrelated with the previous sets. Both of the alcohol situation variables in Set IV were significantly zero-order correlated with the dependent variable. Drinking at home and ethanol scores were positively related ($r = .55, p < .001$). Drinking with one's family and ethanol scores were also positively associated ($r = .26, p < .01$). In testing the null hypothesis that $R^2 = 0$, with previous sets being partialled-out, Set IV was significant, $F(2, 79) = 14.45, p < .05$.

Of the eleven interactions selected for the regression analysis, only ten met the entry criteria. The interaction between control and stress was not entered into the regression equation because it failed to meet the pre-established entry criteria. Set V, then, consisted of ten interactions which together accounted for approximately 8% of the ethanol variance, $F(10, 69) = 1.32, p > .05$. Over half of the ethanol variance in Set V was accounted for by two of the ten interaction variables. The interaction of the counter-normative discrepancy score with stress score provided a contribution to ethanol score variance of 2.3%. A breakdown of that interaction, using two levels of stress (above and below sample mean scores)
and two levels of the counter-normative discrepancy score (above and below the sample mean) showed the following. Ethanol scores were marginally significantly higher in the high counter-normative discrepancy high-stress group ($M = 4.14$) than in the low counter-normative discrepancy high-stress group ($M = 1.69$), $t(43) = 1.95$, $p < .057$. With subjects who reported low stress, no significant difference in ethanol consumption in the high and low counter-normative discrepancy groups was found, $t(47) = -.94$, $p > .35$ ($M$ low stress low counter-normative discrepancy = 2.99; $M$ low stress high counter-normative discrepancy = 4.47).

The age and perceived control interaction variable contributed a marginally significant amount of ethanol score variance (2.5%) to the regression equation. That interaction was examined using three levels of age, and above and below the mean scores for perceived control. In younger age groups no difference in ethanol scores were found for levels of control ($M$ Age 24-39, low control = 2.72; $M$ Age 24-39, high control = 2.49; $t(31) = .19$, $p > .85$); ($M$ Age 40-49, low control = 4.22; $M$ Age 40-49, high control = 5.37; $t(28) = -.54$, $p > .59$). In the oldest age group a significant difference in ethanol scores was found for levels of control ($M$ Age 50-63, low control = 5.35;
M Age 50-63, high control = 1.37; $t(29) = 2.35$, $p \leq .03$.
DISCUSSION

There has been a lack of research concerning female use and abuse of alcohol—particularly in the identification of predictors of vulnerability. Thus, the present research examined a number of demographic, psychosocial, and situational variables and their relationship to ethanol use level in a population of married, long-term employed, middle- and upper-middle class females. The results indicate that a combination of psychosocial and situational factors predict ethanol consumption to a considerable extent. About half of the variance in ethanol can be predicted in this sample of nonalcoholic females.

Ethanol Use

In several instances, the sample's beverage preference and quantity of consumption data closely parallel that of prior research. Previous studies have shown that most drinkers have a preference for beer, wine, or liquor although few drinkers consume only one beverage exclusively (Wallace, 1972). That finding holds for this sample. Although beer is the most preferred alcoholic beverage among United States drinkers, wine is generally preferred by middle- and
upper-middle class women (Rodin et al., 1982). In quantitative terms, wine is the beverage of choice for this sample. About half of the subjects drink beer, but very infrequently. In fact, only nine percent of the subjects drink two or more beers per week. The subject's mean ethanol consumption per week was 3.42 ounces which closely parallels that of Harford and Gerstel's subjects (1980) and is slightly less than the total weekly consumption by females in the Rodin et al. study.

Hypotheses 1a, 1b

Power strategy use. Although society perceives female influencing agents as being indirect, emotional, helpless, and ingratiating (Johnson, 1978), it was expected and confirmed that married employed females would report a significantly greater frequency of use of direct, as opposed to indirect, power strategies. Females did report using indirect, manipulative tactics, yet their frequency of use of logical, forceful, and straightforward methods of influence was significantly greater. Therefore, the stereotype of females as generally manipulative and weak does not hold for the present sample.

On the other hand, on the basis of the Falbo and Peplau (1980) research, it was expected that married employed women would report a significantly greater
frequency of use of indirect power strategies in their home setting with their spouse as the target than in their employment setting with co-workers as the targets. This hypothesis was also confirmed.

Why should females be more indirect with their spouses than they are with their co-workers? Gillespie (1976) in an incisive article, "Who Has the Power? The Marital Struggle," suggested that females are at a decided disadvantage when they sign the marriage contract for marriage diminishes females' opportunity for power, personal autonomy, and self-realization. That is, in the traditional marital relationship women are structurally deprived--occupationally, legally, and by cultural norms--of equal opportunities to develop their capacities, resources, and competence. Thus, Gillespie believes that males acquire greater power in the marital relationship not by virtue of their personal competence, but because of structural discrimination against women in that relationship. Similarly, Johnson (1976, 1978, 1982) suggested that the traditional division of labor by sex has created a societal status hierarchy in which males are the superior and females are the inferior. In addition, Cowan et al. (in press) found that directness is used more frequently with one's peers, while indirectness is used more frequently with more powerful persons.
Prior research, then, suggests that the marital relationship is not in general a peer relationship. Wives apparently are not the peers of their husbands in traditional marital relationships.

As a group, however, women who are employed outside of the home should have more power vis-a-vis their spouses than nonworking wives. Moreover, the longer one has been employed the more power she should be able to obtain. Interestingly, even the long-term-employed females in this sample used indirectness significantly more often with their spouses than their co-workers. Thus, co-workers may be more often perceived (responded to) as peers while the spouse may be perceived as the more powerful person in the relationship.

In sum, the stereotype of females as generally manipulative and weak does not hold for the present sample; rather, indirect (powerless) tactics appear to be situation-specific.

Hypothesis 2

Power strategy use and ethanol level. It was expected that a discrepancy in power strategy usage would be a predictor of ethanol consumption; that is, behavior which does not conform to traditional expectations or was discrepant with target and/or setting expectations would indicate sex role conflict,
and ethanol might be used to alleviate the stress of that conflict. Therefore, the positive association of the counter-normative discrepancy score and ethanol consumption level is of considerable interest. High counter-normative scores reflect a higher frequency of use of direct power strategies with one's spouse, and a higher frequency of use of indirect power strategies with one's co-workers. On the basis of the Falbo and Peplau (1980) research it appears that a higher frequency of direct power strategies with one's spouse may be counter-normative. On the basis of the Cowan et al. (in press) research indirectness with one's peers (co-workers) is seen as counter-normative. In addition, indirectness seems logically inconsistent with the task-orientedness of the work setting; moreover, Key (1975) suggested that directness is the language of the work place for both males and females. Differences in male and female forms of speech tend to be suspended in favor of a special work place jargon which is used by both sexes.

It should be noted that the two situation-specific sets of power strategies that comprise the counter-normative discrepancy score, direct power strategy use with one's spouse and indirect power strategy use with one's co-workers, are unrelated in the sample as a whole. Yet the common link of the
counter-normative score is that in both situations the influence agent is deviating from traditional social norms or ascribed sex role behavior in a specific setting. Atypical behavior in these diverse settings may be perceived by the target(s) as inappropriate and may be met with a negative response or a lack of social approval. Therefore, one plausible explanation for the positive association between the counter-normative score and ethanol use level is that such social disapproval for females results in higher levels of drinking.

Although a small but significantly positive relationship between different strategies in the same setting was found (e.g., direct and indirect at home; and direct and indirect at work) a stronger relationship was found between type of strategy across settings (e.g., direct at work and home; and indirect at work and home). Thus, women who use more direct strategies in a particular setting tend to use more indirect strategies as well in that same setting. Although individual differences in sheer use of strategies, regardless of setting and type of strategy occur, there is stronger evidence for cross situational use of specific types of power strategies. By contrast, total frequency of power strategy use, total frequency of indirect power strategy use, and total frequency of
direct power strategy use did not account for a significant amount of ethanol use variance. This suggests that sex role constraints depend on the target and/or situation.

Experts in power strategy research have implied that because directness is a more powerful approach it is a more valuable approach (Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Johnson, 1976, 1978). The implication that directness is a more valuable approach stems from research which suggests that an indirect influence tactic such as using helplessness to get one's way may be short-term effective. In the long run, however, the influence agent who uses helplessness is seen as incompetent, weak, and ineffective. This type of phenomenon is the crux of the double-bind for females—a circular dilemma which can be halted only by systematically identifying and eliminating sex role stereotypes (Johnson, 1982).

In terms of relationships with same-sex peers directness may be valuable and effective (Cowan et al., in press). Directness in influence tactics may also be valuable and effective for females when the target expects direct power strategy use or the situation itself is conducive to a direct approach—a task-oriented setting, for example. The marital contract, however, confers both legally and in terms
of social norms more power and status on males (Gillespie, 1976; Rosenfield, 1980). In general, then, females' use of direct strategies in marital relationships may not be effective due to the marital institution's structure which places females in a less powerful position. This is not to suggest that women should succumb to social and institutional pressures which channel them into indirect power strategy use; rather, an understanding that such pressures exist may be helpful in understanding female behavior in specific situations and also helpful in effecting the change that is necessary to provide women with greater access to more forms of power (Johnson, 1976).

There are of course alternative explanations for the counter-normative discrepancy scores' association with ethanol use level. For example, the possibility that ethanol use reduces the subjects' inhibitions making them feel freer to use a direct (nontraditional) approach with their spouse cannot be ruled out. Because interactions with one's spouse and drinking are more apt to occur in the home the "reduction of inhibitions" concept would hold for that behavioral setting and target. On the other hand, drinking is not likely to occur at work; hence, no lessening of inhibitions via alcohol use would occur in that setting.
and may explain the high-ethanol-use subjects more frequent use of indirectness with co-workers.

Several prior-research-prompted explanations of the counter-normative discrepancy scores' positive association with ethanol consumption level seem unlikely. First, that the high-ethanol users are simply more masculine (direct) in sex role orientation than their low-ethanol-use counterparts does not appear to hold. High-ethanol-use females are not generally more direct. The tendency for ethanol use to be positively associated with indirect power strategy use with one's co-workers does not fit that schema. Conversely, being more feminine (indirect) in sex role orientation does not explain the counter-normative discrepancy scores' association with ethanol use level. The high-ethanol-use subjects did not use higher feminine strategies in both settings. Similarly, the need for power concept suggested by McClelland et al. (1972) appears to have no accross-the-board explanatory value. Ethanol use level was not related to the frequency of use of more powerful (direct) strategies per se. Thus, a simplified gender-typed sex role explanation is inadequate. In sum, the counter-normative discrepancy score result seems to indicate that a strategy by situation approach is a more viable explanation of
ethanol use level than an individual or sex-typing approach.

Interestingly, the counter-normative discrepancy score and ethanol use level have a much higher correlation in younger women than in older subjects in the sample. Why should nontraditional use of direct strategies with one's spouse and use of indirect strategies with one's co-workers have a much stronger relationship to higher ethanol consumption levels in younger females in the sample? In a review of the stages of the female life cycle, Sales (1978) suggests that female sex role constraints tend to lessen with age. Specifically, Sales notes that the mid-life stage (48-60), which is referred to as the peak wife-dominance stage, is a reversal of the earlier marital structure. Therefore, older women may no longer feel as dependent on their spouses for approval. This phenomenon may also be facilitated by a corresponding decline in the husband's need to play his marital role according to social prescriptions (Sales, 1978). Older females, then, may receive less negative responses for counter-normative (nontraditional) sex role behaviors. A related factor may be that of greater life solidarity with increased age. For example, longevity in one's employment role should provide a sense of security and stability. In
addition, older females may have greater stability in their personal or intimate relationships. Thus, the need for social approval, both at home and at work, may have diminished for older females in our sample.

We suggest that the opposite set of circumstances may be occurring in the younger females. That is, younger females may have relatively unstabilized intimate and work relationships in comparison with the older females and may also have greater sex role demands/expectations placed upon them. By way of support, we note that the younger females in our sample are more apt to have children living at home, report a higher frequency of counter-normative power strategies, and also report greater levels of stress. In addition, the differential effect of counter-normative power strategy use on drinking is greater when subjects report higher stress levels. Therefore, the strong positive association of the counter-normative discrepancy score and ethanol use level in younger females strengthens the suggestion that sex role constraints interact with the situation.

In summary, of the psychosocial variables the counter-normative discrepancy score was the strongest predictor of ethanol use level. One plausible explanation for this relationship is found in sex role theory which suggests that individual response is
predicated on the expectations and demands of one's sex role. In this instance breaching (nonconformance with) expected behavioral patterns may result in a negative response or lack of approval by the target(s) and alcohol may be used to relieve stress brought about by such disapproval.

**Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5**

Although it was expected that the psychosocial variables of self-reported levels of stress, powerlessness, and perceived life control would be significantly associated with ethanol use level, no such associations occurred. On the other hand, two interactions of the psychosocial variables—stress with the counter-normative discrepancy score, and age with perceived life control—were related to drinking and will be discussed in a subsequent section dealing with the multiple regression analysis.

Several provocative relationships exist among the power strategy measures and other psychosocial variables in the study. As one might expect, people who perceived themselves as powerless used significantly greater levels of indirect strategies in both work and home situations. There was also a tendency, though not significant, for indirectness to be associated with lower levels of perceived life control. The relationship between self-reported stress and power
strategy use is not quite so clear. Stress was associated with all of the independent power strategy measures except direct power strategy use with one's spouse.

**Hypothesis 6**

It was expected that a positive response to the intrinsic reward question would be associated with lower ethanol use. In fact, just the opposite result occurred. Sixty percent of the sample responded that they would continue to be employed outside of the home even if it were not financially necessary. When Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1975) posed the same question to their employed female subjects, 59% gave a positive response.

On the one hand, the intrinsic reward result seems to mediate against the notion that multiple roles, in general, and the employment role specifically, are unduly stressful. Why would females wish to continue the financially unnecessary role of employee if that role created unduly stressful conditions for them? This seems to suggest that the employee status may provide a buffer against the traditional female social sex roles of wife, mother, or homemaker.

On the other hand, the desire to continue one's employment even when it is financially unnecessary is positively related to ethanol use. If satisfaction
with work provides a buffer or an important source of rewards for women, logically the presence of the buffer should mitigate against ethanol consumption.

Perhaps, however, intervening factors moderate the potential buffering effect of the employment role for females. For example, Keith and Schafer (1982) conducted a study regarding depression in employed females. The married employed subjects in that study held more conventional sex role attitudes than the unmarried employed subjects. Keith and Schafer's results indicated that nontraditional attitudes appeared to provide a buffer against depression for the unmarried employed females, but this same buffering effect did not occur in the married employed women.

Although sex role attitudes were not specifically measured in the present study, a phenomenon similar to Keith and Schafer's (1982) buffering effect could be occurring here. The overwhelming majority of our subjects are pre-liberation women in terms of age; hence, they may hold traditional sex role attitudes even though their long-term employment suggests they are nontraditional females. Schuckit and Morrissey (1976) found evidence that sex role confusion (e.g., women in nontraditional life styles who have conscious feminine values) may contribute to alcoholism in women.

It should be noted here that a substantial case
might also have been made for interrole or multiple role conflict if ethanol use level had been positively and significantly associated with the normative discrepancy score. High scores on direct power strategy use with one's co-workers and high indirect strategy use with one's spouse would indicate a high degree of social conformity to both situation and target demands/expectations. Such a finding would support Johnson's (1982) suggestion that a role stress process which is brought about by a clash between what people expect from a woman and what people expect from a worker may be related to alcohol use level. This study's results, however, support the position that nonconformance with situational demands/expectations is related to higher levels of ethanol use.

Two results should be mentioned in the context of role overload, defined as increasing responsibility due to multiple roles. The married employed females in the present sample report, on average, that 2.9 hours of their day is spent performing household chores and family oriented tasks. This figure is considerably less than the 4.6 hours per day reported by Robinson and Converse (1966). Moreover, this tasks variable is not significantly associated with ethanol use level which suggests, again, that no undue stress from multiple role responsibilities occurs in the present
sample. In addition, the subjects' self-reported level of stress due to work and family responsibilities is not significantly associated with ethanol use level.

**Sex of Supervisor and Sex of Co-workers**

No hypotheses were made regarding the subjects' ethanol use level and the employment situation variables of sex of supervisor and sex of co-workers; however, the results indicate that having a female supervisor and having female co-workers are positively and significantly related to ethanol use level. Perhaps some undetermined variables are moderators of these results. Feild and Caldwell (1978) found that with experience women are not more satisfied with male supervisors. However, the bulk of research and the current stereotype suggests that females prefer (are more satisfied) working for a male supervisor (Decker & Yoshihare, 1984; Kantor, 1976). Possibly female supervisors do not have the same resources or equal standing with male supervisors even though the females are organizationally on the same level (Kantor, 1976). If so, female supervisors might be unable to provide the same rewards and leader support that male supervisors of similar organizational levels could provide to their supervisees. One plausible explanation for the positive association between alcohol use level and having predominately female
co-workers is that these females may be in lower paying, lower status positions and thus experience greater stresses.

Unfortunately the sex of supervisor and sex of co-worker variables may simply be confounded due to the various levels of job status of the subjects. That is, the occupations of the subjects are varied. Nevertheless, these exploratory results seem worthy of future study. All this study provides is the setting condition and the outcome. More research regarding the intervening processes is necessary in order to make clearer inferences as to the processes underlying the outcome.

**Regression Analysis**

The results of the regression analysis suggest that a combination of psychosocial and situational factors predict alcohol consumption level to a considerable extent. That is, approximately 53% of the variance in ethanol can be predicted in this sample. This finding is particularly noteworthy because the subjects are solicited from the general population rather than being members of an alcohol treatment population.

Consistent with Johnson's (1982) research the demographic set of variables (I) is not a significant or strong predictor of ethanol use level. Moreover,
the demographic set was not expected to be a strong indicator in this sample because education and income ranges, for example, were not large. In other words, the sample was relatively homogeneous in terms of income and education. Age, however, appears to be a moderator or to have interactive effects in combination with other variables in the analysis. This issue will be addressed shortly.

Only two of the five pre-ordered sets of variables are statistically significant, Sets II and IV. For several reasons the strength of the alcohol situation variables (Set IV) of drinking at home and with one's family members is not an unusual result. First, the beverage of choice of the sample is wine. Previous research (Rodin et al., 1982) has indicated that wine drinking is related to drinking at home and in conjunction with meals and therefore related to drinking with family members. Previous research also suggests that higher-ethanol-use females tend to have spouses who tend to abuse alcohol (Mulford, 1980). Therefore, drinking with one's spouse and at home would be the normal course of events for higher-ethanol female users. The predictive strength of Set IV, then, is not only logical, but also consistent with previous research.

Although Set II, the psychosocial variables, is
a significant contributor of ethanol score variance, only the counter-normative discrepancy score is a unique contributor. Plausible explanations for this finding have been covered thoroughly in preceding sections and will not be reiterated here.

Two interactions do merit some mention at this point. First, the differential effect of counter-normative power strategy use on drinking is greater when the individual reports high stress as opposed to low stress. Stress alone, however, was not a predictor of ethanol use level. Stress is not significantly related to direct power strategy use with one's spouse (which is the major component of the counter-normative discrepancy score). This implies that stress may operate as a moderator of the effects of the counter-normative discrepancy score. Under high stress conditions the counter-normative power strategies are more strongly related to drinking level as was found with younger females in the sample.

A second significant interaction indicated that perceived life control and drinking are strongly related in older females. Under conditions of lower levels of perceived life control ethanol use level greatly increases in older subjects. Perhaps this is a response to dissatisfaction with one's life. As was alluded to earlier in the context of age and the
counter-normative discrepancy score, older age is a life stage when females would normally be experiencing a peak time in powerfulness vis-a-vis their spouses, and also experiencing greater solidarity and stability in their employment role and employment relationships; hence, would normally be experiencing a diminished need for social approval. To say this differently, life control would normally be relatively high for older females. Therefore, the perception that one has little control over one's life at this later stage of life may be particularly stressful.

Although only two of the five sets of variables entered into the regression analysis are significant, one must consider that the small sample size may be adversely affecting certain sets—particularly the lack of significance of the employment situation set of variables. If the effect of the employment situation set remained constant and the sample size were enlarged to 104 subjects, Set III would be significant. Similar research using a larger sample is called for to clarify that issue and to confirm the results of the present study. Nevertheless, this study does suggest that a significant amount of ethanol variance can be predicted from psychosocial and situational variables.

Relatively recently many behavioral science
investigators have come to understand that the psychology of males is not the psychology of females. As Miller (1976) so aptly states, "the human experience has obviously been divided in two—not down the middle, but somewhere askew of it" (p. 74). Miller suggests that women encounter many problems due to the dominant role that affiliation (hence social approval or the lack thereof) plays in their lives. Women are in a sense stressed (punished) for being selfless rather than selfish. Because women's experience is not the same as men's, women's drinking (like most other phenomena) can perhaps best be predicted from variables separate from men's drinking parameters.

Summary

Johnson's (1982) research suggested that a combination of statuses, being employed and being married, increases a female's risk for alcoholism. The present study examined a number of potential life problem areas for that increased-alcohol-risk population—married employed females. Because of the great interest and recent controversy over the impact of sex roles on mental health, and in response to previous studies relating sex role factors to alcohol use, this study's theoretical base is that of sex role theory. Power is a central issue; hence, the
psychosocial variables examined different aspects of power--power strategy tactics, perceived powerlessness, and perceived life control--as well as self-reported levels of stress.

The focal point within the psychosocial variables is the use of power strategies by married employed females in two specific situations, and the relationship between strategy use and ethanol use level. In this sample, nonnormative behavior appears to be the common link to situationally unrewarded behavior. Moreover, the study clearly points out that no simplistic explanation in terms of role overload or sex role personality traits holds for the sample. Rather, an outcome-based situational approach appears more viable.

In terms of future research, more attention should be given to situational parameters when investigating power strategy use. In addition, more in-depth research regarding employment situation variables and ethanol use level seem appropriate and possibly helpful in understanding married employed females' alcohol use and abuse.

If, as Johnson (1982) points out, married employed women are simply conforming to heavier drinking norms, women alcoholics will probably increase in number as the proportion of women in the labor force
increases. However, if married employed females' alcohol use is affected by current sex role stereotypes, demands, expectations, or discrimination, a resolution of the problem can be effected not only by helping women cope with these stresses, but also by helping society redefine sex role expectations and demands (Beckman, 1975). Although our results suggest that drinking can be predicted by psychosocial and situational variables, a greater understanding of female alcohol use and abuse depends upon more in-depth research regarding intervening processes.
APPENDIX A

Sample Questionnaire

Please answer all questions with the response you feel is most appropriate for you. When any question is left unanswered or inadvertently left blank, critical information is lost. Thank you for your interest and accuracy in completing this questionnaire.

1. How old are you? ____ years
2. How many children do you have?____
3. How many of your children are currently living with you? ____
4. Are you: ____ a. married ____ b. separated or divorced
   ____ c. never married ____ d. widowed
5. Please indicate the level of your education:
   ____ a. High School graduate
   ____ b. Business School or Special Training
   ____ c. Community College Degree
   ____ d. Baccalaureate College Degree
   ____ e. Graduate or Professional School
   ____ f. Other: (specify) __________________
6. Are you currently employed? ____ Yes ____ No
   If yes, how many hours a week do you work? ____
7. What is your occupation? __________________
8. Are you married to or do you have an intimate relationship with a person of the opposite sex?
   ___ Yes    ___ No

9. How many years have you been employed? ____

10. Do you work in a supervisory capacity?
    ___ Yes    ___ No

11. Is your immediate supervisor: ___ Male ___ Female

12. Most of my co-workers are:
    ___ Male    ___ Female
    ___ An equal number of each sex

13. Is your annual family income:
    ___ a. $ 6,000 or less
    ___ b. $ 6,001 - $11,000
    ___ c. $11,001 - $18,000
    ___ d. $18,001 - $35,000
    ___ e. $35,001 - $50,000
    ___ f. $50,001 or more

14. If you were to get enough money to live as comfortably as you would like for the rest of your life, would you continue to work?
    ___ Yes    ___ No

15. Approximately how many hours per day do you spend performing household chores or family oriented services? (Please circle the number that comes closest to being the correct response for you.)
   1  2  3  4  5  6+ (hours per day)
The following questions deal with "How I get my way."

16. How often do you argue your point logically or reason with your spouse or intimate partner in order to get your way?
   4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

17. How often do you mislead and/or tell "white lies" in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
   4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

18. How often do you tell your spouse or intimate partner to do what you want in order to get your own way?
   4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

19. How often do you discuss your differences or talk about them in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
   4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

20. How often do you drop hints in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
   4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

21. How often do you ask your spouse or intimate
partner to do what you want in order to get your way?

__ 1. Never    __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

22. How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?

__ 1. Never    __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

23. How often do you become silent and/or withdraw in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?

__ 1. Never    __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

24. How often do you show negative feelings (for example: sadness, anger, getting upset) in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?

__ 1. Never    __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

25. How often do you show positive feelings (for example: smile, use flattery, or attempt to put your spouse or intimate partner in a "good mood") in order to get your way?

__ 1. Never    __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
26. How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

27. How often do you negotiate or compromise in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

28. How often do you become silent and/or withdraw in order to get your way with your co-workers?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

29. How often do you ask your co-workers to do what you want in order to get your way?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

30. How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your co-workers?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes

31. How often do you drop hints in order to get your way with your co-workers?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
32. How often do you tell your co-workers to do what you want in order to get your way?

33. How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with your co-workers?

34. How often do you argue your point logically or use reasoning to get your way with your co-workers?

35. How often do you show negative feelings (for example: sadness, anger, getting upset) in order to get your way with your co-workers?

36. How often do you discuss your differences or talk about them in order to get your way with your co-workers?

37. How often do you mislead and/or tell "white lies" in order to get your way with your co-workers?
___ 1. Never ___ 2. Rarely ___ 3. Sometimes
4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always
38. How often do you negotiate or compromise to get your way with your co-workers?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
39. How often do you show positive feelings (for example: smile, use flattery, or attempt to put your co-workers in a "good mood") in order to get your way?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
The following questions concern stressful situations.
40. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your work responsibilities?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
41. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your relationships with your co-workers?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
42. How frequently do you feel that your job outside of the home may interfere with your family life?
   __ 1. Never  __ 2. Rarely  __ 3. Sometimes
43. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your responsibilities at home?
4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

44. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your relationship with your spouse or intimate partner?
4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

45. How frequently do you feel that your family life may interfere with your job outside of the home?
4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

46. How often do you feel powerless in your relationships with your co-workers?
4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

47. How often do you feel powerless in your relationship with your spouse or intimate partner?
4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

The following questions concern personal control.
(Please circle the number that comes closest to being the correct response for you.)

48. To what extent do you feel you have control over the major parts of your life?
49. To what extent have you been able to plan ahead and control your future by careful planning?

50. To what extent do you have a feeling of personal power and control over what happens to you?

51. To what extend do you feel that nothing you do makes any difference?

52. To what extent do you feel powerless over what happens to you?

53. To what extent do you feel a sense of personal control over your intimate relationships?
The following questions concern alcohol.

54. Have you, within the last year, ever drunk wine, liquor, or beer?  ___ Yes  ___ No

If your answer was "no," you need not answer any further questions.

55. How often do you usually have a glass of wine?

___ 1. Never
___ 2. About 3 times a year
___ 3. About 6 times a year
___ 4. About 9 times a year
___ 5. About once a month
___ 6. 2-3 times a month
___ 7. 1-2 times a week
___ 8. 3-4 times a week
___ 9. 5-6 times a week
___10. Once a day
___11. 2 times a day
___12. 3 times a day

5. When you drink wine, how many glasses do you usually have on each occasion? (Please circle one of the numbers below.)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9+ glasses per occasion
57. How often do you usually have a drink of liquor?
   ___ 1. Never
   ___ 2. About 3 times a year
   ___ 3. About 6 times a year
   ___ 4. About 9 times a year
   ___ 5. About once a month
   ___ 6. 2-3 times a month
   ___ 7. 1-2 times a week
   ___ 8. 3-4 times a week
   ___ 9. 5-6 times a week
   ___10. Once a day
   ___11. 2 times a day
   ___12. 3 times a day

58. When you drink liquor, how many dranks do you usually have on each occasion?
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9+ drinks per occasion

59. How often do you usually drink beer?
   ___ 1. Never
   ___ 2. About 3 times a year
   ___ 3. About 6 times a year
   ___ 4. About 9 times a year
   ___ 5. About once a month
   ___ 6. 2-3 times a month
   ___ 7. 1-2 times a week
   ___ 8. 3-4 times a week
9. 5-6 times a week

10. Once a day

11. 2 times a day

12. 3 times a day

60. When you drink beer, how many beers do you usually have on each occasion?

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9+ beers per occasion

61. How would you describe your drinking?

1. Very Light

2. Light

3. Light Moderate

4. Moderate

5. Heavy Moderate

6. Heavy

7. Very Heavy

62. Where do you drink most often?

1. At home

2. Outside of your home

63. Who is most often with you when you drink?

1. Friends

2. Family

3. Alone
### APPENDIX B

**Occupations of the Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional/Technical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers, bankers, real estate</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Sales</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Perceived Life Control, Scale and Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>very little</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>a great deal</td>
<td>control</td>
<td>of control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions:

1. To what extent do you feel you have control over the major parts of your life?

2. To what extent have you been able to plan ahead and control your future by careful planning?

3. To what extent do you have a feeling of personal power and control over what happens to you?

4. To what extent do you feel a sense of personal control over your intimate relationships?
APPENDIX D

Self-reported Stress Scale and Questions

Never _____ 2. Rarely _____ 3. Sometimes

Questions:
1. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your work responsibilities?
2. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your relationships with your co-workers?
3. How frequently do you feel that your job outside the home may interfere with your family life?
4. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your responsibilities at home?
5. How frequently do you experience stress or tension due to your relationship with your spouse or intimate partner?
6. How frequently do you feel that your family life may interfere with your job outside the home?
APPENDIX E

Direct Power Strategy Use in Intimate Relationship, Scale and Questions

   4. Often   5. Very Often   6. Always

Questions:

1. How often do you argue your point logically or reason with your spouse or intimate partner in order to get your way?

2. How often do you tell your spouse or intimate partner to do what you want in order to get your own way?

3. How often do you discuss your differences or talk about them in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?

4. How often do you ask your spouse or intimate partner to do what you want in order to get your way?

5. How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?

6. How often do you negotiate or compromise in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
APPENDIX F

Direct Power Strategy Use With Co-workers, Scale and Questions

4. Often 5. Very Often 6. Always

Questions:
1. How often do you ask your co-workers to do what you want in order to get your way?
2. How often do you state the importance of an issue in order to get your way with your co-workers?
3. How often do you tell your co-workers to do what you want in order to get your way?
4. How often do you argue your point logically or use reasoning to get your way with your co-workers?
5. How often do you discuss your differences or talk about them in order to get your way with your co-workers?
6. How often do you negotiate or compromise to get your way with your co-workers?
APPENDIX G

Indirect Power Strategy Use in Intimate Relationship, Scale and Questions

4. Often  5. Very Often  6. Always

Questions:
1. How often do you mislead and/or tell "white lies" in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
2. How often do you drop hints in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
3. How often do you become silent and/or withdraw in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
4. How often do you show negative feelings (for example: sadness, anger, getting upset) in order to get your way with your spouse or intimate partner?
5. How often do you show positive feelings (for example: smile, use flattery, or attempt to put your spouse or intimate partner in a "good mood") in order to get your way?
6. How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with
(Appendix G continued)

your spouse or intimate partner?
APPENDIX H

Indirect Power Strategy Use With Co-workers, Scale and Questions

_____ 1. Never  ____ 2. Rarely  ____ 3. Sometimes

Questions:
1. How often do you become silent and/or withdraw in order to get your way with your co-workers?
2. How often do you drop hints in order to get your way with your co-workers?
3. How often do you use "helplessness" or pretend to be unable to do something in order to get your way with your co-workers?
4. How often do you show negative feelings (for example: sadness, anger, getting upset) in order to get your way with your co-workers?
5. How often do you mislead and/or tell "white lies" in order to get your way with your co-workers?
6. How often do you show positive feelings (for example: smile, use flattery, or attempt to put your co-workers in a "good mood") in order to get your way?
# APPENDIX I

**Standard American Equivalents of Alcohol**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wine</strong></td>
<td>(15% ethanol)</td>
<td>1 glass = 4 ounces alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquor</strong></td>
<td>(45% ethanol)</td>
<td>1 drink = 1 ounce alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beer</strong></td>
<td>(4% ethanol)</td>
<td>1 drink = 12 ounces alcohol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Participant,

Until quite recently, employed women have received little specific attention in social science research. There is, therefore, a pressing need for information concerning the attitudes, interests, values and problems of employed women. The following questionnaire is part of a Master's Thesis undertaken at CSCSB. The questions that follow deal with how women get their way in various situations; what levels of stress and satisfaction are present in women's lives; and what types of input women feel they have in regard to the direction of their lives. Because there are few studies concerning the general level of alcohol use in adult women, we are also interested in employed women's use of alcohol.

There are no "right" or "wrong" answers to any of the questions; moreover, your responses will be kept strictly confidential and anonymous. To that end, we ask that you do not place your name on any page of the questionnaire. In order to ensure that your participation in this study is on a completely voluntary basis, you may withdraw as a participant at
any time during the administration of the questionnaire.

A brief, written summary of the results of the present study will be provided the president of your organization who will see that individual copies are made available to all interested participants. In the event that your group expresses a desire for an oral presentation of the study's results, as well as a question and answer period dealing with its contents, that will also be provided.

Thank you for your interest and participation.

Sincerely,

Rosemary May
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