

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE POWER/CONTROL SCALES

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Georgi Vladislavovich Kroupin

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

William Doherty, Ph.D, adviser, Shonda Craft, Ph.D, co-adviser

September 2011

© Georgi V. Kroupin 2011

Acknowledgements

The foundation of this project was built in my work with Dr. James Maddock to whom I am grateful for mentorship and support, but most importantly, for the contagious passion for scientific research. I also want to express my sincere appreciation for the guidance and patience of Dr. Shonda Craft who made the completion of this project possible. I want to express my deep respect for Dr. William Doherty, my first teacher and mentor, for his teaching, his respect for students and his passion for social change based on personal responsibility. Through my years in the Family Social Science Department I always felt supported and encouraged by Dr. Pauline Boss, Dr. Paul Rosenblatt and Dr. Kathryn Rettig. Finally my big Thank You goes to the department staff, most importantly to Kathy Witherow, Lorraine Haley and Roberta Daigle for their eternal patience and kindness.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to Dr. James Maddock, my teacher and a man with a curious mind and true inspiration.

Abstract

The present study used a rather new instrument, the *Power/Control Scales (P/C-S)* to examine its reliability, factor structure and concurrent and discriminant validity. It used a convenience sample of 158 couples - graduate and undergraduate students--and their partners--at the University of Minnesota. Power/Control Scales (P/C-S) was found to be a reliable instrument. However, in contrast to the original theoretical conceptualization, constructs of “Power” and “Control” were found to be highly correlated. Analysis of correlations between the original “Power” and “Control” scales and similar SCI scales and between the original “Power” and “Control” scales and dissimilar SCI provided some support for the concurrent and discriminant validity of the P/C-S. Exploratory factor analysis provided limited support for the proposed four-factor structure (“Power”, “Control”, “Self”, “Other”) of the instrument. Although data analysis resulted in a clear difference between “Self” and “Other” for all subsets of data , only factors 3 and 4 resulting from the Varimax rotation of the male data provided partial support for the existence of the separate constructs of “Power” and “Control”. The subsets of “Power” and “Control” items in the newly identified factors seemed to represent constructs that are different form the originally defined “Power” and “Control” constructs. The new factors were labeled “Active/Enabling Influence” and “Passive/Inhibiting Influence”. A model of analyzing “Power” and “Control” dynamics in close relationships was introduced based on a redefined constructs and possible practical implications of the proposed model were discussed.

Keywords: *power, control, close relationships, instrument development.*

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
Introduction	
Theoretical base for the Power/Control Scales	1
The Dynamics of Power/Control and Gender	2
Purpose of the study and research questions	3
Method	
Sample	4
Instrumentation	5
Data Analysis	7
Results	
P/C-S Reliability Analysis	8
Factor Analysis, Unrotated Solutions	9
Factor Analysis, Unrotated Solutions	10
Correlations Between PCS and SCI Items Scales	14
Concurrent Validity	15
Discriminant Validity	16
Discussion	16
Conclusion	21
References	26
Appendix A	29
Appendix B	53
Appendix C	58

List of Tables

Table 1. Chronbach α and Spearman/Brown ρ Reliability for the Four Scales of the P/C-S Separately and Combined	29
Table 2 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Total Subjects	30
Table 3 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Male Subjects	33
Table 4 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Female Subjects	36
Table 5 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Total Subjects	39
Table 6 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Male Subjects	42
Table 7 Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Female Subjects	45
Table 8 Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Total Subjects	48
Table 9 Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Male Subjects	49
Table 10 Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Female Subjects	50

Table 11	
Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Total Subjects	51
Table 12	
Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Male Subjects	51
Table 13	
Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Female Subjects	52

Validity and reliability of the power/control scales

Introduction

Issues of power and control in close relationships have drawn attention from researchers, particularly in family science, over the past half-century. Power/control (P/C) dynamics are believed to be important components of close relationships, with particular significance for cross-gender interaction (Heatherington, 1990; Gray-Little & Burks, 1983; Jacobson & Gottman, 1998; Kantor & Jasinski, 1998; Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Stock, 1985; Tiffany & Tiffany, 2000). Distortions appear to set the stage for conflict, abuse and even violence. The study reported here focused on a rather new instrument, the *Power/Control Scales* (P/C-S) (Maddock, 1990) to examine its reliability, factor structure and validity based on a sample of 158 couples at a large Midwestern university. This paper will describe possible modifications of the original constructs based on the results of an exploratory factor analysis and introduce a theoretical model for describing P/C dynamics in close relationships.

Theoretical base for the Power/Control Scales

The instrument in study, Power/Control Scales, was built by Maddock (1993, 1995), who, working within a systemic/ecological paradigm, conceptualized power and control as a single dialectical construct with reciprocally related components. In view of the fact that previous research on couples and families often has produced inconsistent results based upon a great diversity of conceptual and operational definitions, Maddock utilized basic dictionary definitions. The uniqueness of his approach lies in highlighting the dialectical aspects of couple and family relationships (Maddock, 1993; Maddock & Larson, 1995; Pence, 1988).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Maddock used a dictionary definition of the concept of power as "the capacity to influence." Interpersonally, he saw power as the capacity to use oneself to have an impact on others. He conceptualized power as an interactive phenomenon, something that exists *between* rather than within persons (Cromwell & Olson, 1975; Maddock, 1993).

Maddock defined control as reciprocal to power, that is, as "the capacity to restrain or regulate (influence)." From his point of view, control conveys the sense of shaping or channeling, establishing the limits within which power can be expressed. In this paradigm, interpersonally, control is the capacity to regulate the impact of others upon oneself; it can occur in an active or passive manner. However, like power, Maddock saw control as an interactive phenomenon—something occurring *between* alternatives. In this view, power and control are each interactive concepts that can be best understood in relation to each other. Defined as above, a deeper meaning arises out of the tension between them. Following this logic Maddock combined the two terms into a single dialectical construct: *power/control*.

The Dynamics of Power/Control and Gender

Distinguishing power and control in this way may be potentially useful in understanding what are often referred to as "power struggles" in close relationships such as marriage. This approach focuses on *process* rather than outcome. Ideally, a balance of power/control, both within and between partners, is achieved in a close relationship. Systems characterized by an overall balance of power/control are better able to maintain *reciprocity* in interactions (internal systemic processes) and transactions (external ecosystemic processes). At the macro-systemic and institutional levels, this can be referred to as "*coordination*;" at the micro-systemic and interpersonal levels, as

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

"*mutuality*." In human transactions characterized by mutuality, the contributions of both parties are influential to the outcome, and regulation is a shared endeavor (Erikson, 1959, 1963). Put another way, in a relationship characterized by balanced power/control, each partner can be both *a part of* the relationship as a participant and *apart from* the relationship as an individual.

The fact that there is power differences linked to gender is widely recognized. However, a more detailed and complex picture is obtained when the entire power/control dialectic is understood in relation to gender. Traditional sex-segregated cultures, even today, orient males toward power and reward them primarily for expressions of power from an early age, while orienting and rewarding females primarily for expressions of control. Conflict may ensue when women expand their expressions of power beyond the narrowly defined channels of social interaction that they control; for example, when their actions challenge the ultimate social authority of their husbands as "heads" of the family (Imber-Black, 1988; Luepnitz, 1988; Thorne & Yalom, 1982).

Interpersonal conflict patterns *between* the genders also reflect the distortions of power/control. Open and direct conflict, particularly involving expressions of aggression, reflects power dynamics, while distancing behaviors reflect primarily control dynamics. Research on marital interaction (e.g., Gottman, 1994, 1999; Tannen, 1990) suggests that women and men experience conflict differently—and behave somewhat differently in conflict situations (although there are similarities as well).

Purpose of the study and research questions

Based on the theoretical framework described above, and given previous research evidence that Power/Control Scales has the potential to tap into this aspect of couple relationships, this study was designed to investigate the reliability and validity of the Power/Control Scales (P/C-S). Present exploratory study was guided by the following four general areas of inquiry, each of which was divided into more specific research questions:

- 1. What is the reliability of the P/C-S?*
- 2. Is the 4-factor structure proposed by Maddock (self-control, self-power, other-control, other-power) upheld ?*
- 3. What is the concurrent validity of the P/C-S C-S?*
- 4. What is the discriminant validity of the P/C-S?*

Method

Sample

This study employed a convenience sample of subjects recruited from a population of graduate and undergraduate students--and their partners--taking family related courses at a large, Midwestern research-oriented university. Participants were recruited through 30 minute class presentations by the primary investigator, introducing an ecological conceptualization of Power/Control in couple relationships, and briefly describing the P/C-S. Only those students who were in a "long-term committed relationship" (defined as a relationship lasting at least three months) were invited to participate. Volunteers took survey booklets and demographic information sheets for

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

themselves and their partners to complete. To decrease influence (or bias) in responses, each partner was instructed not to share their answers with the other partner, as it would undermine the validity of the results. Participants were instructed to return completed surveys to the primary investigator in separate sealed envelopes. The final number of couples whose data were analyzed in the study was 158. Response rate has not been calculated in this study.

The age range for the sample was 19-57 years, with a mean of 24.23 for females, and a mean of 25.65 for males. The majority of respondents were European-American/Caucasian (88.5% of females and 86.1% of males). Religious affiliation was mixed, with three major groupings: Protestant (45.2% females and 35.0% males), Roman Catholic (30.6% female and 32.5% male), and Atheist (15.3% females and 19.1% males), while the rest of the subjects indicated "Other".

Reporting on the current status of their relationship, roughly 17% of the respondents said they were married; 60% reported they were dating; 10% listed their status as "living together, not married;" and 7% said they were engaged. Duration of reported relationships ranged from four months to 30 years (360 months). Its distribution was positively skewed, with a mean duration of around 44.5 months.

Instrumentation

Present study employed two instruments: Power/Control Scales (Maddock, 1985) and Styles of Conflict Inventory (Metz & Dwyer, 1993; Metz, 1998). P/C-S was analyzed to investigate its reliability and factor structure. Comparing sets of P/C-S and SCI scales based on the similarity of constructs behind them and on the similarity of particular items

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

describing behaviors, cognitions and perceptions was used to establish the convergent and discriminant validity of the P/C-S.

P/C-S (*Appendix B*) is an instrument created by James Maddock based on his conceptualization of power/control dialectics in close relationships and his work in the areas of domestic abuse and violence. This version of the P/C-S consisted of four scales of 25 questions each (100 items total), measuring Self-Power (SP), Other-Power (OP), Self-Control (SC), and Other-Control (OC). The items from the four scales are randomly mixed, and each item is answered on a 5-point Likert scale with response choices from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree”. Thus the scores for each scale range from 25 to 125, with higher scores indicating a stronger presence of the construct represented by this particular scale.

The Styles of Conflict Inventory (SCI) (Metz & Dwyer, 1993; Metz, 1998) is a 71 item, self-report inventory, which measures 12 Appraisal of Conflict items and 16 styles of Conflict used by partners in a situation of disagreement in an intimate relationship (*Appendix C*). The 12 Appraisal of Conflict items measure couple’s attributions about frequency and intensity of conflict, responsibility for conflict, power, level of distress, optimism about conflict resolution, and effort to resolve disagreements.

The Styles of Conflict scales categorize individual reactions into “engaging” versus “avoiding” response styles to conflict. These two general styles are measured through assessing each partner’s Cognition, Behavior and his/her Perception of his partner’s behavior. There are four Cognition scales (Assertion, Aggression, Submission, and Denial), six Behavior and six corresponding Perception (i.e., perception-of partner’s

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

behavior) scales (Assertion, Verbal Aggression, Physical Aggression, Withdrawal, Submission, and Denial).

Responses regarded as Verbal Aggression (VA), Physical Aggression (PA) and Global Aggression (GA) are negative, coercive responses aimed at compelling compliance and are conceptually similar to some “power” items of the P/C-S. Withdrawal scale captures avoidance behaviors such as shunning conflict or drawing back with such items like “unwilling to talk” or “staying away from partner”. Withdrawal Avoidance (WA) items are similar to “control” items of the P/C-S. Adaptation Engagement scales are based on the construct of adaptive conflict resolution such as using play or humor in dealing with conflict, and are different from constructs behind all P/C-S scales. The last scale, Denial, is targeted at “avoidance” by disowning, discounting, or failing to acknowledge disagreement. DA scales measures relational reality similar to the control scales of the P/S-C. Each SCI Behavior and Cognitions item has a corresponding Perception of Partner’s Behavior item.

Data Analysis

To answer the research questions the following steps in the data analysis were taken:

1. Reliability of the P/C-S as a whole and reliability of its individual scales was measured using Chronbach’s alpha reliability analysis.
- 2, Factor structure of the P/C-S was explored using both unrotated and Varimax rotated solutions.
- 3, Concurrent validity of the P/C-S was tested through comparing it with SCI scales that are conceptually similar and contain similar items describing behaviors, cognitions and

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

perceptions. Where P/C-S “Self” scales were compared to SCI Behavior and Cognitions scales, the corresponding P/C-S “Other” scales were compared to Perception scales.

- SP scale of the P/C-S was compared to the SCI scales of Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression and General Aggression Cognitions and Behaviors
- OP scale of the P/C-S was compared to the SCI scales of Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression and General Aggression Perceptions
- SC scale of the P/C-S was compared to the SCI scales of Withdrawal Avoidance and Denial Avoidance in Cognitions and Behaviors
- OC scale of the P/C-S was compared to the SCI scales of Withdrawal Avoidance and Denial Avoidance in Perceptions

4, Discriminant validity of the P/C-S was tested through comparing it with SCI scales that are conceptually different.

- All four P/C-S scales were compared with conceptually different Adaptive Engagement Behaviors and Adaptive Engagement perceptions scales of the SCI.

Results

P/C-S Reliability Analysis

Chronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated using the entire sample of respondents for each subscale and for the total P/C-S to determine the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument. Reliability analysis for the whole instrument as well as for separate scales yielded high alpha values: .92 (.91 for males and .92 for females). Analysis of the four scales provided the following results: Self-Power $\alpha = .84$ (males = .85; females = .83); Self-Control $\alpha = .77$ (males = .77; females = .78);

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Other-Power $\alpha = .86$ (males $= .84$; females $= .88$); Other-Control $\alpha = .84$ (males $= .82$; females $= .85$) (Table 1). Spearman/Brown ρ coefficients for the whole instrument were calculated to determine split-half reliability of the P/C-S. Analysis yielded equal values for the total subjects, male and female subsamples with $\rho = .87$.

Factor Analysis, Unrotated Solutions

Exploratory factor analysis of the full data set, and of male and female subsamples, was performed as a next step in data analysis. According to the original theoretical conceptualization which identified four dimensions in the P/C-S, a four factor model was explored, and simple unrotated solutions and solutions with Varimax rotation were attempted. A cutoff score of loadings of 0.4 and higher was used to identify potential factors in this procedure (reference the standard).

An unrotated four factor solution for the full set of data yielded mixed results. Although 33 out of 39 factor I items (Table 2) represented “other” items, the presence of 6 “self” items makes it difficult to interpret this set as reflecting a coherent construct. The second factor was a mixture of SC and SP items (12 items, Table 2) and was labeled as “Self-Influence”. Only three items loaded on the third factor: “My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (#49 OP), “My partner influences my actions” (#54 OP), and “I influence my partner's actions” (#66 SP). Although very few and representing different proposed scales, these items can be grouped as representing the construct of “Mutual influence”. The fourth factor was represented by only one item “I am better than my partner at being silent” (#87 SC).

Factor I of male data contained both “self” and “other” items from all four scales and could not be interpreted meaningfully (38 items, Table 3). Factor II items (7 items,

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 3), besides all being “self” items, also represented active or enabling influence thus it was called “Active/Enabling Self Influence” Factor III in an unrotated solution was represented by 5 items, three of which were worded in terms of influence partners have on each other in their relationship (Table 3). Items #50 “My partner tries to keep things the same in our relationship” and #62 My partner makes it clear to me when he/she is interested in being sexual, although worded differently, seems to be reflecting similar concept of engaging or constructive influence. Based on this similarity 3d factor could be called “Mutual Engaging Influence”. The fourth factor resulting from the unrotated analysis of male data contains only two items and both represent passive forms of influence (Table 3). As both items in this factor are “self” items, it can be labeled as “Self Influence through Passivity/Avoidance”.

The first factor in the analysis of female data was a mix of items which could not be fit in any one construct (39 items, Table 4). Similar to factor II in male data, items in female factor II (18 items, Table 4), with the exception of items #98 and #17, represent active/enabling relational patterns thus it was also labeled “Active/Enabling Self-Influence”. Third factor contained 3 items all representing “other” influence (Table 4). In addition to that, all three items reflect various forms of indirect/passive influence and thus this factor could be labeled as “Indirect/Passive Other Influence”. Factor 4 of this solution contains only one item (Table 4) and thus cannot be interpreted in any meaningful way.

Factor Analysis, Unrotated Solutions

Varimax rotation of a full set of data with the same cutoff scores of 0.4 yielded a surprisingly clear factor structure for at least 3 factors. The first factor included 29 items

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

all of them representing OP and OC scales of the P/C-S with the exception of one item (#48) which represented SP scale but had a negative loading (Table 5). In the process of scale construction this was one of the items introduced to cross check the consistency of the scale and according to the P/C-S manual scores for this item should be multiplied by -1 and used as an indicator of OP. Loadings on the first newly identified factor varied from 0.405 to 0.681. This new factor was labeled “Other Influence”.

With equal clarity the second newly identified factor consisted of 26 items representing SP and SC scales with only one item from the OP scale (#24) which also was introduced to cross check the consistency of the scale and should be multiplied by -1 and used as an indicator of SP. Loadings on this second newly identified factor varied from 0.401 to 0.702. This new factor was labeled “Self Influence”.

The picture with the third factor resulting from this analysis was more mixed. It had 9 items that loaded above 0.4, ranging from 0.40 to 0.58 (Table 5). Several items from this factor described aggressive or harmful behaviors such as item #4 “My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him” (originally OC scale), or item #26 “I threaten to harm my partner” (originally SP scale). It also included more neutral items such as #1 “I seek change in our relationship” (SP) and a reverse OP item #39; #13 “I am judgmental of my partner” item (SC) and a reverse OC item #58. This third factor can be seen as representing assertive/aggressive behaviors towards the other partner and thus can be labeled as such (“Mutual Aggressive/Assertive Influence”). It’s important to say that items representing direct physical aggression #15 “I physically attack my partner” (SP) and the reverse item #21 did not load significantly on this or any other factors.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Loadings on factor four in this analysis were low with only 2 items with loading values above 0.4 (Table 16). These were items #11 “My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting” (OC) and #87 “I am better than my partner at being silent” (OC). Although few, both of them clearly represent passive/avoidant behaviors and it is logical to identify the fourth new factor as “Passive/Inhibiting Influence”.

Similar to the total data, the first two factors resulting from a factor analysis of the male data represented “Other Influence” and “Self Influence” respectively. Third factor was represented by both “self” and “other” items. It included 13 items and 9 of them related to aggressive or even harmful interactions between partners (Table 6). All items with the highest loadings on factor 3 belong to this first group. Item #40 “I say “no” to my partner” (SC), although doesn’t relate to aggression, may certainly represent assertive behaviors. Two other items, #1 “I seek change in our relationship” (SP) and #39 “My partner seeks change in our relationship” (OP), even though they don’t directly relate to any interpersonal aggression or assertion, may reflect challenges to the existence of the relationship itself and thus may be perceived as threat and fall into the same category as aggressive/assertive behaviors. Item # 75 “I have to guess at what my partner wants” (OC) is the only item does not seem to fit this pattern. With all the above similarities between the items in mind this third factor, similarly to factor 3 for the full set of data, can be labeled as “Mutual Assertive/Aggressive Influence”. Factor 4 contains only 3 items (Table 6). All of these items are “other” items and although it is difficult to provide a meaningful interpretation for such a small group of items, it can be hypothesized that they represent the construct of “Other Indirect Influence”.

The first two factors in a factor analysis of the female data were similar to both

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

total and male sets of data representing “other” and “self” influences respectively (Table 7). However, in addition to representing “self influence” 11 out of 14 items on factor 2 represented “Power” items. Out of the three remaining items SC item #18 “I am better than my partner at keeping things from happening in this relationship” is very similar to a SP item #6 “ I am better than my partner at making things happen in this relationship”. Although intended to represent opposing theoretical constructs, these items seem to allude to very similar relational patterns of “active/enabling self-influence”. Same could be said about the other two SC items in this factor: #37 “I control my partner when he/she is around me” and #60 “I control more things in this relationship than my partner does”. Similarly, last two items, although using the word “control” and alluding to the same theoretical construct, clearly represent an active stance in a relationship. With this interpretation the third factor can be labeled as “Active/enabling Self Influence”.

Factor 3 of the female data to some extent confirms this hypothesis. It contains 10 items 8 of which are SC items (Table 7). While items #87 “I am better than my partner at being silent” (SC) and #98 “I can hold out longer than my partner can” represent behaviors with very low level of activity or lack thereof several other items, such as #2 “I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do” (SC), #14 “There are things I won’t let my partner do” (SC) and #85 “I tell my partner not to do certain things” (SC) also relate to relational patterns inhibiting activity. Even item #57 “I am able to control what my partner says”, although worded in an active form in essence means that one can tell his partner to shut up as opposed to the item #37 “I control my partner when she/he is around me” (factor 2) which has a more active meaning of “managing” other person’s behavior (with active verbal or active non-verbal cues).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Two items on this scale, however, are significantly different. Item #63 “I force my partner to do things she/he does not want to do” (SP) and #64 “I demand my partner obeys my wishes” (SP) clearly relate to very active if not forceful relational patterns which makes it difficult to explain how they fit with the rest of the items in this factor. With the exception of the above mentioned two items though, this factor can be labeled as “Passive/Inhibiting Self Influence”.

Factor 4 of the female date included 7 items 3 of which were "OP" items, one "SP" item and two SC item (Table 7). This group includes very diverse items and is very difficult to interpret other than "Mutual Engaging Influence".

Correlations Between PCS and SCI Items Scales

The next step in the analysis of data was to investigate convergent validity of P/C-S through correlations of P/C-S scales with certain scales of SCI. P/C-S scale of SP was compared to SCI scales of Verbal Aggression (VA), Physical Aggression (PA) and Global Aggression (GA) on Behaviors dimension, while OP of the P/C-S was compared to the same scales on SCI Perceptions dimension. P/C-S Self-Control Scales were compared to Withdrawal Avoidance (WA) and Denial Avoidance (DA) scales on both SCI Cognitions and Behaviors dimensions scales as representing similar or close constructs. P/C-S Other Control was compared to both WA and DA scales on SCI Perceptions dimension.

In addition to the analysis described above, correlations between the four P/C-S scales and SCI Adaptation Engagement Behaviors (AEB) and Adaptation Engagement Perceptions (AEP) scales were analyzed to explore the discriminant validity of the P/C-S.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Adaptation Engagement scale contain such items as #81 “Tries to play or act silly about the issue” or #104 “Finds a way to laugh about it together”. These scales seem to represent a construct reflecting the use of cooperation or peacemaking in dealing with relational matters, which is conceptually different from constructs behind all P/C-S scales based on competition or winning vs. losing.

Concurrent Validity

Total data. Analysis of correlations between conceptually similar P/C-S and SCI scales for total subjects data revealed low to moderate level correlations between the relevant scales (Table 8). P/C-S SP scale correlated significantly with Behaviors dimension VA, PA and GA scales (.41, .30 and .39 respectively, all at $p < .01$). Similarly, OP scale correlated with SCI Perceptions dimension VA, PA and GA scales at somewhat higher levels (.51, .53 and .55 respectively, all at $p < .01$).

P/C-S SC scale was significantly correlated with WA and DA SCI scales on both Cognitions (.33 and .36 both at $p < .01$) and Behaviors dimensions (.42 and .25 both at $p < .01$). Confirming this trend, P/C-S OC scale was found to be correlated significantly with SCI WA and DA scales on Perceptions dimension (.44 and .32 both at $p < .01$).

Male data. As expected, P/C-S SP scale for male subjects data showed correlations with Behaviors dimension VA, PA and GA scales of the SCI (.35, .30 and .34 respectively, all at $p < .01$) (Table 9). OP scale correlated with the conceptually similar Perceptions dimension VA, PA and GA scales at somewhat higher levels (.32, .40 and .42 respectively, all at $p < .01$). P/C-S SC scale correlated with SCI Cognitions dimension WA and DA scales (.31 and .28 respectively, both at $p < .01$) and with

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Behaviors dimensions WA and DA scales (.41 and .31 both at $p < .01$). OC scale correlated significantly with SCI Perceptions dimension WA scale (.38 at $p < .01$) and DA scale (.18 at $p < .05$).

Female data. Correlational analysis of the relationship between the relevant P/C-S and SCI scales for female data (Table 10) also revealed significant similarities. P/C-S SP scale was found to be significantly related to SCI VA, PA and GA scales (.40, .20 and .36 respectively, all at $p < .01$). Comparison of the OP scale with VA, PA and GA scales in SCI Perceptions dimension showed moderate level relationships of the OP scale with all three of the above SCI scales (.45, .56 and .55 respectively, all at $p > .01$). P/C-S SC scale correlated with conceptually similar WA and DA scales on both Cognitions (.29 and .28 both at $p < .01$) and Behaviors (.42 and .24, both at $p < .01$) dimensions. OC scale was moderately correlated with SCI Perceptions dimension WA and DA scales (.45 and .40, both at $p < .01$).

Discriminant Validity

Analysis of correlations of all P/C-S scales with AEB and AEB for all subsets of data (Tables 11, 12 and 13) revealed no significant relationships between the two instruments with the single exception of a low level correlation between AEB and SC for the male data subset (.19 at $p < .018$).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to investigate reliability, factor structure and validity of the Power/Control Scales (P/C-S). P/C-S was built based on a systemic/ecological paradigm, (Maddock, 1993, 1995) which conceptualized the

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

concepts of power and control as a single dialectical construct with reciprocally related components with the purpose of assessing Power/Control dynamics in close relationships. An obvious limitation of this study is its small, homogenous sample, particularly its skew toward younger ages and therefore relatively short relationship histories. Further, the sample is biased by the participants' pre-existing interest in family relationships, which is likely to predispose them to value such things as egalitarian gender roles, good communication between partners, and the exclusion of violence. At the same time, this bias may have a positive side; namely, subjects' sensitivity to relationship issues and, hopefully, their motivation to be as thorough and honest as possible when responding to the questionnaire.

Certainly, a larger and more diverse sample that included a broader age range, differing ethnicity, and more social class differences might produce different results and would likely be more valid. Further, the inclusion of clinical comparison groups--particularly those that have a history of high conflict and even abuse--would be particularly important.

To analyze the reliability of the P/C-S Chronbach's alpha coefficients were calculated for the whole instrument as well as for individual scales and both Chronbach's alpha and Spearman/Brown rho split-half reliability coefficients were calculated for the total sample and male and female subsamples. P/C-S as a whole instrument and all of its scales were found to be highly reliable.

Factor analysis provided limited support to the proposed 4 factor structure of the P/C-S. Only factor 3 resulting from the analysis of the female data using Varimax rotation could be interpreted as representing the construct of "Self-Control" which is one

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

of the factors described in the original theoretical conceptualization. At the same time analysis revealed a number of themes or potential constructs tapped into by the P/C-S.

One of the most important findings was the ability of the P/C-S to differentiate between “self” and “other” generated data. With the exception of the first factor in an unrotated solution using the full set of data, first and second factors always reflected “Other Influence and “Self Influence” respectively. In most cases these factors contained the greatest number of items and had stronger loadings than the other factors. This tendency was particularly clear in the analysis of data using Vairmax rotation.

One of the themes that emerged was a dichotomy of “Active/enabling Influence” versus “Passive/inhibiting Influence” in couples’ relationships. Another theme identified as a result of this factor analysis was a theme of “direct” and “indirect” influence (female unrotated factor 3). In most cases the resulting factors were a combination of the above described themes of “self”, “other”, “active”, “passive”, “direct” or “indirect influence”.

Although somewhat undifferentiated/mixed in terms of the particulars of influence and the agent of influence, these factors revealed important information about the style of the relationship. Although individual initially, these emerging factors may provide information about couples’ level of analysis reflecting “saturation” with certain relational patterns. Similarly to the concept of “expressed emotion”, extreme presence of certain individual behaviors in a relationship, (“active” or “passive”), could result in producing certain characteristics of the relationship such as being abusive or devitalized. If validated in other studies, this may be an alternative to using mathematical formulas to compute couples’ level data.

Factors consisting of mixed items raised another important issue, that of wording

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

of questions representing particular constructs. Most “Power” items are worded in positive terms while many “Control” items are worded negatively (#14 “There are things I won’t let my partner do”). Although intended to reflect the stopping or inhibiting action that is assumed to be the basis of the concept of “Control,” these items reflect active/assertive behaviors which can even precede other partner’s intention to do things. The fact that these items are found in the same factor with typical “Power” items demonstrates that negative wording alone is not enough to reflect the inhibiting or stopping action.

Similarly, several factors alluding to Active/Enabling influence have items with the word “control”. Although intended to reflect the “Control” construct, these items very similar in meaning to “power” items in the same scale (#37 “I control my partner when he/she is around me” and # 60 “I control more things in this relationship than my partner does”), which means that use of the word “control” does not guarantee that a particular question taps into the same theoretical construct of “control”.

One of the explanations for problems with items representing “control” is that active/enabling behaviors are easier to spot and describe. When one looks at the level of relationship and operates in a psychological domain, neglectful behaviors can be just as harmful as aggressive ones for the existence of the relationship. However, on an individual level, aggressive behaviors can be definitely more damaging. This is certainly true when we think of physical safety. This danger may result in increased cognitive awareness of these behaviors and easier representation of these behaviors in specific questions. In fact, previous analysis of descriptive statistics on the P/C-S (Kroupin, 2008, unpublished) revealed that all “Power” scores were higher than “Control” scores and OP

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

was the highest score for this set of data. Although possibly related to the true elevated sensitivity of subjects to issues of power, this pattern may reflect biases in P/C-S construction skewed towards diagnosing “Power” behaviors.

Based on the above it can be argued that positively phrased items describing particular behaviors that represent a theoretical construct in question may be more useful in representing the experiential reality of a given construct.

The correlational analysis of the relationships between the P/C-S and SCI scales revealed several tendencies. First, a number of comparisons, including comparisons of “Control” scales with WA and DA and “Power” scales with Aggression scales showed similarity between these P/C-S and SCI scales which can be seen as an evidence of convergent validity of the P/C-S. Comparison of the P/C-S scales with SCI AEB and AEP scales based on unrelated constructs provided support for the discriminant validity of the P/C-S.

Second, in several cases, like with the analysis of the relationships between SCI DA scales with the relevant P/C-S scales, results varied significantly by gender. This supports the results of the previous analysis using P/C-S (Kroupin, 2008) and may reflect the properties of the P/C-S as well as SCI as instruments. At the same time it may be an evidence of true gender differences in perception of the relational reality.

Third, both previous research and the results of the factor analysis in this study support significant differences between “Self” and “Other” data. Previous research (Kroupin, 2008) showed that P/C-S “Other” scores on the average tend to be higher than “Self” scores although it was unclear whether these results reflected properties of the instrument, characteristic of a particular sample of participants or even a more general

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

and stable tendency. In the present study, almost all comparisons of the P/C-S “Self” scales to SCI “Cognitions” and “Behaviors” scales yielded at least some difference with the comparison of “Other” scales to “Perception” scales while these relationships were assumed to be similar. Although one explanation of these findings may be the effects of the properties of one or both of the instruments used in this study, it also may reflect true differences in how people see themselves and their own behavior compared to how they see the others.

Conclusion

This study analyzed psychometric properties of the Power/Control Scales. The study found some support for the validity and reliability of the P/C-S and for the theoretical model on which it was based. It also identified some of the challenges of this instrument, some of them related to the underlying theory and some related to instrument construction and measurement issues.

Contrary to the conceptual formulation of Power/Control dynamics in close relationships defining Power and Control as opposing and complimentary concepts, current study showed high levels of similarity between the two constructs supporting previous research exploring this issue (Kroupin, 2008). Lack of support for “power” and “control” as opposing/complimentary constructs may be a result of conceptual definitions of “power” and “control” and the resulting strategy in item construction.

Use of the dictionary definitions of “power” as the ability to influence and “control” as the ability to control/limit influence, although having the advantage of clarity, may have had substantial drawbacks. First, it sets up a linear relationship where

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

“power” always precedes “control”. Second, although formulated in opposing terms, both “power” and “control” represent influence and, if the modality of this influence is not defined more specifically, despite the use of different words, they could represent similar behaviors, they could be perceived similarly and could have similar relational consequences.

Second, results suggest that power or assertive/enabling behaviors may be more easily identified in relationships than controlling or passive/inhibiting behaviors, which is understandable given the common perception linking power behaviors and relational violence. One of the resulting drawbacks of the P/C-S is the lack of representation of passive/inhibiting behaviors reflecting dead/devitalized relationships dominated by control (Maddock, 1985).

Factor analysis of the P/C-S data did produce several factors that contained predominantly “power” or “control” items. However, these particular subsets of items seemed to represent theoretical constructs somewhat different from the “power” and “control” constructs as defined by Maddock. While the original power/control dichotomy put an emphasis on initiating/limiting the influence, new constructs juxtaposed different types of influence coexisting in a close relationship. The former speaks to the relationship between push and resistance, the latter is the relationship between fire and ice. These factors were labeled as “influence through assertiveness/enabling” and “influence through passivity/inhibition”. The latter pair of constructs seems to be consistent with Maddock’s (1985) original classification of problems in close relationships where he proposed the two extremes resulting from the imbalance of power: violent relationships dominated by power and devitalized relationships dominated by control.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Correlational analysis between the relevant P/C-S and SCI scales, besides the analysis of P/C-S validity, raised some interesting theoretical issues. Specifically, absence of correlations between P/C-S scales based on power/control dichotomy and SCI scales based on cooperation, while providing evidence for the discriminant validity of the P/C-S, and thus supporting its strength, at the same time speaks to its limitations. Use of the P/C-S for the purpose of exploring the potential of conflict in close relationships puts an emphasis on the confrontation but does not address cooperation/coping which certainly has a profound impact both on family process and on family outcomes. While potentially useful in the analysis of violence in a relationship, attention to conflict only is insufficient and should be supplemented by the analysis of the ability to manage it in a committed relationship.

Furthermore, from the standpoint of safety in the real world, conflict, as a possible precursor of violence, is a valid concern for anybody who works with families and this concern understandably played a significant role in the creation of the P/C-S. However, the important difference between the presence of conflict and acts of violence should be made clear. Violence can be seen as a shift from psychological/human dimension of close relationships to a physical/animal dimension and can represent situational, larger relational dynamics or significant individual pathology irrelevant of the current relational dynamics. Use of violence involves issues of moral values and choice and thus can not be seen as a direct logical consequence of conflict.

While couples with no conflict may be less prone to violence, due to conflict inhibition, violence in couples with sporadic conflict may be just as prevalent, and

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

possibly have even more devastating consequences than violence in relationships with frequent explicit conflict (Straus 1979).

Although violent acts cannot be predicted with certainty a model can be proposed that may provide a way of predicting the threat of violence based on analyzing the “saturation” of the relationship with particular relational patterns.

One of the future directions of development of the P/C-S can be based on the theoretical dichotomy of assertiveness/enabling versus passivity/inhibition resulting from the newly identified factors. A model predicting conflict in close relationships can be built with the two dimensions representing assertive/enabling behaviors and passive/inhibiting behaviors

It could be speculated that couples whose scores fall closer to the A/E axis will be prone to having more open conflict while couples whose scores fall closer to the P/I axis will exhibit little to no conflict. Middle ground represents couples with sporadic conflict.

Future efforts in the analysis of risks of violence in close relationships may involve a combination of the analysis of presence of conflict, analysis of the intensity of interaction, couple's strengths/resources and the exploration of couple's ability to use psychological means of resolving conflict including using effective conflict resolution strategies. This approach, although somewhat more complex, may provide a useful framework for further research as well as clinical practice.

Adherence to a dialectical notion of balance may help clinicians avoid linear/blaming approaches and adopt a more systemic view of family functioning. Despite the challenges ahead, the P/C-S shows promise as an application of an

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

ecological approach to the study of family relationships (Maddock, 1993), with both research and clinical applications. After further development it can potentially be used to assess power/control balance in couples and family therapy. It could also be used as an assessment tool and educational instrument in premarital counseling.

References

- Bograd, M. (1984). Family systems approach to wife battering: A feminist critique. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 54, 558-568.
- Chubb, H. (1990). Looking at systems as process. *Family Process* 29,169-17.,
- Cromwell, R. & Olson, D. (1975). *Power in families*. New York: John Wiley.
- Dell, P. (1989). Violence and the systemic view: The problem of power. *Family Process*, 28, 1-14.
- Erikson, E. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle: Selected papers*. New York: International University Press.
- Erikson, E. (1963). *Childhood and society (2nd Ed.)*. New York: Norton.
- Goldner, V. (1985). Feminism and family therapy. *Family Process*, 24, 31-47.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994). *What predicts divorce? The relationship between marital processes and marital outcomes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum.
- Gottman, J.M. (1999). *The marriage clinic: A scientifically based marital therapy*. New York: Norton.
- Gray-Little, B., & Burks, N. (1983). Power and satisfaction in marriage: A review and critique. *Psychological Bulletin* 93, 513-538.
- Hare-Mustin, R. (1987) The problem of gender in family therapy theory. *Family Process* 26,15-27.
- Heatherington, L. (1990). Family therapy, control, and controllingness. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 4, 132-150.
- Imber-Black, E. (1988). *Families and larger systems*. New York: Guilford.
- Jacobson, N. & Gottman, J. (1998). *When men batter women: New insights into ending abusive relationships*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kantor, G.K. & Jasinski, J. (1998). Dynamics and risk factors in partner violence. In J. Jasinski & L. Williams (Eds.), *Partner violence: A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kroupin, G. (2008). *Power and Control in Close Relationships*. Special Project Paper, Department of Family Social Science, University of Minnesota. Unpublished.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). *Gender roles and power*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lloyd, S. (1991). The darkside of courtship: Violence and sexual exploitation. *Family Relations*, 40, 14-20.
- Luepnitz, D. A. (1988). *The family interpreted: Feminist theory in clinical practice*. New York: Basic Books.
- Maddock, J. W. (1990) *Power, Control and Victimization*. St. Paul: Meta Resources
- Maddock, J.(1993). Ecological dialectics: An approach to family theory construction. *Family Science Review*, 6, 21-44.
- Maddock, J.W. & Larson N. (1995). *Incestuous families: An ecological approach to understanding and treatment*. New York: Norton.
- McGoldrick, M., Anderson, C., & Walsh, F. (eds.) (1989). *Women in families: A framework for family therapy*. New York: Norton.
- Melson, L. G. (1980) *Family and environment: An ecosystemic perspective*. Minneapolis: Burgess Press,.
- Muehlenhard, C., Goggins, M., Jones, J., Satterfield, A. (1991). Sexual violence and coercion in close relationships. In C. Huehlenhard (Ed.), *Sexuality in close relationships* (pp. 155-175). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Niehoff, D. (1999). *The biology of violence*. New York: Free Press.
- Pence, A. (Ed.) (1988), *Ecological research with children and families*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Pistole, M.. C. (1994). Reflections on attachment and closeness-distance struggles. *Family Process*, 33, 147-159.
- Schumm, W., Jeong, G., Bollman, S., Jurich, A., & Milliken, G. (1989) Analytical strategies for dealing with discrepancy scores in family data. In *Theory Construction and Research Methodology National Council on Family Relations*, New Orleans, LA,.
- Stock, W. (1985) The influence of gender on power dynamics in relationships. In D. Goldberg (ed.), *Contemporary marriage*. Homewood, IL: Dorsey Press,.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

- Szinovacz, M. & Egley, L. (1995). Comparing one-partner and couple data on sensitive marital behavior: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 57, 995-1010.
- Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: William Morrow.
- Thorne, B. & Yalom, M. (1982). *Rethinking the family: Some feminist questions*. New York: Longman.
- Tiffany, D.W. & Tiffany, P.G. (2000). *Power and control: Escape from violence*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Walker, L. (1989). Psychology and violence against women. *American Psychologist*, 44, 695-702.
- Zillman, D. (1984). *Connections between sex and aggression*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Appendix A

Table 1.

Chronbach α and Spearman/Brown ρ Reliability for the Four Scales of the P/C-S Separately and Combined

Subjects	SP	OP	SC	OC	4 scales α	4 scales ρ
Total	.84	.86	.77	.84	.92	.87
Male	.85	.84	.77	.82	.91	.87
Female	.83	.88	.78	.85	.92	.87

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 2

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Total Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)	.57			
7. My ideas and feelings influence my partner. (SP)		.45		
10. My partner gets her/his way with me (OP)	.43			
11. My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting (OC)	.41			
13. I am judgmental of my partner (SC)	.51			
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.47		
19. My partner is able to control how I act (OC)	.58			
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.55		
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)	.48			
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.51			
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things (OC)	.59			
31. My partner tells me how things should be done (OP)	.65			
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me (SC)	.45			
35. I verbally overpower my partner (SP)	.42			
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship (OP)	.47			
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.58			
43. I am more stubborn than my partner (SC)		.45		
45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes (OP)	.58			
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (OP)			.58	
51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)	.52			
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.55			
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner (SP)		.62		

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

54. My partner influences my actions (OP)		.53
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.54	
58. My partner is judgmental of me (OC)	.62	
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.52	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)		.54
61. My partner is able to control what I say (OC)	.53	
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do (SP)	.41	
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does (SC)		.62
66. I influence my partner's actions (SP)		.43
67. My partner decides what we will do (OP)	.43	
69. I decide what we will do (SP)		.49
70. I get my partner to do things I want done (SP)		.49
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.54	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.59	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.67	
74. My partner controls sex in our relationship (OC)	.41	
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants (OC)	.52	
76. My partner says "no" to me (OC)	.43	
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)		.44
78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.69	
79. My partner limits my actions (OC)	.64	
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.45	
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.57	
84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done (OP)	.52	
85. I tell my partner not to do certain things (SC)	.43	
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.47	
87. I am better than my partner at being silent (SC)		.52
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.57	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

89. My partner verbally overpowers me (OP)	.47	
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.68
96. I am led by my partner (OP)	.50	
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)		.42
100. My partner is able to keep me from doing things he/she doesn't want me to do (OC)	.57	

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2; F3 = Factor 3; F4 = Factor 4; SI = Self Influence; MI = Mutual Influence.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 3

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Male Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
2. I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do (SC)	.42			
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)	.49			
11. My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting (OC)	.41			
13. I am judgmental of my partner (SC)	.43			
14. There are things I won't let my partner do (SC)	.41			
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.46		
17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do (SC)	.42			
19. My partner is able to control how I act (OC)	.45			
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.55		
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)	.44			
26. I threaten to harm my partner (SP)				
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.42			
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things (OC)	.52			
30. I leave when there is conflict with my partner (SC)				
31. My partner tells me how things should be done (OP)	.60			
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me (SC)	.46			
35. I verbally overpower my partner (SP)	.49			
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship (OP)	.40			
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.56			
45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes (OP)	.59			
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (OP)			.58	
50. My partner tries to keep things the same in our relationship (OC)			.43	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)	.56	
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.46	
54. My partner influences my actions (OP)		.56
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.50	
58. My partner is judgmental of me (OC)	.54	
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.47	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)	.44	
62. My partner makes it clear to me when she/he is interested in being sexual (OP)		.43
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do (SP)	.46	
64. I demand that my partner obey my wishes (SP)	.41	
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does (SC)		.61
66. I influence my partner's actions (SP)		.44
69. I decide what we will do (SP)		.53
70. I get my partner to do things I want done (SP)		.44
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.44	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.50	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.63	
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants (OC)	.46	
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)		.43
78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.67	
79. My partner limits my actions (OC)	.60	
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.44	
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.49	
84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done (OP)	.46	
85. I tell my partner not to do certain things (SC)	.54	
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.47	
87. I am better than my partner at being silent (SC)		.47
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.57	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.66	
93. I tell my partner how things should be done (SP)	.58		
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me (SP)	.47		
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)			.53

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2 (Active/Enabling Self Influence); F3 = Factor 3 (Mutual Engaging Influence); F4 = Factor 4 (Self Influence through Passivity/Avoidance).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 4

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, Unrotated Component Matrix for Female Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)	.61			
5. My partner takes charge when he/she is with me (OP)	.47			
6. I am better than my partner at making things happen in this relationship(SP)	.41			
7. My ideas and feelings influence my partner. (SP)		.52		
8. I am better than my partner at sulking and pouting (SC)				.45
10. My partner gets her/his way with me (OP)	.45			
13. I am judgmental of my partner (SC)	.60			
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.53		
17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do (SC)		.53		
19. My partner is able to control how I act (OC)	.66			
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.54		
23. My partner is better than I am at being silent (OC)			.54	
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)	.51			
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.56			
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things (OC)	.63			
31. My partner tells me how things should be done (OP)	.69			
32. I insult my partner and/or call her/him names (SP)	.45			
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me (SC)	.49			
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship (OP)	.60			
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.59			
42. I am able to control how my partner acts (SC)		.47		
43. I am more stubborn than my partner (SC)		.52		

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes (OP)	.55	
46. My partner can hold out longer than I can (OC)		.50
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (OP)		.45
51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)	.49	
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.64	
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner (SP)		.63
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.58	
57. I am able to control what my partner says (SC)		.43
58. My partner is judgmental of me (OC)	.68	
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.62	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)		.69
61. My partner is able to control what I say (OC)	.65	
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does (SC)		.63
67. My partner decides what we will do (OP)	.50	
69. I decide what we will do (SP)		.44
70. I get my partner to do things I want done (SP)		.52
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.65	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.65	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.71	
74. My partner controls sex in our relationship (OC)	.41	
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants (OC)	.54	
76. My partner says "no" to me (OC)	.48	
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)		.45
78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.70	
79. My partner limits my actions (OC)	.66	
80. I have greater say than my partner in how we spend money (SP)		.41
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.42	
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.65	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done (OP)	.56	
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.53	
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.55	
89. My partner verbally overpowers me (OP)	.62	
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.70
91. My partner has to guess at what I want (SC)	.44	
96. I am led by my partner (OP)	.62	
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me (SP)		.50
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)		.47
99. I get my partner to do things my way (SP)		.61
100. My partner is able to keep me from doing things he/she doesn't want me to do (OC)	.63	

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. F1 = Factor 1; F2 = Factor 2 (Active/Enabling Self Influence); F3 = Factor 3 (Indirect/Passive Other Influence); F4 = Factor 4.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 5

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Total Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
1. I seek change in our relationship (SP)			.46	
2. I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do (SC)		.43		
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)			.48	
5. My partner takes charge when he/she is with me (OP)	.54			
7. My ideas and feelings influence my partner. (SP)		.45		
9. My partner loses control of him/herself with me (OC)				
10. My partner gets her/his way with me (OP)	.54			
11. My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting (OC)				.40
13. I am judgmental of my partner (SC)			.51	
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.60		
17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do (SC)		.53		
18. I am better than my partner at keeping things from happening in this relationship (SC)		.46		
19. My partner is able to control how I act (OC)	.57			
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.63		
24. My partner backs down when I am angry with him (OP)		-.49		
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)			.58	
26. I threaten to harm my partner (SP)			.40	
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.54			
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things (OC)	.48			
31. My partner tells me how things should be done (OP)	.54			
32. I insult my partner and/or call her/him names (SP)			.57	
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me (SC)			.42	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

37. I control my partner when he/she is around me (SC)	.57	
39. My partner seeks change in our relationship (OP)		.47
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.56	
42. I am able to control how my partner acts (SC)	.60	
43. I am more stubborn than my partner (SC)	.40	
45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes (OP)	.46	
46. My partner can hold out longer than I can (OC)	.50	
48. I back down when my partner is angry with me (SP)	-.50	
51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)		
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.67	
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner (SP)		.66
54. My partner influences my actions (OP)	.46	
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.63	
57. I am able to control what my partner says (SC)	.52	
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.71	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)		.69
61. My partner is able to control what I say (OC)	.55	
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do (SP)	.40	
64. I demand that my partner obey my wishes (SP)	.40	
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does (SC)	.68	
66. I influence my partner's actions (SP)	.45	
67. My partner decides what we will do (OP)	.57	
69. I decide what we will do (SP)	.56	
70. I get my partner to do things I want done (SP)	.59	
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.68	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.50	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.65	
74. My partner controls sex in our relationship (OC)	.40	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)		.57
78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.61	
80. I have greater say than my partner in how we spend money (SP)		.46
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.52	
82. I tell my partner what to do (SP)		.60
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.64	
84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done (OP)	.60	
85. I tell my partner not to do certain things (SC)		.44
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.49	
87. I am better than my partner at being silent (SC)		.55
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.47	
89. My partner verbally overpowers me (OP)	.52	
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.70
93. I tell my partner how things should be done (SP)		.60
96. I am led by my partner (OP)	.67	
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me (SP)		.53
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)		.51
99. I get my partner to do things my way (SP)		.70
100. My partner is able to keep me from doing things he/she doesn't want me to do (OC)	.63	

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. F1 = Factor 1 (Other Influence); F2 = Factor 2 (Self Influence); F3 = Factor 3 (Mutual Aggressive/Assertive Influence); F4 = Factor 4 (Passive/Inhibiting Influence).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 6

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Male Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
1. I seek change in our relationship (SP)			.47	
2. I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do (SC)		.40		
3. My partner limits our spending (OC)	.43			
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)				
5. My partner takes charge when he/she is with me (OP)	.63			
6. I am better than my partner at making things happen in this relationship(SP)		.50		
7. My ideas and feelings influence my partner. (SP)		.44		
10. My partner gets her/his way with me (OP)	.56			
11. My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting (OC)	.41			
13. I am judgmental of my partner (SC)			.47	
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.57		
17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do (SC)		.46		
18. I am better than my partner at keeping things from happening in this relationship (SC)		.53		
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.68		
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)			.63	
26. I threaten to harm my partner (SP)			.46	
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.48			
32. I insult my partner and/or call her/him names (SP)			.61	
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me (SC)			.59	
35. I verbally overpower my partner (SP)			.64	
37. I control my partner when he/she is around me (SC)		.58		
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship (OP)	.71			

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

39. My partner seeks change in our relationship (OP)		.53
40. I say "no" to my partner (SC)		.42
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.53	
42. I am able to control how my partner acts (SC)		.55
46. My partner can hold out longer than I can (OC)	.43	
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (OP)		.45
51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)		.47
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.58	
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner (SP)		.70
54. My partner influences my actions (OP)		.55
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.53	
57. I am able to control what my partner says (SC)		.43
58. My partner is judgmental of me (OC)		.49
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.69	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)		.61
61. My partner is able to control what I say (OC)		.51
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do (SP)		.51
64. I demand that my partner obey my wishes (SP)		.44
66. I influence my partner's actions (SP)		.41
67. My partner decides what we will do (OP)	.61	
69. I decide what we will do (SP)		.63
70. I get my partner to do things I want done (SP)		.63
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.65	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.49	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.59	
74. My partner controls sex in our relationship (OC)	.48	
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants (OC)		.42
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)	.63	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.64	
80. I have greater say than my partner in how we spend money (SP)		.50
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.56	
82. I tell my partner what to do (SP)		.54
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.63	
84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done (OP)	.61	
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.48	
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.56	
89. My partner verbally overpowers me (OP)	.41	
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.68
93. I tell my partner how things should be done (SP)		.58
96. I am led by my partner (OP)	.63	
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me (SP)		.41
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)		.58
99. I get my partner to do things my way (SP)		.69
100. My partner is able to keep me from doing things he/she doesn't want me to do (OC)	.52	

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. F1 = Factor 1 (Other Influence); F2 = Factor 2 (Self Influence); F3 = Factor 3 (Mutual Aggressive/Assertive Influence); F4 = Factor 4 (Other Indirect Influence).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 7

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis, With Varimax Rotation Component Matrix for Female Subjects

P/C-S items	F1	F2	F3	F4
2. I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do (SC)			.55	
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him (OC)	.63			
5. My partner takes charge when he/she is with me (OP)				.45
6. I am better than my partner at making things happen in this relationship(SP)		.58		
8. I am better than my partner at sulking and pouting (SC)				.43
14. There are things I won't let my partner do (SC)			.54	
16. My partner is led by me (SP)		.60		
17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do (SC)			.53	
18. I am better than my partner at keeping things from happening in this relationship (SC)		.53		
19. My partner is able to control how I act (OC)	.61			
20. I take charge when I am with my partner (SP)		.66		
21. My partner physically attacks me (OP)	.49			
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names (OP)	.56			
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship (OC)	.52			
28. My partner threatens to harm me (OP)	.43			
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things (OC)	.66			
31. My partner tells me how things should be done (OP)	.69			
32. I insult my partner and/or call her/him names (SP)	.44			
35. I verbally overpower my partner (SP)		.54		
37. I control my partner when he/she is around me (SC)		.56		
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship (OP)	.61			.45
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do (OC)	.55			

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes (OP)	.65	
46. My partner can hold out longer than I can (OC)		.49
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me (OP)		.58
51. I limit my partner's actions (SC)		.41
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way (OP)	.64	
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner (SP)		.70
54. My partner influences my actions (OP)		.59
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her (OP)	.54	
57. I am able to control what my partner says (SC)		.50
58. My partner is judgmental of me (OC)	.75	
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I (OP)	.61	
60. I get my way with my partner (SP)		.55
61. My partner is able to control what I say (OC)	.69	
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do (SP)		.51
64. I demand that my partner obey my wishes (SP)		.47
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does (SC)		.73
66. I influence my partner's actions (SP)		.52
67. My partner decides what we will do (OP)	.42	
69. I decide what we will do (SP)		.42
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do (OC)	.65	
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do (OC)	.72	
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him (OC)	.76	
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants (OC)	.52	
76. My partner says "no" to me (OC)	.57	
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions (SP)		.53
78. My partner tells me what to do (OP)	.79	
79. My partner limits my actions (OC)	.72	
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am (OC)	.43	

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions (OP)	.60	
85. I tell my partner not to do certain things (SC)		.47
86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money (OP)	.51	
87. I am better than my partner at being silent (SC)		.51
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do (OP)	.68	
89. My partner verbally overpowers me (OP)	.75	
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship (SP)		.73
93. I tell my partner how things should be done (SP)		.60
96. I am led by my partner (OP)	.57	
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me (SP)		.56
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can (SC)		.46

Note. Factor loadings >.4 used only. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control; F1 = Factor 1 (Other Influence); F2 = Factor 2 (Assertive/Engaging Self Influence); F3 = Factor 3 (Passive/Inhibiting Self Influence) F4 = Factor 4 (Mutual Engaging Influence).

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Note. Tables 8 through 10 presented in a reduced format, different from the APA standards to avoid large (16X16) tables. Standard format tables are available if recommended by the dissertation committee.

Table 8

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Total Subjects

SCI scales	SP	OP	SC	OC
WA cognition	.15	.47*	.33**	.53**
DA cognitions	.25**	.40**	.36**	.51**
VA behaviors	.41**	.45**	.40**	.44**
PA behaviors	.30**	.41**	.29**	.42**
GA behaviors	.39**	.46**	.38**	.46**
WA behaviors	.25**	.34**	.42**	.45**
DA behaviors	.06	.10	.25**	.26**
VA perceptions	.29**	.51**	.33**	.50**
PA perceptions	.22**	.53**	.26**	.53**
GA perceptions	.27**	.55**	.31*	.54**
WA perceptions	.25**	.33**	.33**	.44**
DA perceptions	.17*	.22**	.31**	.32**

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. WA=Withdrawal Avoidance, DA=Denial Avoidance, VA=Verbal Aggression Engagement, PA=Physical Aggression Engagement, GA=General Aggression Engagement.

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

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 9

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Male Subjects

SCI scales	SP	OP	SC	OC
WA cognition	.10	.33**	.31**	.32**
DA cognitions	.14	.38**	.28**	.38**
VA behaviors	.35**	.23**	.32**	.32**
PA behaviors	.30**	.15	.32**	.27**
GA behaviors	.34**	.20*	.34**	.32**
WA behaviors	.18*	.19*	.41**	.22**
DA behaviors	.09	.17*	.31**	.18*
VA perceptions	.18*	.39**	.20*	.46**
PA perceptions	.18*	.40**	.22**	.44**
GA perceptions	.19*	.42**	.22**	.48**
WA perceptions	.26**	.24**	.23**	.38**
DA perceptions	.16*	.09	.20**	.18*

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control.
 WA=Withdrawal Avoidance, DA=Denial Avoidance, VA=Verbal Aggression Engagement,
 PA=Physical Aggression Engagement, GA=General Aggression Engagement.
 **p<.01; *p<.05.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 10

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Similar P/C-S and SCI Scales for Female Subjects

	SP	OP	SC	OC
SCI scales				
WA cognition	.06	.37**	.29**	.44**
SA cognition	-.14	.38**	.04	.42**
DA cognitions	.08	.24**	.28**	.38**
VA behaviors	.40**	.29**	.38**	.24**
PA behaviors	.20**	.22**	.19*	.26**
GA behaviors	.36**	.30**	.33**	.28**
WA behaviors	.10	.36**	.42**	.34**
DA behaviors	-.03	.10	.24**	.16*
VA perceptions	.13	.45**	.17*	.37**
PA perceptions	-.06	.56**	.03	.44**
GA perceptions	.03	.55**	.10	.44**
WA perceptions	.14	.25**	.04	.45**
DA perceptions	.15	.29**	.19*	.40**

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control.
 WA=Withdrawal Avoidance, DA=Denial Avoidance, VA=Verbal Aggression Engagement,
 PA=Physical Aggression Engagement, GA=General Aggression Engagement.
 **p<.01; *p<.05.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 11

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Total Subjects

SCI/P/C-S scales	ADEB	ADEP	SP	OP	SC	OC
ADE behaviors	-		-.07	-.10	-.05	-.02
ADE perceptions		-	-.00	-.10	.00	-.03
SP			-			
OP				-		
SC					-	
OC						-

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. ADE = Adaptation Engagement. Only correlation coefficients relevant to the analysis of the discriminant validity included

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

Table 12

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Male Subjects

SCI/P/C-S scales	ADEB	ADEP	SP	OP	SC	OC
ADE behaviors	-		.13	.08	.19*	.11
ADE perceptions		-	.03	-.11	.14	-.04
SP			-			
OP				-		
SC					-	
OC						-

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. ADE = Adaptation Engagement. Only correlation coefficients relevant to the analysis of the discriminant validity included

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

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Table 13

Summary of Intercorrelations for Scores on the Unrelated P/C-S and SCI Scales for Female Subjects

SCI/P/C-S scales	ADEB	ADEP	SP	OP	SC	OC
ADE behaviors	-		-.09	-.08	-.07	-.00
ADE perceptions		-	.04	-.04	.09	-.04
SP			-			
OP				-		
SC					-	
OC						-

Note. SP = Self Power; OP = Other Power; SC = Self Control; OC = Other Control. ADE = Adaptation Engagement. Only correlation coefficients relevant to the analysis of the discriminant validity included

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

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

Appendix B

Power/Control Scales (James W. Maddock, Ph.D.)

Instructions: PLACE THE NUMBER OF THE ANSWER THAT BEST APPLIES ON THE LINE AT THE LEFT OF EACH STATEMENT. PLEASE ANSWER EVERY QUESTION. BE AS HONEST AS YOU CAN.

1. I seek change in our relationship
2. I am able to keep my partner from doing things she/he wants to do.
3. My partner limits our spending.
4. My partner gets angry if I disagree with her/him.
5. My partner takes charge when he/she is with me.
6. I am better than my partner at making things happen in this relationship.
7. My ideas and feelings influence my partner.
8. I am better than my partner at sulking and pouting.
9. My partner loses control of him/herself with me.
10. My partner gets her/his way with me.
11. My partner is better than I am at sulking and pouting.
12. My partner is better than I am at making things happen in this relationship.
13. I am judgmental of my partner.
14. There are things I won't let my partner do.
15. I physically attack my partner.
16. My partner is led by me

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

17. I am able to keep my partner from doing things I don't want him/her to do.
18. I am better than my partner at keeping things from happening in this relationship.
19. My partner is able to control how I act.
20. I take charge when I am with my partner.
21. My partner physically attacks me.
22. I don't do things that my partner and I have agreed to.
23. My partner is better than I am at being silent.
24. My partner backs down when I am angry with him/her.
25. My partner insults me and/or calls me names.
26. I threaten to harm my partner..
27. My partner is better than I at keeping things from happening in this relationship.
28. My partner threatens to harm me.
29. My partner tells me not to do certain things.
30. I leave when there is conflict with my partner.
31. My partner tells me how things should be done.
32. I insult my partner and/or call her/him names.
33. I keep my partner from physically attacking me.
34. I get angry if my partner disagrees with me.
35. I verbally overpower my partner.
36. My partner leaves when there is conflict with me.
37. I control my partner when he/she is around me.
38. My partner is the dominant person in our relationship.
39. My partner seeks change in our relationship.
40. I say "no" to my partner.
41. My partner is able to keep me from doing things I want to do.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

42. I am able to control how my partner acts.
43. I am more stubborn than my partner.
44. I try to keep things the same in our relationship.
45. My partner demands that I obey her/his wishes.
46. My partner can hold out longer than I can.
47. My partner keeps me from physically attacking her/him.
48. I back down when my partner is angry with me.
49. My partner's ideas and feelings influence me.
50. My partner tries to keep things the same in our relationship.
51. I limit my partner's actions.
52. My partner gets me to do things her/his way.
53. I am more powerful in this relationship than my partner.
54. My partner influences my actions.
55. My partner persuades me to agree with him/her.
56. I make it clear to my partner when I am interested in being sexual.
57. I am able to control what my partner says.
58. My partner is judgmental of me.
59. My partner is more powerful in this relationship than I.
60. I get my way with my partner.
61. My partner is able to control what I say.
62. My partner makes it clear to me when she/he is interested in being sexual.
63. I force my partner to do things she/he doesn't want to do.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

64. I demand that my partner obey my wishes.
65. I control more things in this relationship than my partner does.
66. I influence my partner's actions.
67. My partner decides what we will do.
68. I control sex in our relationship.
69. I decide what we will do.
70. I get my partner to do things I want done.
71. My partner controls more things in this relationship than I do.
72. There are things that my partner won't let me do.
73. My partner controls me when I am around her/him.
74. My partner controls sex in our relationship.
75. I have to guess at what my partner wants.
76. My partner says "no" to me.
77. I have more say than my partner in making decisions.
78. My partner tells me what to do.
79. My partner limits my actions.
80. I have greater say than my partner in how we spend money.
81. My partner is more stubborn than I am.
82. I tell my partner what to do.
83. My partner has more say than I in making decisions.
84. My partner gets me to do things he/she wants done.
85. I tell my partner not to do certain things.

Validity and Reliability of the Power/Control Scales

86. My partner has greater say than I in how we spend money.
87. I am better than my partner at being silent.
88. My partner forces me to do things I don't want to do.
89. My partner verbally overpowers me.
90. I am the dominant person in our relationship.
91. My partner has to guess at what I want.
92. I limit our spending.
93. I tell my partner how things should be done.
94. I lose control of myself with my partner.
95. My partner doesn't do things that she/he and I have agreed to.
96. I am led by my partner.
97. I persuade my partner to agree with me.
98. I can hold out longer than my partner can.
99. I get my partner to do things my way.
100. My partner is able to keep me from doing things he/she doesn't want me to do.

The Styles of Conflict Inventory (SCI)

Michael E. Metz, Ph.D.

SCI APPRAISAL ITEMS

1. Rate the quality of your overall relationship.
(1)Very Unhappy/Very Happy(7)
2. How frequently do you have disagreements or conflicts in your relationship?
(1)Almost Never/Almost all the Time(7)
3. How intense or emotional are your relationship disagreements?
(1)Very Calm/Very Intense(7)
4. How responsible are you for the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)Not At All/Very Responsible(7)
5. How responsible is your partner for the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)Not At All/Very Responsible(7)
6. How likely is it that the relationship conflict or disagreement can be resolved in the future?
(1)Not At All/Very Likely(7)
7. How much power or control do you have over the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)None/Total(7)
8. How much power or control does your partner have over the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)None/Total(7)
9. How upset are you about the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)Not At All/Very Much(7)
10. How upset is your partner about the relationship conflict or disagreement?
(1)Not At All/Very Much(7)
11. How much effort are you putting into having a relationship free of hurtful conflict?
(1)None/Very Much(7)
12. How much effort is your partner putting into having a relationship free of hurtful conflict?
(1)None/Very Much(7)