STRONG FAMILIES AND THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE

By

KELLEY MICHAEL LEE BRIGMAN

Bachelor of Arts
Harding College
Searcy, Arkansas
1968

Master of Divinity
Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma
1976

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July 29, 1977

STRONG FAMILIES AND THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett
_____
Thesis Adviser

Althea Wright
_____

Frances Stromberg
_____

Norman N. Durham
_____
Dean of the Graduate College

989113

ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The family is the basic unit of society, therefore, the stability

and well being of the individual as well as society as a whole has

traditionally been dependent on the family. The family placed on a

continuum falls in the middle between the extreme ends of the individ-

ual and society. It serves a variety of needs and functions most of

which are unspecified (Zimmerman, 1972). A concept of family strengths

implies that the strong family is more desirable for the stability of

society (Grams, 1967) and Zimmerman (1972) has also noted that

> . . . societies with strong family systems tended to
> recuperate rapidly from conditions of adversity where-
> as the opposite types recovered only with great dif-
> ficulty (p. 325).

It is, therefore, important for individual members within the family

unit and for society as a whole that we have healthy families.

A study of strong families offers an opportunity to understand the

unique assets and potentials of family life. The rising number of

divorces which exceeded one million in 1976 in the United States (U. S.

Bureau of Census, 1976) indicates the need to strengthen families in

the United States and evidences the need for this study. This need

is compounded by the number of couples who stay together but who are

unsatisfied with their marriages.

Most people consider a strong satisfying family life among their most important goals in life. There are, however, few guidelines concerned with how one can achieve a successful, satisfying family life. Research of family strengths offers possibilities in this area.

As all families today are influenced by the hectic pace of life and must either cope successfully with its demands or be destroyed by them, it is extremely important that we investigate how those who have adapted successfully have dealt with these multiple stresses.

Need for Research

One important reason for the lack of guidelines about how to have a successful family life is the scarcity of research dealing with family strengths. Most research done in the area of the family has emphasized the pathology of the family (Otto, 1962, 1972). This, of course, is very useful to the therapist. But it is important to increase our understanding of what makes a strong family healthy. This would be beneficial to all who are concerned with the development of strong families. Studies of healthy families can make a contribution to the therapist in assessing the positive as well as the negative function of families (Otto, 1964). It would also serve as a positive model for the therapist to help families in developing their strengths, resources and potentials. Kinter and Otto (1964), dealing with the selection of foster parents have noted that

> . . . if child placement is to proceed on the basis of
> complementary needs, what the family has to offer (the
> pattern of family strengths) is an important criterion
> in the placement process (p. 361).

The prevention of serious emotional problems through the strengthening of family life is considered to be of primary importance (Joint

Commission on Mental Health of Children, Inc., 1969). Today there is much concern about the effects of the busy pace of life on the family. It seems unavoidable that all families - both strong and weak alike - are affected by the busy pace of life. Those families that survive must successfully cope with the multiple pressures in some way. It would be important, therefore, to determine the degree to which the busy pace of life is perceived as a problem by members of strong families and what they do to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on their families. Such research could contribute to a greater awareness of the resources and potentials of positive family life, and would also be a needed contribution to the expertise of the family therapist and others who work with families by developing a positive model for family therapy and education and by creating an atmosphere whereby more families could seek help in developing their potentials.

Research concerned with family strengths is thus far very limited. The present research was designed to provide increased knowledge and understanding in the area of family strengths. It is hoped that this research will also contribute toward the enrichment of family life.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to examine the perceptions of members of strong families concerning:

1. The degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family.

2. What is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family (for the total sample and also

according to sex and the employment status of the wife).

A secondary purpose of this study is to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family according to sex, socio-economic status, number of children, and the employment status of the wife.

2. There is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and optimism versus pessimism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores.

3. There is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and self-determination versus fatalism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores.

4. There is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and belief in God versus atheism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores.

Definition of Terms

Family Strengths: "are those forces, and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourage the development of the personal resources and potentials of members of the family and which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to family members" (Otto, 1975, p. 15).

Strong Families: are those families whose members have a high degree

of happiness in the husband-wife and parent-child relationships and
whose members fulfill each others needs to a high degree: the family
is also intact with both parents present in the home.

Description of Procedure

The questionnaire used in this study was designed by Dr. Nick
Stinnett, Associate Professor of family relations and child develop-
ment, Oklahoma State University, to measure various marital, parental
and family interaction patterns. The sample was composed of 157 hus-
bands and wives representing 99 families. The husbands and wives were
asked to complete the questionnaire and return it separately, there-
fore, the sample does not always contain responses from both the hus-
band and wife of the same family.

The study examines data concerning three questions. Two of the
questions were fixed alternative. One question was open ended thus
giving the respondents the opportunity to answer in their own words.
Categories for the responses given on the open ended question were de-
veloped by the investigator. The categorization process was then re-
viewed by a second person, a family life specialist and experienced
researcher. Percentages and frequency distribution were used to ana-
lyze the responses to the open ended question. The Kruskal-Wallis one-
way analysis of varience was used to examine the fixed alternative
questions. The chi-square test was used to analyze these questions
according to sex and the employment status of the wife.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature contained in this paper is concerned
with family strengths and also with specific areas of marital stabil-
ity, marital satisfaction, and parent-child relationships as they re-
late to the total family system.

Family Strengths

Most research has been done in the area of the dysfunctional fam-
ily rather than the strong family. It has been said that "Sometimes
therapists are so busy identifying and eradicating pathology they over-
look the healthy, intimate, joyful aspects of couples and family life"
(Kaslow, 1976). Therefore, literature concerning what makes strong
families is rather limited. Some, however, have made good contribu-
tions.

Otto (1962, 1966) asked 27 families to list what they perceived as
their family strengths. He found that the affective aspects of family
life, specifically the giving and receiving of love and understanding
between spouses and parents and children, were the greatest source of
family strength. Doing things together as a family and sharing reli-
gious convictions and moral values were also important aspects of the
strong family.

Sauer (1976) reported that strong families were characterized by:

(a) mutual respect and understanding, (b) expressions of appreciation among family members, (c) parental expressions of interest in their children and their activities, and (d) religious convictions were also important to their life style.

Statt (1951) suggested that in the growing family the overall criterion of family success might be the extent to which (a) all the family members are growing in functional adequacy as they play their respective roles as individuals and (b) the family as a whole as well as the various pairs and groupings are making progress in the achievement of their joint development tasks.

In developing a framework in which to view family strengths, Otto (1963, 1975) found that family strength is the end product of a series of ever changing related components. He identified the following 12 as resulting in family strength:

1. The ability to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of the family.

2. The ability to be sensitive to the needs of the family members.

3. The ability to communicate.

4. The ability to provide support, security and encouragement.

5. The ability to establish and maintain growth-producing relationships within and without the family.

6. The capacity to maintain and create constructive and responsible community relationships in the neighborhood and in the school, town, local and state governments.

7. The ability to grow with and through children.

8. An ability for self-help, and the ability to accept help when appropriate.

9. An ability to perform family roles flexibly.

10. Mutual respect for the individuality of family members.

11. A concern for family unity, loyalty and interfamily cooperation.

12. The ability to use crisis or seemingly injurious experiences as a means of growth.

Family strengths were seen by Otto (1962) as constantly changing elements within the family's subsystems which were simultaneously interacting and interrelated. Each element can be identified individually as a strength, but family strength results from the totality of the individual elements.

Blackburn (1967) has defined a strong family in terms of reciprocal role fulfillment and satisfaction within the parent-child and husband-wife dyads. Within this context the family is seen as an important source of physical and emotional gratification. Family strengths as defined by Otto (1975)

> . . . are those forces, and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourage the development of the personal resources and potentials of members of the family and which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to family members (p. 16).

Variations in the strengths of a family would be expected throughout the family life cycle.

The following qualities that contribute to successful families have been reported by Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960):

1. Successful families have more intimate family friends and have more in common with their friends than do unsuccessful families.

2. The basic "social" family principle is that of common values. This unique, purposeful, common value principle begins with mating and

extends through the life history of the family and outward in family friends.

3. In every city, in every degree of intimacy and in every measure of friendship similarity, the co-working of intimacy and similarity has been associated strikingly with success. The more friends are like each other, the more successful they are in avoiding divorce, desertion, juvenile arrest records and other phases of the breaking up of homes and domestic relations.

4. Having a child continue in high school is a positive function of child protection and of family success. Failing to continue in school is negative. To abolish the negative, the positive should be accentuated.

5. Parents with an ideal for their children, such as school continuance, can most thoroughly implement that ideal in the minds of the children by surrounding their household from the beginning with friends who also possess the same ideals.

6. The totality of all the impressions of life other than parental had been received by the children from members of friend families.

7. Analysis leads to the conclusion that friendship between similar minded adults living in proximity over a period of years results in its most basic or primary type. The friendship of this type is between equals, is voluntaristic, involves common experiences and is not primarily for the appetitive pleasure or political, economic or social gain.

Similarity and intimacy are the two interrelated characteristics of friendship that contribute to family strengths. Therefore, Zimmerman and Cervantes found that families in their study who were successful

were those who allowed only families who were like themselves into their homes and circle of friends. Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) also observed that only about one per cent of their sample reported no friends at all while between 70% and 80% reported having five or more intimate family-group friends. Depending on locality, from three-tenths to almost one-half of the family-group friends were relatives. The family as a whole was able to relate to a wide diversity of family types as family-group friends were not restricted to one stage of the family life cycle.

deLissovoy (1973) discovered that a kin network of economic and psychological support and church activities help sustain marriage. Solomon (1972) found a positive correlation between emotional stability and a good family identity. Family identity is determined by a person's attitude toward his or her surname.

Reeder (1973) hypothesized that certain family characteristics would aid problem solving behavior in families which included a mentally retarded child. The successful family:

> (a) is integrated into society; (b) maintains an internal focus of authority, decision-making, and emotional investment; (c) has ties of affection and support among all members; (d) has open channels of communication; (e) has a centralized authority structure to coordinate problem-solving efforts; (f) has the ability to communicate and evaluate conflicting ideas according to their intrinsic merit rather than the status of their source; (g) is able to reach a consensus on family goals and related role allocations and expectations; (h) prefers specific value orientations (p. 1758B).

Anthony (1969) found that a family with a strong background responds to difficulties by mobilizing its resources and working out the most constructive solutions together. Barton, Kawash and Cattell (1972) found that individuals comprising strong families usually come

from similar economic classes and backgrounds with similar goals and expectations. They are also compatible sexually.

One factor central to the stability and strength of the family is commitment. Commitment has been defined as the process where individuals give their energy and loyalty to a central theme. Committed family members strongly believe in what the family stands for as they continue to demonstrate this commitment. Kanter (1968) states that many of the problems in our society are seen as stemming from a lack of commitment.

Marital Stability

Levinger (1965) identified three factors that relate to marital stability: affectional rewards, barrier strength and alternate attraction. His theory of marital cohesiveness purports that:

> . . . the strength of the marital relationship is a
> direct function of the attractions within the barriers
> around the marriage and the inverse function of such
> attractions and barriers from other relationships
> (p. 19).

One strength of the American family is that it continues to meet the needs of men and women. These needs range from providing shelter, protection, family development, affection, reproduction, emotional, educational, love, to meeting sexual needs (Barton, Kawash, Cattell, (1972). Truitt (1976) found that one characteristic of strong families is that they are having their needs for love and purpose in life met within the family relationship to such a large degree that there is not a strong inclination to develop relationships and loyalties outside the family structure.

The ability of the family to provide companionship is another strength of the family. The family provides a place where members can

turn and be accepted, loved and cared for. The family provides for fulfilling emotional and physical needs of its members.

A stable marriage does not necessarily mean that a happy or satisfying relationship exists according to Cuber and Haroff (1963). They state that a:

> . . . 'stable' married pair may, on the one hand be deeply fulfilled people, living vibrantly, or at the other extreme entrapped, embittered, resentful people, living lives of duplicity in an atmosphere of hatred and despair (p. 141).

They suggest that one major reason for the stability of marriages in which partners feel their needs are not being fulfilled is the lack of attractive acceptable alternatives. Spouses settle for permanence rather than happiness because although their intrensic needs are not being met, their instrumental needs are.

Cuber and Haroff (1965) have stated that the "qualitative aspects of enduring marital relationships vary enormously" (p. 43). From their research among upper-middle class couples who have been married at least 10 years and who had never considered divorce or separation, Cuber and Haroff dilineated two basic types of marriages - utilitarian and intrensic. Utilitarian marriage is defined as "any marriage which is established and maintained for purposes other than to express an intimate, highly important personal relationship between a man and a woman" (p. 43). This category includes conflict habituated, passive-congenial, and devitalized relationships. Intrensic marriages are those which meet affective and companionship needs as well as the instrumental needs. These are vital and total relationships.

Among upper-middle class respondents, the intrensic marriage represented a minority (Cuber and Haroff, 1965), although Burgess (1945),

and Mace and Mace (1975) have expressed their belief that this type relationship is the preference of a great many men and women today. Foote and Cottrell (1955) have observed that the skills needed for achieving intimacy in a companionship marriage are more complex than those required for an instrumental relationship.

Levinger (1966) studied divorce applicants and found that middle class spouses were more concerned with the psychological and emotional support factors of the relationship while lower class spouses were more concerned with financial matters and unstable physical actions of their partners. It seems that spouses cannot be concerned with emotional and psychological factors of the marital relationship until their instrumental needs are met.

Mercer (1967) found that there were significantly: (1) more intact families among Whites than non-whites; (2) more nuclear families intact than extended; (3) more stable families living in towns than in the country. Several studies show that marriage happiness and stability is significantly higher among those families who have a high degree of religious orientation (Zimmerman and Cervantes, 1960; Bowman, 1974). Crockett, Babchuk and Ballweg (1969) found that religious homogeneity between spouses is related to family stability for both Protestants and Catholics.

Husband-Wife Role Perceptions

Stinnett and Walters (1977) Have observed that "Marriage success involves more than a marriage which is permanent because there are permanent marriages in which the partners are miserable and maintain a very destructive relationship with one another (p. 1). They agree with

Bowman (1974) in suggesting that a successful marriage is one in which the partners' level of satisfaction with their relations is at least what they expected from marriage. The more satisfaction they obtain above this level, the greater is the success of the marriage relationship.

Marriage success has been associated with marriage happiness by Gurin (1960). This happiness stems from a good interpersonal relationship between husband and wife. Factors such as mutual respect, expression of appreciation and affection are important in contributing to marital happiness which in turn, affects marital success.

The quality of the interpersonal relationship is another factor that has been associated with marital happiness (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Levinger (1966) stated that in relation to marital happiness both husband and wife place a higher value on the affective aspects than on the instrumental aspects. Blood (1969) found that one major factor associated with marriage success is the wife's happiness with the amount of attention given to her by the husband. On the other hand, Matthews and Milhanovich (1963) found that unhappily married individuals felt they: (a) were neglected by their mates; (b) received little appreciation, affection, or understanding from their mates; (c) were belittled and that their self-respect was attacked by their mates; (d) were often falsely accused by their marriage partners.

Luckey (1960a, 1960b, 1960c) and Stuckert (1963) found that marital satisfaction is related to the agreement of the husband's self concept and his spouse's concept of him. It was found not to be important that the husband's concept of the wife agree with her own self concept. Hurvitz (1965) found that there was a significant relationship between

marital satisfaction and the degree to which wives conform to husbands' expectations. It was also noted that men do not conform as much as women do in the marital relationship.

Katz, Goldstein, Cohen and Stucker (1963) noted a positive relationship between marital happiness and the favorableness of the husbands' self-description. The higher the husband's status, prestige, or social standing in the community the greater the wife's satisfaction with the marital relationship (Blood and Wolfe, 1960). Blacks and those persons who have low incomes and/or little education are more likely to become unhappy in their marriages (Renee, 1970). The relation between marital satisfaction and socioeconomic status is greater for Blacks than for Whites (Blood and Wolfe, 1960; Gurin, Veroff and Feld, 1960; Levinger, 1966). Whitehurst (1968) found that conventional lifestyles and a high degree of involvement in family activities were related to a high degree of marital adjustment. Lee (1974) noted a positive relationship between normlessness and marital dissatisfaction. Burr (1971) found that there are discrepancies between role expectation and role behavior which influences marital satisfaction. A high negitive relationship was found between role discrepancies and marital satisfaction.

Effect of Women's Employment

Some investigators have found a lower degree of marital adjustment in families with working wives than in families where the wife was not employed (Axelson, 1963; Hicks and Platt, 1970). A direct relationship between marital happiness and the wife's employment or unemployment and the husband's attitude toward her work status was noted by Nye (1961). Axelson (1963) found that marital satisfaction was lower when wives

worked full time than when they worked part time. A lower degree of marital happiness was noted by Orden and Bradburn (1969) when the woman was not given a choice, i.e. working due to necessity rather than by choice. There was no apparent difference in the level of marital adjustment among wives who worked by choice and those who were not employed. Women who worked part time rather than full time and women who remained at home, did, however, have a slightly higher degree of marital adjustment.

Jessie Bernard (1976) has noted that "in the past 20 to 25 years, women have increasingly assumed two roles . . . . Wives are putting in a full days work, but having to put dinner on the table at the end of it" (p. 7). She points to the fact that women are overloaded as a cause for depression which in turn puts a strain on the whole family. The most vulnerable for depression under these strains are those women who are mothers of small children, in the labor force, with relatively low incomes, and in menial jobs.

Ridley (1973) found indications that the marriage relationship was adversely affected when either spouse became deeply involved in his job. A significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and marital adjustment was found for men. A high degree of marital adjustment was found to exist when wives received little satisfaction from their jobs and their spouses received much job satisfaction.

Occupation of both the husband and wife have an important influence on marriage success. Marriage happiness and stability tend to be higher among the more stable and higher paid occupations according to Bernard (1966). Marriage satisfaction also tends to be associated with job satisfaction which is also associated with a feeling of self worth

(Ridley, 1973).

Personality Factors

Perhaps the single most important factor necessary for the development of a satisfactory companionship marriage is a personality that allows for and facilitates intimacy. Research indicates that personality characteristics of marriage partners are related to marriage failure and success (Lantz and Snyder, 1969). No one type of personality guarantees success in marriage, but clinical evidence suggests that the person with a generally healthy personality will have a better chance for marital success than the person on the other end of the personality continuum (Stroup, 1963).

The following personality characteristics have been identified by Lantz and Snyder (1969) as being related to marriage success or failure: (a) emotional maturity and stability, (b) self control, (c) ability to demonstrate affection, (d) considerate of others, (e) optimistic, (f) willingness to take on responsibility, (g) ability to overcome feelings of anger.

Spanier (1972) describes spouses of successful marriages as being mature, stable, conventional and conforming people who come from untroubled family backgrounds. Murstein and Glauding (1966) report that a balance of positive personality attributes is important for marital happiness. Their list is identical to that of Lantz and Snyder (1969) except they add the tendency to be conventional and favorable self-perception. Dean (1966, 1968) found a strong association between emotional stability and marital happiness.

Stinnett and Walters (1977) observed that happily married

persons have personality attributes that contribute to the development of any successful interpersonal relationships. Landis and Landis (1973) noted that those who have kind attitudes toward others, are considerate, cooperative, emotionally stable, and optimistic tend to have satisfying friendships as well as marriages. Those who are inconsiderate, selfish, uncooperative, aggressive and moody tend to have unsatisfactory marriages and fewer friendships. Truitt (1976) found that persons in strong families tend to express a low degree of behavior which attempts to control others.

Barton, Kawash and Cattell (1972) related individual personality factors to various marital dimensions and found that partners with high ego strength and low guilt proneness reported high sexual gratification. Subjects with high superego tended to be highly devoted to the home. Low anxiety respondents reported high social-intellectual equality in their marriages. Marriage instability was high among those who used cognition rather than feeling in problem solving.

Persons with satisfying marriages tend to have characteristics that promote positive interpersonal relationships. They are considerate, cooperative, generous, conventional and responsible. They also tend to see their spouses as having moderate and not extreme personality qualities (Landis and Landis, 1970; Hicks and Platt, 1970; and Allen, 1962).

Adaptability and flexibility correlate positively with marriage success (Clements, 1967; Crouse, Karlins and Schroder, 1968). These characteristics determine the ability or nonability to resolve conflicts (Hicks and Platt, 1970; Kieren and Tallman, 1972). The wife's adaptability is positively associated with the husband's marital happiness

(Kieren and Tallman, 1972). Clements (1967) found that stable couples were more willing to modify their behavior than unstable couples.

A high degree of marital dissatisfaction is associated with large differences in personality traits, but it is not known whether the personality characteristics are the cause of the unhappy marriage or the marital problems the cause of the personality characteristics (Stroup, 1963). Persons dissatisfied with their marriages tend to view their spouses as being impatient, either dictatorial or passive, unkind, blunt, aggressive, gloomy, complaining, slow to forgive and distrustful (Allen, 1962).

Winch, Ktsanes, and Ktsanes (1954) suggested that personality traits of successful spouses will be complimentary reather than homogenous. But Hicks and Platt (1970) state that Blazer (1963) found "that marital dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction was strongly associated with need complimentarity" (p. 67). Similarity rather than complimentarity was found to contribute to marriage success along the following dimensions: enthusiasm, social boldness, emotional stability and conscience (Cattell and Nesselroade, 1967).

Ammons (1967) found that strong family members and also those strong family members who had high degree of vital-total marital relationship expressed high levels of personality needs which tend to contribute to successful interpersonal relationships. Strong family members in this study also had low levels of those needs which, if possessed to extreme degrees, may be contraproductive to successful relationships, e.g. low or very low levels of need for exhibition (need to be center of attention), aggression and autonomy. The study suggested that marriage partners who have a high degree of total-vital relation-

ship tend to compliment each other in terms of their personality needs.

Affectional Needs and Communication

Marriage success has been associated with marriage happiness by Gurin (1960). This happiness stems from a good interpersonal relationship between husband and wife. Factors such as mutual respect, expressions of appreciation and affection are important in contributing to marital happiness which in turn, affects marital success. Sauer (1976) studied family strengths and found that mutual respect and understanding, mutual love, and good communication were among the five most frequently given responses to the question, what has contributed most to your marriage.

Communication has been identified as one prerequisite of the development of a happy marriage (Clarke, 1970). Ball (1970) found that satisfactory interfamilial communication was a characteristic of strong families. The factors that contribute to satisfaction included: (a) talking out problems together, (b) honesty (openness), (c) listening, and (d) talking together.

Navran (1967) found that couples that reported themselves happily married had better verbal and nonverbal communication than did unhappy couples. Good verbal communication was more positively associated with a couple's satisfactory relationship than was good nonverbal communication. When happily married couples were compared with unhappily married couples significant differences were observed. The happily married couples:

> (a) talk more to each other, (b) convey the feeling that they understand what is being said to them, (c) have a wider range of subjects available to them, (d) preserve communication channels and keep them open,

(e) show more sensitivity to each other's feelings,
(f) personalize their language symbols, and (g) make
more use of supplementary nonverbal techniques of
communication (p. 182).

Matthews and Milhanovich (1963) noted that unhappily married couples:

1. Experienced more conflict than happily married couples.

2. Are neglected, receive little affection, understanding, appreciation, or companionship.

3. Feel that their self respect is attacked.

4. Feel that their faults are magnified by spouse.

5. Feel worthless, belittled, and falsely accused by spouse.

Terman (1938) found that one of the chief complaints of dissatisfied wives was that their husbands did not talk things over with them frequently enough. Locke (1951) found that divorced couples tended to talk things over less frequently than happily married couples. Locke, Sabagh, and Thomas (1956) found a significant correlation between marital adjustment and communication among randomly selected couples.

Ball (1976) noted that a large majority of her respondents (87.1%) from strong families were either satisfied or very satisfied with their communication with spouse. The respondents most frequently indicated that talking things out together had contributed most to good marital communication. By relating the degree of satisfaction with marital communication and with degree of satisfaction with parent-child communication a significant positive relationship at the .0001 level was found. This may suggest that satisfaction or dissatisfaction with communication patterns with the spouse or children in part reflects the degree of communication skills an individual has acquired rather than the quality of interaction between particular individuals. This finding is in keeping with psychotherapists (Ackerman, 1966, 1972;

Jackson, 1959, 1972; Brammer and Shostrom, 1960; Boyer, 1960; Haley, 1962, 1963, 1971; Watson, 1963; Elizur, 1969; and Satir, 1972) who claim that communication distortions are the main cause of family problems and suggest that improvement in intra-family communication is where the emphasis in family treatment should be.

Rollins and Feldman (1970) have identified three keys to marital success. These are: (a) personal readiness for marriage, (b) compatible mate selection, and (c) early adjustment to marriage.

Partners with common interests are likely to have a successful marriage. These persons are likely to do many things together. It is in this type of sharing relationship that partners find good companionship (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Scanzoni (1966) states that cultural backgrounds also affect marriage success. It is to the advantage of the partners to have such things in common as: similar attainment level in education, race, and socio-economic status. Great differences in these areas are associated with marital failure (Hicks and Platt, 1970).

Chilman and Meyer (1966) studied married undergraduates and found that "love and companionship in marriage received far higher rating . . . than sex satisfaction, living conditions and academic pursuits" (p. 75). Levinger (1964) found that both spouses placed a higher value on the affective aspects of task performance than on instrumental aspects.

Effects of Children on the Marital Dyad

Contrary to popular presumption, having children has not been found to be associated with marriage satisfaction (Hicks and Platt,

1970). Children can greatly affect the success of marriage, even be-
fore they are conceived (Meyerowitz, 1970; and Figley, 1973). Bernard
(1972) has noted that childless couples are more satisfied with their
marriages than couples with children. Sauer (1976) found that among
strong families in her study only women indicated that children were a
source of marital satisfaction, and only 4.39 per cent of the women
gave that response.

Rollins and Feldman (1970) studied 799 married couples and noted
that marital satisfaction of both partners is associated with the stage
of the family life cycle. The spouses reported a definite decline in
the number of positive companionship experiences from the beginning of
the marriage to the preschool stage and then a leveling off occurred
for the remainder of the family life cycle. Gurin, Veroff, and Feld
(1960) discovered a curvilinear trend with decreasing marital satis-
faction during the first stages of the family life cycle, a leveling
off, and an increase during the last stages. Rollins and Cannon (1974)
supported the U-shaped trend. They also noted that there was no dif-
ference between the responses of husbands and wives. Figley (1973)
also noted a decrease in marital communication and adjustment during
the child-rearing period.

Renee (1970) surveyed 4452 families and found that persons who
were raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied with their
marital relationship than couples who had never had children or couples
whose children were no longer living at home. Walters and Stinnett
(1971) report that couples without children tend toward extremes in
adjustment being either extremely unhappy or extremely happy while
those with children approached average in happiness. Hurley and

Palonen (1967) found that the greater the ratio of children per years of marriage, the lower the satisfaction of the spouses. Luckey (1966) found that the relationship between the number of children and the degree of marital satisfaction was not significant. Ammons (1976) found no significant differences in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondents number of children. It is interesting that while an increase in the number of children may decrease marriage satisfaction (qualitative dimension), it also decreases the liklihood of divorce (endurance dimension) (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1976). Luckey and Bain (1970) have noted that children were reported by unhappily married couples as the main and usually the only source of satisfaction.

Successful parent and child relationships also tend to strengthen and bind the family as a unit. Children affect the marital dyad in many ways. Many resources indicate that children actually weaken the family unit, but that the commitment the couple has to the children seems to make the family stronger (Blackburn, 1967; Figley, 1973).

Sauer (1976) found that nearly half of her responses from strong families concerning what the parents would most like to change about the parent-child relationships was nothing. This reveals that these strong families are satisfied not only with the husband-wife relationships but also with the parent-child relationships and express few dissatisfactions with family interaction.

<div align="center">Parent-Child Relationships</div>

Children's Identification and
Orientation to Life

Elder (1963) examined the pattern of role modeling. He noted

that adolescents are more likely to model democratic parents than parents who are either authoritarian or permissive.

A study of religiosity of adolescents by Wiegert (1968) reported that parental supportiveness had a greater impact on the adolescent's degree of religiosity than did parental control. Cooke (1962) noted that among undergraduates which he studied, the strongly religious respondents tended not only to view themselves more like both of their parents but also liked their parents better than those respondents who said they had a low degree of religious convictions. The level of religious feelings of the students was directly and positively related to the perceived level of the mother's religiosity.

Several studies indicate that there is a definite association between occupational choice and the parent-child relationship. Children who experienced their family life as warm and accepting tend to choose occupations which are person-oriented while children who perceive their home life as unsatisfactory generally choose occupations which are nonperson-oriented (Green and Parker, 1965; Schneider, 1968).

Stinnett and Walters (1967) studied low income families and found that adolescents who reported a low evaluation of the family were more likely to be peer-oriented than those students who reported a high evaluation of the family. Brittain (1967) studied adolescent girls and noted that when a choice is thought by adolescents to be of great importance to peers they tend to be peer-compliant, but when the choice is thought to be important to parents the adolescent tends to be parent-compliant. It was also noted that when the choice was important to both parents and peers, the choice was parent-compliant and when the decision was considered of little importance to either group the

adolescent tended to be peer-compliant. Condry and Siman (1974) found that adult-oriented children receive greater support from both parents than peer-oriented children. They further stated that children who became peer-oriented and conformed to socially undesirable peer subcultures had experienced parental rejection and neglect.

Children's Achievements

Norris (1968) noted that the child's ability to achieve basic skills, school grades, and positive teacher comments for pre-adolescent boys was associated with the degree of parental satisfaction and understanding of the child. Morrow and Wilson (1961) in a study of family relationships of high-achieving and under-achieving high school boys discovered: (a) high-achievers' parents shared family recreation, confidences, and ideas more often than under-achievers' parents; (b) high-achievers had parents who were more approving, trusting, affectionate, and more encouraging of achievement than under-achievers.

Esty (1968) investigated the difference between leaders and non-leaders among college students and noted that leaders perceived their parents as less neglecting, rejecting, overprotective, and more loving than did non-leaders. Richardson (1965) found that female college freshmen who scored high on tests of creative thinking recalled their parent-child relationships as significantly less rejecting and more loving than those who scored low.

Siegelman (1965) studied the effect of early parent-child relationships on personality characteristics of college students and found that those students who were considered introverts recalled their parents as rejecting. Students who reported low levels of anxiety stated that

they remembered their parents as loving and students who stated that
they experienced high levels of anxiety reported their parents as being
rejecting.

Juvenile Delinquency

The backgrounds of juvenile delinquents almost always reveal an
ineffective or missing mother during the formative years. Disruptive
relationships among parents and other relatives may result in a lack of
security and disorientation in children. Maunch (1970) states that the
best barrier against juvenile delinquency is the family in which each
person has his place. Socioeconomic and sociocultural conditions can
have either a preventative or contributive nature in relation to juve-
nile criminality (Lebovici, 1973). In a study of middle class boys,
Gallenkamp (1968) found that parents of delinquents are more sanction-
ing of antisocial behavior than parents of non-delinquents. Delinquent
boys have more negative attitudes toward their parents than do non-
delinquents, with the greatest difference being the attitudes toward
the father (Andry, 1960; Medinnus, 1965). Harris (1973) compared a
group of sixteen-year-old boys with a study of the same group ten years
earlier and reported that delinquency could be predicted at age six
with 84 per cent accuracy. The factors used in predicting the occur-
rence of delinquent behavior included: (a) inconsistent discipline of
the child; (b) lack of parental supervision; and (c) lack of family
cohesiveness and affection.

Parental Supportiveness

Stinnett, Talley and Walters (1973) stated that while Black

subjects were less likely to have both parents present, they experienced more mother-oriented environments then White families and consequently have closer parent-child relationships.

Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971) studied adolescent boys and found that the quality of parenting seems to be more important than the amount of time the parent has in the home. There was also a definite contrast between the adaptive and maladaptive boys in terms of the degree of affection and mutual support present in the family system.

The relationship between parent's attitudes and behaviors in child rearing and the child's self concept in school was investigated by Mote (1967) who observed that the parents' satisfaction with the child's learning was significantly and positively associated with the child's self concept. A supportive family was conducive to the development of high ability, achievement and creativity. The cohesive family was found to be more significantly associated with late adolescent adjustment (Ahlstrom and Havighurst, 1971).

Clapp studied four-year-old male children's competence and dependence and found that competent children had parents who tended to treat them more like children and less like adults. The parents were also found to be more permissive, less restrictive, warmer, and less hostile in their relationship with their children than parents of children who expressed dependence (Clapp, 1967).

Chalkin and Frank (1973) found that in successful families there is a corresponding accuracy in self-other perceptions which is related to good child adjustment. Tracey (1971) observed that when parent-child relationships improved, the ability to meet and deal with stress in other relationships also improved.

Leonard, Rhymes and Solnit (1966) state that medical professionals have recognized the "failure to thrive" syndrome which is defined as a lack of physical development with a corresponding lack of organic reason as being caused by problems in the parent-child relationship. Bullard, Glaser, Heagerty and Pivchick (1967) found that in most instances "failure to thrive" children who were neglected by their parents came from homes in which there was a severe marital conflict, erratic living habits and an inability of the parents to maintain employment or provide financial support for the child's care.

Summary

Despite the fact that literature concerning family strengths is very limited in quantity, several significant findings do emerge. Some of these are summarized below:

1. One of the most important lifetime goals for most people is a fulfilling family life, yet there are few guidelines for how this goal can be achieved.

2. Marriage and family success are strongly associated with various affective aspects of family interaction such as the presence of love and understanding, participation in family activities, a high degree of religious orientation, and the presence of intimate family friends of similar interests and values.

3. Marital satisfaction is dependent on a number of variables of both the affective and instrumental nature.

4. A satisfying marital relationship has been found to be related to the agreement of the wife's concept of the husband and the husband's own self concept. This agreement of concept of the spouse

was not found to be as important for the wife.

5. The employment of women is not necessarily a disruptive factor in the family and marital relationships. Women who work part time rather than full time and women who remain at home have a higher degree of marital adjustment. The woman's opportunity to work if she wishes to and not to work if she wishes not to seems to be relevant to marital and family adjustment.

6. A high degree of job involvement tends to have an adverse effect on the marriage relationship and couples who reported a high degree of marital adjustment also tended to report that the wives received little job satisfaction while the husbands received a greater degree of job satisfaction.

7. Personality factors such as emotional maturity and stability, self control, ability to demonstrate affection, consideration for others, optimism, willingness to take responsibility, ability to overcome anger and favorable self perception are crucial to successful companionship marriages.

8. Interpersonal skills such as good verbal and nonverbal communication, flexibility and adaptability, empathy and sensitivity are very important to marital happiness.

9. Happily married couples tend to have better communication patterns than unhappily married couples in that they talk to each other more often, understand what the other is saying, show sensitivity to one another's feelings and make more use of nonverbal cues.

10. When compared to happily married couples, unhappily married couples experience more conflict, feel neglected, receive little affection or appreciation, and feel that their self respect is attacked.

11. The increasing importance of meeting others' emotional and affectional needs indicates that the marital relationship may be becoming more companionship oriented.

12. There seems to be a positive correlation between parental support, warmth and acceptance and the development of emotional, social and intellectual growth of children.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The Cooperative County Extension Service was asked to help in
obtaining the sample for this study. As strong families who would par-
ticipate were being sought, the Extension Home Economists were consid-
ered to be reliable professionals to recommend strong families. In
addition, their degree of contact with families in their county and
their continuing concern for strengthening family life made them ideal
for helping secure subjects for the study.

The Extension Home Economist in each of Oklahoma's 77 counties
were sent letters requesting that they recommend two or more families
in their county whom they felt were strong families. The following
guidelines were provided for their consideration in selecting families.

1. The family members appear to have a high degree of happiness
   in the husband-wife and parent-child relationships.

2. The family members appear to fulfill each other's needs to a
   high degree.

3. The family is intact with both parents present in the home.

4. The family must have at least one school age child, 21 years
   or younger living at home.

In addition, the respondent must rate his or her marital happiness and
satisfaction in the parent-child relationship as satisfactory or very
satisfactory on the questionnaire.

The procedure obtained 157 subjects representing 99 families throughout the state of Oklahoma. Cover letters (see Appendix) explaining the study and assuring confidentiality were sent to approximately 180 families. Questionnaires were included for both the husband and wife. They were requested to complete the questionnaires separately and not to compare answers. Because of this procedure the sample does not always contain responses from both members of the same family. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with each questionnaire. The data were obtained by Dr. Nick Stinnett during March, April and May, 1975.

The Instrument

The questionnaire was designed by Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor of family relations and child development, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. The questionnaire was designed to measure several aspects of family life which a review of literature indicated were important components of family strength.

The questionnaire was then turned over to a group of four judges, all of whom held advanced degrees in the area of family relations. They were asked to rate the items in terms of the following criteria:

1. Does the item possess sufficient clarity?

2. Is the item sufficiently specific?

3. Is the item significantly related to the concept under investigation?

4. Are there other items that need to be included to measure the concepts under investigation?

The judge's suggestions were incorporated into the final version of the instrument. There was a high degree of agreement among the

judges that the items met the four criteria.

A pre-test including 20 families was used to evaluate the instrument. Modifications concerning the wording of questions and the overall length of the questionnaire were made as a result of the pre-test.

For the present study data from the following sections of the questionnaire (see Appendix) were used: (a) biographical information such as sex, age, and place of residence; (b) perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family; (c) perceptions concerning what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the respondent's family; (d) Life Philosophy Scale. The questions used to obtain the above information were fixed alternative and open ended.

The Life Philosophy Scale (LPS) (Stinnett, 1975) was designed to measure the respondent's life philosophy with regard to:

1. Optimism versus pessimism.

2. Self-determination versus fatalism.

3. Belief in God versus atheism.

Two different forms of the questionnaire were administered to different subjects. As only one form contained the Life Philosophy Scale, only about one-half the subjects completed the LPS.

Martin (1976) obtained an index of validity of the LPS by employing the chi-square test to determine which of the items in the three subsections significantly discriminated between upper and lower quartiles on the basis of total scores for each section. All of the items in the three sections were found to be significantly discriminating at the .001 level. A test re-test reliability coefficient of 1.00 was obtained by Martin (1976) based on a small sample.

Analysis of the Data

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the background characteristics of the subjects - age, sex, socio-economic status, etc. Percentages and frequencies were also used to examine the perceptions of the respondents concerning:

1. Degree to which the busy pace of life was a problem for the respondent's family.

2. What was done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the respondent's family.

The chi-square test was used to examine the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and each of the following: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) number of children, and (d) employment status of the wife.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the hypotheses that there is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life was a problem for the respondent's family and each of the following life philosophies: (a) optimism versus pessimism, (b) self-determination versus fatalism, and (c) belief in God versus atheism.

Categories were developed for the open ended questions by the investigator from the responses given. A family life specialist and experienced researcher reviewed the process of categorization.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Subjects

Table I presents a detailed description of the 157 subjects who participated in the study. The sample consisted of 40.12 per cent males and 59.88 per cent females. Ages ranged from 24 to over 50 years. The group from 36 to 40 years comprised the greatest percentage (30.57%) by age.

Whites comprised 94 per cent of the sample. The sample was primarily from upper-middle (41.03%) and lower-middle (39.10%) socioeconomic classes as determined by the modified McGuire Index of Social Status (1955). The largest percentage of respondents (48.41%) indicated they resided on a farm or in a rural area. A small town under 25,000 population was the residence of another 36.94 per cent of the respondents. Most respondent families (78.80%) reported that the wife was not employed outside the home.

Perceptions Concerning the Degree to Which

the Busy Pace of Life is a Problem

for the Respondent's Family

Percentages and frequencies were used to examine the perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	Number	Per Cent
Sex	Male	63	40.12
	Female	94	59.88
Race	White	147	94.23
	Black	6	3.85
	Indian	3	1.92
Age	20-25	2	1.27
	26-30	12	7.64
	31-35	33	21.02
	36-40	48	30.57
	41-45	44	28.03
	46-50	8	5.10
	over 50	10	6.37
Religion	Catholic	22	14.19
	Protestant	126	81.29
	Morman	1	0.65
	None	6	3.87
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very much	31	20.00
	Much	73	47.09
	Moderate	46	29.67
	Little	5	3.22
	Very little	--	-----
Socio-Economic Class	Upper	7	4.49
	Upper-middle	64	41.03
	Lower-middle	61	39.10
	Upper-lower	21	13.46
	Lower-lower	3	1.92
Place of Residence	Farm or country	76	48.41
	Small town under 25,000	58	36.94
	City of 25,000 to 50,000	11	7.01
	City of 50,000 to 100,000	9	5.73
	City over 100,000	3	1.91
Wife's Employment	Not employed	66	70.21
	Employed full time	28	29.79

the respondent's family. An analysis of the findings is presented in Table II. As the table indicates the greatest percentage of respondents (39.61%) indicated that the busy pace of life was a moderate problem for their families. The second greatest percentage of respondents (25.97%) indicated that they perceived the busy pace of life as a large problem.

TABLE II

PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE TO WHICH
THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE IS A PROBLEM
FOR THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY

Perceptions	number	Per Cent
Very little or no problem	19	12.34
Little problem	20	12.99
Moderate problem	61	39.61
Large problem	40	25.97
Very large problem	14	9.09

Perceptions Concerning What is Done

To Prevent the Busy Pace of Life

From Having Adverse Effects

On the Respondent's Family

Percentages and frequencies were used to examine perceptions concerning what was done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the respondent's family. The results given in Table III indicated that the greatest percentage of responses (24.55%) fell in the category of planning activities so the family can be together. The next most frequent responses which were reported by the strong family members were: limiting unnecessary activities (17.96%) and

commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play (15.57%).

TABLE III

PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT IS DONE
TO PREVENT THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE
FROM HAVING ADVERSE EFFECTS ON
THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY

Perceptions	Number	Per Cent
Planning activities so family can be together	41	24.55
Limiting unnecessary activities	30	17.96
Commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play	26	15.57
Eating meals together	15	8.98
Placing the family first	10	5.99
Participating in children's activities	10	5.99
Nothing - it's not a problem	2	1.20
Religious conviction (keeping God first)	7	4.19
Taking life as it comes	6	3.59
Other	20	11.98

Comparisons by Sex

When the perceptions concerning what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family was analyzed according to sex some marked differences were noted. A detailed breakdown of these results is given in Table IV.

Approximately six times as many females (7119%) as males (1.80%)

TABLE IV

PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT IS DONE TO PREVENT THE BUSY
PACE OF LIFE FROM HAVING ADVERSE EFFECTS ON
THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY ACCORDING TO SEX

Perceptions	Wives		Husbands	
	number	per cent	number	per cent
Planning activities so family can be together	23	13.77	18	10.78
Limiting unnecessary activities	22	13.17	8	4.79
Commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play	17	10.18	9	5.39
Eating meals together	12	7.19	3	1.80
Placing family first	8	4.79	2	1.20
Nothing - it's not a problem	0	0.00	2	1.20
Religious conviction (keeping God first)	3	1.80	4	2.40
Taking life as it comes	4	2.40	2	1.20
Other	10	5.99	10	5.99

reported that eating meals together was a way of coping with the busy pace of life. Approximately three times as many females (13.17%) as compared to males (4.79%) perceived limiting unnecessary activities as important. More females (10.18%) than males (5.39%) reported commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together - work and play.

There were three categories where perceptions of the men concerning what was helpful in coping with the busy pace of life were higher than the women's. Two men (1.20%) indicated nothing - it's not a problem while no women chose this response. More men (3.59%) than women (2.40%) indicating that participating in children's activities was helpful. Surprisingly, more men (2.40%) than women (1.80%) indicated that religious conviction (keeping God first) was important.

Comparisons by Employment Status of Wife

Analysis of perceptions concerning what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family according to the employment status of the wife reveals some interesting findings. One might suspect that the employed mothers would perceive themselves as doing several different things to keep the busy pace of life from affecting their families adversely, but the non-working mothers tended to rank most coping activities higher than working mothers. However, no working mothers indicated nothing - it's not a problem while a small percentage (1.20%) of non-working mothers did. Also fewer mothers who worked outside the home (0.60%) indicated taking life as it comes than did the mothers who do not work outside the home (2.99%).

More non-working mothers (5.39%) than working mothers (0.60%) reported participating in children's activities as a way of coping with

the busy pace of life. More non-employed mothers (12.57%) than employed mothers (2.99%) reported commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play. Also more non-working mothers (4.79%) than working mothers (1.20%) reported placing the family first. More non-working mothers (17.96%) reported planning activities so family can be together than did working mothers (6.59%). More non-working mothers (6.59%) than working mothers (2.40%) reported eating meals together. Table V gives a detailed analysis of the findings in this category.

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. There is no significant relationship between perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family according to each of the following: (a) sex (b) socio-economic status (c) number of children (d) employment status of the wife.

The variables in this hypothesis were examined by the chi-square test. The results indicated that no significant relationship existed between perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and each of the following: (a) sex (b) socio-economic status (c) number of children (d) employment status of the wife. The chi-square values are given in Table VI.

Hypothesis II. There is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and optimism versus pessimism as measured by the Life Philosophy Scale.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of varience was used to analyze this hypothesis. As Table VII indicates an H value of 6.31 was

TABLE V

PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT IS DONE TO PREVENT THE BUSY PACE OF
LIFE FROM HAVING ADVERSE EFFECTS ON THE RESPONDENT'S
FAMILY ACCORDING TO EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF WIFE

Perceptions	Employed		Not Employed	
	number (N = 28)	per cent	number (N = 66)	per cent
Planning activities so family can be together	11	6.59	30	17.96
Limiting unnecessary activities	9	5.39	21	12.57
Commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play	5	2.99	21	12.57
Eating meals together	4	2.40	11	6.59
Placing family first	2	1.20	8	4.79
Participating in children's activities	1	0.60	9	5.39
Nothing - it's not a problem	0	0.00	2	1.20
Religious conviction (keeping God first)	2	1.20	5	2.99
Taking life as it comes	1	0.60	5	2.99
Other	6	3.59	14	8.38

obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and optimism versus pessimism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores.

TABLE VI

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING THE DEGREE
TO WHICH THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE IS A PROBLEM
FOR THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY ACCORDING TO
SEX, SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS, NUMBER OF
CHILDREN, AND EMPLOYMENT OF WIFE

Variable	Chi-square	Level of Significance
Sex	1.82	n.s.
Socio-economic status	14.23	n.s.
Number of children*		
Employment of wife	6.13	n.s.

*due to insuffecient number of cases in various categories
this variable was not analyzed by the chi-square test.

TABLE VII

H VALUE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
DEGREE TO WHICH THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE IS A
PROBLEM FOR THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY
AND OPTIMISM VERSUS PESSIMISM
AS MEASURED BY LIFE
PHILOSOPHY SCALE
SCORES

Degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family	Number*	Average Rank	H Value	Level of Significance
Very little or no problem	12	41.63		
Little problem	13	44.08		
Moderate problem	31	48.39	6.31	n.s.
Large problem	22	35.61		
Very large problem	5	26.00		

*The Life Philosophy Scale was administered to only about
half the sampling.

HYPOTHESIS III. There is no significant relationship between the de-
gree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's
family and self-determination versus fatalism as measured by the Life
Philosophy Scale scores.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to ana-
lyze this hypothesis. As Table VIII indicates an $\underline{H}$ value of 4.39 was
obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed between
the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the res-
pondent's family and self-determination versus fatalism as measured by
the Life Philosophy Scale scores.

TABLE VIII

H VALUE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE
IS A PROBLEM FOR THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY
AND SELF-DETERMINATION VERSUS FATALISM
AS MEASURED BY LIFE PHILOSOPHY
SCALE SCORES

Degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family	Number	Average Rank	$\underline{H}$ Value	Level of Signifi-cance
Very little or no problem	12	38.04		
Little problem	13	41.88		
Moderate problem	31	48.45	4.39	n.s.
Large problem	22	35.30		
Very large problem	5	41.30		

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant relationship between the degree
to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family
and belief in God versus atheism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale
scores.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was also used to
analyze this hypothesis. As Table IX indicates an $\underline{H}$ value of 4.21 was

obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and belief in God versus atheism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores.

TABLE IX

$\underline{\text{H}}$ VALUE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
DEGREE TO WHICH THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE IS A
PROBLEM FOR THE RESPONDENT'S FAMILY AND
BELIEF IN GOD VERSUS ATHEISM AS
MEASURED BY LIFE PHILOSOPHY
SCALE SCORES

Degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family	Number	Average Rank	$\underline{\text{H}}$ Value	Level of Significance
Very little or no problem	12	35.04		
Little problem	13	41.27		
Moderate problem	31	40.89	4.21	n.s.
Large problem	22	45.30		
Very large problem	5	53.00		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

This study was designed to investigate responses from members of
strong families concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is
a problem for the respondent's family and what is done to keep the busy
pace of life from having adverse effects on the family. The study was
also designed to test the hypothesis that there is no significant rela-
tionship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a prob-
lem for the respondent's family according to sex, socio-economic status,
number of children, and the employment status of the wife. Another
purpose of the study was to investigate the hypotheses that there is no
significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of
life is a problem for the respondent's family and the following philos-
ophies of life: optimism versus pessimism, self-determination versus
fatalism, and belief in God versus atheism.

The respondents were 157 husbands and wives from the 77 counties in
Oklahoma. The respondents were members of strong families as deter-
mined by previously mentioned criteria, had at least one child 21 years
or younger in the home, were primarily White and were predominately
from rural areas and small towns in Oklahoma. The data were collected
during March, April, and May, 1975.

The study examines data concerning three questions. Two were fix-
ed alternative. One was open ended thus giving the respondents the

opportunity to answer in their own words. Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the responses to the open ended question and also to compare the responses to this question according to sex and employment status of the wife. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the fixed alternative questions.

1. The greatest percentage of respondents (39.61%) indicated that the busy pace of life was a moderate problem for their families. The second greatest proportion (25.97%) indicated that they perceived the busy pace of life as a large problem for their families. The smallest percentage of respondents (9.09%) indicated that the busy pace of life was a very large problem for their families.

2. In terms of what was done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family the greatest percentage of respondents indicated the following three things: (1) planning activities so the family can be together (24.55%), limiting unnecessary activities (17.96%), and commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play (15.57%). When comparisons were made by sex approximately three times as many females as males reported eating meals together and limiting unnecessary activities. Almost twice as many females as males reported commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play. Two men (1.20%) indicated they did nothing - it's not a problem while no women chose this response. It was interesting that more men than women perceived participating in children's activities and religious conviction (keeping God first) as important in preventing the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family. Comparisons by the employment status of the wife indicate generally that mothers who are not employed

outside the home perceive themselves as doing more to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family. However, no wives who were employed outside the home indicated nothing - it's not a problem while a small percentage (1.20%) of non-working mothers did. Non-employed mothers as compared with working mothers placed greater emphasis on participating in children's activities (5.39% compared to 0.60%), commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family-work and play (12.57% compared to 2.99%), placing the family first (17.97% compared to 6.59%), and eating meals together (6.59% compared to 2.40%).

3. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family according to sex, socio-economic status, number of children and employment status of the wife was examined by the chi-square test. The results indicated that no significant relationship existed between perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and each of the variables.

4. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and optimism versus pessimism as measured by the Life Philosophy Scale scores was examined by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. An H value of 6.31 was obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed.

5. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and self-determination versus fatalism as measured by the Life Philosophy Scale was also tested by the Kruskal-Wallis

one-way analysis of variance. An $\underline{H}$ value of 4.39 was obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed.

6. The hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family and belief in God versus atheism as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores was also analyzed by the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. An $\underline{H}$ value of 4.21 indicated that no significant relationship existed.

Discussion and Conclusions

Findings of this study suggest that strong families are not strong because of the absence of problems of the busy pace of life. The greatest proportion of these respondents perceived the busy pace of life as a moderate problem (39.61%). An additional 25.97 per cent perceived the busy pace of life as being a large problem. Only 12.34 per cent of respondents indicated the busy pace of life was very little or no problem. This study was not conducted with a control group, but there is no evidence to indicate that the strong families involved in the sample have fewer problems because of the busy pace of life than the general population of the area involved.

Otto (1963, 1975) identified 12 components of family strengths. Among them are "the ability to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of a family" and "the capacity to maintain and create constructive and responsible community relationships in the neighborhood and in the school, town, local and state governments." Reeder (1973) states that the successful family is integrated into society. It seems, therefore, that a family that attempted to avoid the busy pace of life would create the absence of some of the things seen as

most vital to the successful family as suggested by the above mentioned
components of family strengths would tend to involve the family in the
busy pace of life. Otto (1963, 1975) cites among his components of
family strengths "the ability to use crisis or seemingly injurious
experiences as a means of growth."

Virginia Satir (1972) feels that it is the ability to cope rather
than the absence of problems that makes a family strong.

> The parents in a nurturing family realize that problems
> will come along, simply because life offers them, but
> they will be alert to creative solutions for each new
> problem as it appears. Troubled families, on the
> other hand, put all their energies into the hopeless
> attempt to keep problems from happening; when they
> do happen - and, of course, they always do - these
> people have no resources left for solving them (p.
> 17).

These findings may suggest that the strong family system is not at all
free from the problems of the busy pace of life, but because of qual-
ities in the individuals and the relationship are able not only to cope
with but grow creatively because of the busy pace of life. Of impor-
tance now is, how strong families cope with the busy pace of life.

The question in this study which deals with what strong family
members perceive themselves doing to prevent the busy pace of life from
a problem was open ended. Ten categories were then developed from
their responses. The greatest percentage of responses indicated the
following three categories: planning activities so the family can be
together (24.55%), limiting unnecessary activities (17.96%), and
commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together (15.57%). These are
not ways of avoiding the busy pace of life, but ways of organizing life
so it can be lived most effectively and creatively. These three cate-
gories comprise 58.08 per cent of all responses concerning what respon-
dents from strong families do to prevent the busy pace of life from

having adverse effects on the family. They are so closely related that they can all be expressed in one sentence dealing with commitment to the family and how that commitment is fulfilled: commitment to a life-style of doing things together by planning activities so the family can be together and limiting unnecessary activities.

Commitment seems to be one of the most important factors in the success of any family. It is the process where individuals give their energy and loyalty to a central theme. Committed family members strong-ly believe in what the family stands for as they continue to demonstrate this commitment. Kanter (1968) states that many of the problems of our society are seen as stemming from a lack of commitment. Blackburn (1967) and Figley (1973) respond to the charge that children actually weaken the family unit by stating that the commitment the couple has to the children seems to make the family stronger.

The respondents in this study indicate that they perceive them-selves expressing their commitment in a lifestyle of doing things to-gether as the most important thing they do to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family. Otto (1962, 1966) found that doing things together is one characteristic of strong families. Being able to do things together depends on a matter of coping with the busy pace of life. Satir (1972, p.256) says, "one of the most frequent complaints I hear is that family members have too many things to do, too many demands, and too little time to do anything." She says this is a problem of family engineering - "you find out what you have, match it with what you need, and figure out the best way to use it." Anthony (1969) found that a family with a strong background responds to difficulties by mobilizing its resources and working out the most con-structive solutions together.

The respondents in this study seem to be expressing a perception of what they do to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on their families in a very productive form of family management. The results suggest that these families are practicing Satir's concept of family engineering (1972) which involves structuring and managing the environment and time in such a way as to maximize enjoyment and enhance relationships.

When comparisons concerning what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family were made by sex, more women than men reported eating meals together, limiting unnecessary activities, and commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play. Two men (1.20%) rated nothing - it's not a problem while no women gave this response. Men also perceived more emphasis on participating in children's activities and religious conviction (keeping God first). These data may perhaps indicate that women perceive emphasis on eating together because they are more concerned with meals and such matters of the home; limiting unnecessary activities because they do so more often than men; and commitment to doing things together as a family because women in our society may be more committed to matters of the home and family than men. It may also be that participating in children's activities and even religious matters are rated higher by the men because they perceive more conscious effort and sacrifice in doing these things than women do. More study would be necessary to test whether these speculations are correct.

Analysis of perceptions concerning what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family according to the employment status of the wife reveals that the non-working mothers perceived themselves as doing more to keep the busy pace of life

from having adverse effects on the family than did working mothers. More non-working mothers than working mothers emphasized <u>participating in children's activities</u>, <u>commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play</u>, <u>placing the family first</u>, <u>planning activities so the family could be together</u>, and <u>eating meals together</u>. In view of much research (e.g. Axelson, 1963; Hicks and Platt, 1970; Nye, 1961; Orden and Bradburn, 1969; and Bernard, 1976) indicating a lower degree of adjustment in families with working mothers, it may be possible that the women in this study who work outside the home are less aware of doing things to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family because they are actually able to do less than women who do not work outside the home. In light of some evidence that suggests the quality of mothering is more important than quantity, the data in this study may not necessarily indicate a lower degree of adjustment especially since all these respondents are considered members of strong families. It may also be possible that some women who do not work outside the home tend to overestimate what they do to prevent the busy pace of life from being a problem. The data in this study indicated that the relationship between the degree to which the busy pace of life was perceived as being a problem for the respondents' families and the employment status of the wife was not significant. Further study in this area would be helpful.

Three of the hypotheses of this study are concerned with life philosophy. It was hypothesized that no significant relationship exists between optimism versus pessimism, self-determination versus fatalism, and belief in God versus atheism and the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family as measured by Life Philosophy Scale scores. These hypotheses were examined by the

Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance and the $\underline{H}$ values indicated that no significant relationships existed.

Satir (1972) suggests that a person's or family's attitude toward life has profound effects on the success or failure of relationships. Lantz and Snyder (1969) identified optimism as one characteristic related to marriage success or failure. Numerous studies suggest the value of religious convictions to family life (Otto, 1962, 1963, 1966, 1975; Sauer, 1976; deLissovoy, 1973; Zimmerman and Cervantes, 1960; Bowman, 1974; Crockett, Babchuk and Ballweg, 1969). These studies seem to oppose data of this study which suggest no significant relationship between the philosophies involved and the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondents' families. It should be noted that while the $\underline{H}$ values suggest no significant relationship, this finding may be due to the nature of the sample; all of the families were classified as strong families and a more diversified sample of families might have yielded different results. Further investigation is needed to determine the significance of the life philosophy on the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for respondents' families. It could be that while the life philosophy has a profound effect on the quality of life it may not exert as great an influence on the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem. Being religious, for instance, might be influential as far as the quality of life is concerned and actually enhance the strength of family life, but at the same time church involvement can increase the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem.

Implications and Recommendations

This study suggests that strong families are strong not because of

the absence of problems related to the busy pace of life. While the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem for family's of the respondents in this study is probably no less than that of the general population, a heterogenus control group would be necessary to determine this. It would also be important to have a control group composed of families with problems. When compared to findings of other studies concerning what makes the family strong or characteristics of strong families it seems that excessive efforts to avoid the busy pace of life might strike at the very foundations of family life and do more harm than good.

The study did not deal specifically with characteristics of the individuals that they perceived as helping to avoid adverse effects from the busy pace of life; it dealt with the respondents' perceptions of "what is done to prevent the busy pace of life from having adverse effects on the family." Three factors emerged as being considered most important by the respondents: (1) planning activities so family can be together, (2) limiting unnecessary activities, and (3) commitment to a lifestyle of doing things together as a family - work and play. These factors seem to come from a foundation of commitment to the family, but definitely fall into the category of family management. These three categories comprise 58.08 per cent of the sampling. It is also interesting that the next three most frequent responses also involve family management. They are: eating meals together, participating in children's activities, and placing the family first. These findings definitely point to the need of family life education which deals effectively with various areas of family and home management.

As research is almost nil in the area of the busy pace of life as it relates to the family, much more is needed. Particularly there is

a need for more research examining the relationship of various life
philosophies and the degree to which the busy pace of life is a family
problem. It is also recommended that future research involve a nation-
al sample with a better representation of various ethnic groups, socio-
economic statuses, and urban families.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, N. W. "Family Psychotherapy - Theory and Practice." In: G. Erickson and T. Hogan (Eds.) Family Therapy: An Introduction to Theory and Technique. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cale Co., 1972, 18-28.

Ackerman, N. W. Treating the Troubled Family. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Ahlstrom, W. M., and Havighurst, R. J. "Family Life in Midadolescence." In: Ahlstrom, 400 Losers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

Allen, F. A. "Role of the Self-Concept in Student Marital Adjustment." Family Life Coordinator, 11 (1962), 43-45.

Ammons, P. W. "Vital-Total Marital Relationships Among Strong Families and Their Association With Selected Demographic and Personality Variables." (Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1976).

Andry, R. Delinquency and Parental Pathology. London: Mathuen, 1960.

Anthony, E. J. "The Mutative Impact on Family Life of Serious Mental and Physical Illness in a Parent." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 14 (1969), 433-453.

Axelson, L. "Marital Adjustment and Marital Role Definitions of Husbands and Working and Non-Working Wives." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 189-195.

Ball, M. "An Investigation of Defense Mechanisms and Recalled Parent-Child Relations." (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970).

Ball, O. "Communication Patterns in Strong Families." (Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1976).

Barton, K., Kawash, G., and Cattell, R. "Personality Motivation, and Marital Role Factors as Predictors of Life Data in Married Couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.

Bernard, J. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Company, 1972.

Bernard, J. "Marital Stability and Patterns of Status Variables." _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 28 (1966), 421-439.

Bernard, J. "Stress and the Family." _Journal of Home Economics_. (November, 1976), 6-10.

Blackburn, C. W. "What Is a Strong Family?" _International Journal of Religious Education_, 43 (May 1967) 3, 35, 36.

Blazer, J. A. "Contemporary Needs and Marital Happiness." _Marriage and Family Living_, 25 (1963), 89-95.

Blood, R. O. _Marriage_. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

Blood, R. O., and Wolfe, D. M. _Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living_. Glenco, Illinois: The Free Press, 1060.

Bowman, H. A. _Marriage for Moderns_. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.

Boyer, D. L. "Group Psychotherapy with Married Couples." _Marriage and Family Living_, 23 (1960), 114-121.

Brammer, L. M. and Shostrum, E. L. _Therapeutic Psychology: Fundamentals of Counseling and Psychotherapy_. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

Brittain, C. D. "An Exploration of the Basis of Peer-Compliance and Parental-Compliance in Adolescents." _Adolescence_, 2 (1967), 445-458.

Bullard, D. M., Glaser, H. H., Heagerty, M. D., and Pivchick, E. C. "Failure to Thrive in the Neglected Child." _American Journal of Orthopsychiatry_, 37 (1967), 680-690.

Burchinal, L. G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 27 (1965), 243-254.

Burgess, E. W., and Locke, H. J. _The Family: From Institution to Companionship_. New York: American Book Company, 1945.

Buros, O. K., ed. _The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook_. Vol. I. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.

Burr, W. R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." _Journal of Marriage and the Family_, 33 (1971), 368-372.

Cattell, R. B., and Nesselroade, J. R. "Likeness and Completeness Theories Examined by Sixteen Personality Factor Measures on Stably and Unstably Married Couples." _Journal of Personality and Social Psychology_, 7 (1967), 351-361.

Chailkin, H., and Frank, C. L. "Separation, Service Delivery, and Family Functioning." _Public Welfare_, 31, 1, (1973), 2-7.

Chilman, C. S., and Meyer, D. L. "Single and Married Undergraduates Measured Personality Needs and Self-rated Happiness." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 67-76.

Clapp, W. F. "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of Four-year Old Boys." Dissertation Abstracts, 28 (1967), 1703.

Clarke, C. "Group Procedures for Increasing Positive Feedback Between Married Couples." The Family Coordinator, 19 (1970), 324-328.

Clements, W. H. "Marital Interaction and Marital Stability: A Point of View and a Descriptive Comparison of Stable and Unstable Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 697-702.

Condry, J., and Siam, M. L. "Characteristics of Peer and Adult Oriented Children." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (1974), 432-454.

Cooke, T. F. "Interpersonal Correlates of Religious Behavior." Dissertation Abstracts, 23 (1962), 1103.

Crockett, H. J., Babchuk, N., and Ballweg, J. A. "Change in Religious Affiliation and Family Stability: A Second Study." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (1969), 464-468.

Crouse, B., Karlins, M., and Schroder, H. "Conceptual Complexity and Marital Happiness." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30 (1968), 643-646.

Cuber, J. F., and Haroff, P. B. "The More Total View: Relationships Among Men and Women of the Upper Middle Class." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 25 (1963), 140-145.

Cutright, P. "Income and Family Events: Marital Stability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 291-306.

deLissovoy, V. "High School Marriages: A Longitudinal Study." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 245-255.

Dean, D. G. "Alienation and Marital Adjustment." Sociological Quarterly, 9 (1968), 186-192.

Dean, D. G. "Emotional Maturity and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 454-457.

Elder, G. H., Jr. "Parental Power Legitimation and Its Effects on the Adolescent." Sociometry, 26 (1963), 50-65.

Elizur, A. "Analysis and Treatment of Communication Disorders in Family Life: First Stage." The Family Coordinator, 18 (1969), 353-361.

Esty, J. F.   "Early and Current Parent-Child Relationships Perceived by College Student Leaders and Nonleaders." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 1169-1170.

Figley, C. R.   "Child Density and Marital Relationship." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 272-282.

Foote, N. R., and Cottrell, L. S.   Identity and Interpersonal Competence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.

Gabler, J., and Otto, H. A.   "Conceptualization of Family Strengths in the Family Life and Other Professional Literature." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26 (1964), 221-223.

Gallenkamp, C. R., Jr.   "Parents and Their Delinquent Sons." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 3085.

Grams, A.   "Sources of Family Strength." International Journal of Religious Education, 43, 9 (1967); 4, 5, 41.

Green, L. B., and Parker, H. J.   "Parental Influences Upon Adolescents" Occupational Choice: a Test of an Aspect of Roe's Theory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12 (1965), 379-383.

Gurin, G., Veroff, J., and Feld, S.   Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Haley, J. (Ed.).   Changing Families: A Family Therapy Reader. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1971.

Haley, J.   "Marriage Therapy." Archives of Generay Psychiatry, 8 (1963), 213-234.

Haley, J.   "Whether Family Therapy?" Family Process, 1 (1962), 69-100.

Harris, T. O.   "Alternatives Available in Solving the Juvenile Problem." The Police Chief, 40, 9 (1973), 42-43.

Hicks, M. W., and Platt, M.   "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1970), 553-573.

Hurley, J. R., and Polonen, D.   "Marital Satisfaction and Child Density Among University Student Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 483-484.

Hurvitz, N.   "Control Roles, Marital Strain, Role Deviation, and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27 (1965), 29-31.

Jackson, D. D.   "Family Interaction, Family Homostasis, and Some Implications for Conjoint Family Psychotherapy." In: Individual and Family Dynamics, J. Masserman (Ed.). New York: Grune and Stratton, 1959.

Jackson, D. D. "Family Rules: Marital Quid Pro Quo." In: G. Erickson and T. Hogan (Eds.). _Family Therapy: An Introduction to Theory and Technique._ Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1972.

Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Inc., "Contemporary American Society: Its Impact on Family Life." In: _Report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children, Inc._ New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Kanter, R. M. "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." _American Sociological Review,_ 33 (1968), 499-516.

Kaslow, F. W. "Essay Review: Nonmarital and Marital Relations: Understanding and Treating the Coming Togethers and Splitting Aparts." _Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling._ 2, 3 (1976), 283-287.

Kieren, D., and Tallman, I. "Spousal Adaptability: An Assessment of Marital Competence." _Journal of Marriage and the Family,_ 34 (1972), 247-256.

Kinter, R., and Otto, H. A. "The Family Strength Concept and Foster Home Selection." _Child Welfare,_ 48 (1964), 359-364.

Kirkpatrick, C. _The Family._ New York: TheRonald Press, Co., 1963.

Katz, L., Goldstein, J., Cohen, M., and Stucker, S. "Need Satisfaction, Perception, and Cooperative Interactions in Married Couples." _Marriage and Family Living,_ 25 (1963), 209-213.

Komarovsky, M. _Blue Collar Marriage._ New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Landis, J. T., and Landis, M. G. _Building a Successful Marriage_ (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1973.

Landis, J. T., and Landis, M. G. _Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living_ (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Lantz, H., and Snyder, E. _Marriage._ New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

Lebovici, S. "Concerning Predelinquent Organization in the Life of the Young Child." _Information Psychiatrique,_ 49 (1973), 203-208.

Lee, G. R. "Marriage and Anomie: A Causal Argument." _Journal of Marriage and the Family,_ 36 (1974), 523-532.

Leonard, M. F., Rhymes, J. P., and Solnit, A. J. "Failure to Thrive in Children." _American Journal of Diseases in Children,_ 11 (1966) 600-612.

Levinger, G. "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry, 27 (1964), 433-448.

Levinger, G. "Marital Cohesiveness and Dissolution: An Integrative Review." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27 (1965), 19-28.

Levinger, G. "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applicants for Divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (1966), 803-807.

Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and Happily Married Group. New York: Henry Holt, 1951.

Locke, H. J., Sabagh, G., and Thomas, M. M. "Correlations of Primary Communication and Empathy." Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 24 (1956), 116-124.

Luckey, E. B., and Bain, J. K. "Children: A Factor in Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 43-44.

Luckey, E. B. "Marital Satisfaction and Its Association with Congruence of Perception." Marriage and Family Living, 22 (1960), 49-54.

Luckey, E. B. "Marital Satisfaction and Parent Concepts." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24 (1960), 195-204.

Luckey, E. B. "Marital Satisfaction and Congruent Self-Spouse Concepts." Social Forum, 39 (1960), 153-157.

Luckey, E. B. "Number of Years Married as Related to Personality Perception and Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 44-48.

Mace, D., and Mace, V. "Marriage Enrichment: Wave of the Future." Family Coordinator, 24 (1975), 132-136.

McGuire, C., and White, G. D. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development, No. 3 (revised), University of Texas at Austin, 1955.

Martin, S. "An Exploratory Study: The Effects of Family Background Variables on the Decision to Remain Childless." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1976).

Matthews, V. C., and Milhanovich, C. S. "New Orientations on Marital Maladjustment." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 300-304.

Maunch, G. "Antisocial Behavior: When and How Does a Person Become Antisocial." In: Horl, R. Die Zukunft Unsrver Kinder, (2nd ed.), Olten, Switzerland: Walter, 1970.

Medinnus. G. R. "Delinquents' Perceptions of Their Parents." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29 (1965), 592-593.

Mercer, C. V. "Interrelations Among Family Stability, Family Composition, Residence, and Race." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 456-460.

Meyerowitz, J. H. "Satisfaction During Pregnancy." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 38-42.

Morrow, W. R., and Wilson, R. C. "Family Relations of Bright Achievers and Underachieving Boys." Child Development, 32 (1961), 501-510.

Mote, F. B. "The Relationship Between Child Self Concept in School and Parental Attitudes and Behavior in Child Rearing." Dissertation Abstracts, 27 (1967), 3319.

Murstein, B. I., and Glauding, V. "The Relationship of Marital Adjustment to Personality: A Factor Analysis of the Interpersonal Check List." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 37-43.

Navran, L. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, 6, 2 (1967), 173-184.

Norris, N. P. "Parental Understanding, Parental Satisfaction and Desirable Personality Characteristics in Preadolescent Boys." Dissertation Abstracts, 28 (1968), 4709-4710.

Nye, F. I. "Maternal Employment and Marital Interaction: Some Contingent Conditions." Social Forces, 40 (1961), 113-119.

Orden, S. R., and Bradburn, N. M. "Working Wives and Marriage Happiness." American Journal of Sociology, 74 (1969), 392-407.

Otto, H. A. "What Is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962), 77-81.

Otto, H. A. "Criteria for Assessing Family Strength." Family Process, 2 (1963), 329-339.

Otto, H. A. "The Personal and Family Strength Researcy Projects - Some Implications for the Therapist." Mental Hygiene, 48 (1964), 439-450.

Otto, H. A. "The Minister and Family Strengths." Pastoral Psychology, 17, 163 (1966), 21-28.

Otto, H. A. "How Can a Family Deliberately Build Strengths?" International Journal of Religious Education, 43, 9 (1967), 6-7, 40-41.

Otto, H. A. "Has Monogamy Failed?" In: Carr, G. B. (ed.). Marriage and Family in a Decade of Change. Reading, Massachusetts: Addision-Wesley Publishing Co., 1972.

Otto, H. A. The Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, California: The Holistic Press, 1975.

Reeder, D. A. "A Model of Family Characteristics for Problem Solving Behavior in Families with a Mentally Retarded Child." Dissertation Abstracts, 34B (1973), 1758B.

Renee, K. S. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 54-66.

Richardson, R. "Parent-Child Relationships and Divergent Students." Dissertation Abstracts, 24 (1965), 5542.

Ridley, C. A. "Exploring the Impact of Work Satisfaction and Involvement on Marital Interaction When Both Partners Are Employed." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 229-237.

Rollins, B. C., and Cannon, K. L. "Marital Satisfaction Over the Family Life Cycle: A Reevaluation." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (1974), 271-282.

Rollins, B. C., and Feldman, H. "Marital Satisfaction Over the Family Life Cycle." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 20-27.

Satir, V. Peoplemaking. Palo-Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1972.

Sauer, K. H. "Relationship Patterns of Strong Families." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1976).

Scanzoni, J. "Family Organization and the Probability of Disorganization." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 407-411.

Schneider, D. L. "Perceptions of Family Atmosphere and the Vocational Interest of Physically Handicapped Adolescents: An Application of Anne Roe's Theory." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 2574.

Siegelman, M. "College Students Personality Correlates of Early Parent-Child Relationships." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29 (1965), 558-564.

Solomon, J. C. "Family Identity." Adolescence, 7 (1972), 511-518.

Spanier, G. B. "Romanticism and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.

Statt, L. H. "The Problem of Evaluating Family Success." Marriage and Family Living, 13 (1951), 149-153.

Stinnett, N., Carter, L. M., and Montgomery, J. E. "Older Persons' Perceptions of Their Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 665-670.

Stinnett, N., Collins, J., and Montgomery, J. E. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 428-434.

Stinnett, N., Talley, S., and Walters, J. "Parent-Child Relationships of Black and White High School Students: A Comparison." Journal of Social Psychology, 91 (1973), 349-350.

Stinnett, N., and Walters, J. "Parental Peer Orientation of Adolescents From Low Income Families." Journal of Home Economics, 59, 1 (1967), 37-40.

Stinnett, N., and Walters, J. Relationships in Marriage and Families. New York: Macmillan, 1977.

Stroup, A. L. Marriage and Family: Developmental Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Stuckert, R. P. "Role Perception and Marital Satisfaction - A Configurational Approach." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 415-419.

Terman, L. M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Tracey, J. F. "Analysis of Parent Guidance Groups." Journal of Psychiatric Nursing and Mental Health Services, 9, 2 (1971), 18-23.

Truitt, D. "Marital Need Satisfaction, Life Philosophies, and Personality Characteristics of Strong Families." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1976).

U. S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1975. 96th ed. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

Walters, J., and Stinnett, N. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 70-111.

Watson, A. S. "The Conjoint Psychotherapy of Marriage Partners." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 33 (1963), 912-923.

Whitehurst, R. N. "Premarital Preference Group Orientation and Marriage Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30 (1968), 397-401.

Wiegert, A. J. "Parent-Child Interaction Patterns and Adolescent Religiosity: A Cross-Nation Study." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 3691.

Winch, R. F., Ktsanes, T., and Ktsanes, V. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: An Analytic and Descriptive Study." American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), 242.

Young, K. "What Strong Family Life Means to Our Society." Social Casework, 34 (1953), 323-329.

Zimmerman, C. C.   "The Future of the Family in America.   Journal of
    Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 323-333.

Zimmerman, C. C., and Cervantes, L. F.   Successful American Families.
    New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIX

OKLAHOMA. STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

Department of Family Relations & Child Development 74074
(405) 372-6211, Ext. 6084

August 12, 1975

Dear Friend:

You and most other Americans may have often wondered, "How can family life be made stronger and more satisfying?". The Department of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University is conducting a state-wide research project which is attempting to find answers to this question. You have shown an interest in improving your family life by the fact that you have chosen to gain greater understanding of your family situation through counseling. Because of this we thought you might be interested in this research project.

We would like to ask you to participate in this research by completing the enclosed questionnaire. There is a questionnaire for you and one for your spouse. If possible, would you both complete the questionnaires (please answer them separately and do not compare answers) and return them in the self-addressed, pre-paid envelope as soon as possible. If for some reason one of you can not assist with the research, we would greatly appreciate it if the other would send his or her questionnaire to us separately.

Your answers are anonymous and confidential since you are asked <u>not</u> to put your name on the questionnaire. Please answer each question as honestly as you can. We are not interested in how you think you <u>should</u> answer the questions, but we are interested in what you actually feel and do in your family situation.

It is expected that the information gained from this research will be of benefit to families and also of benefit to persons in the helping professions such as teachers, ministers, and counselors.

We appreciate your participation in this research. It is only through the contribution of persons such as you that we can gain greater understanding of marriage and family relationships.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

Nick Stinnett, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Family Relations and Child Development

NS/jg

Enclosures

Oklahoma State University   Department of Family Relations
Division of Home Economics   and Child Development

Your cooperation in this research project is greatly appreciated.
Your contribution in a research project of this type helps us to gain
greater knowledge and insight into family relationships.

Please check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question.
Your answers are confidential and anonymous since you do not have to
put your name on the questionnaire. Please be as honest in your
answers as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Family member: Mother _____   Father _____

2. Race: 1. White _____

                   2. Black _____

                   3. Indian _____

                   4. Oriental _____

                   5. Other _____

3. Age: _____

4. What church do you attend:

5. Who earns most of the income for your family?

                   1. Husband _____

                   2. Wife _____

                   3. Other _____

6. What is the educational attainment of the husband?

7. What is the educational attainment of the wife?

8. Husband's occupation:

9. Wife's occupation:

10. Major source of income for the family:

    1. Inherited savings and investments.   _____

    2. Earned wealth, transferable investment.   _____

    3. Profits, royalities, fees.   _____

    4. Salary, commissions (regular monthly, or yearly)   _____

    5. Hourly wages, weekly checks.   _____

    6. Odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity   _____

    7. Public relief or charity.   _____

11. Residence:

    1. On farm or in country   _____

    2. Small town under 25,000   _____

    3. City of 25,000 to 50,000   _____

    4. City of 50,000 to 100,000   _____

    5. City of over 100,000   _____

12. Indicate below how religious your family is: (rate on the 5 point scale with 5 representing the highest degree of religious orientation and 1 representing the least.)

        1   2   3   4   5

13. How long have you been married to your present spouse? _____

14. If this is not your first marriage was your previous marriage ended by:

    1. Divorce _____

    2. Death of spouse _____

15. How many children do you have? _____

16. What are their ages?_____

Please answer all the items in this questionnaire pertaining to parent-child relationships as they apply to your relationship (and your spouse's relationship) with the oldest child living at home.

17. Indicate the degree of closeness of your relationship with your child (oldest child living at home) on the following 5 point scale (with 5 representing the greatest degree of closeness and 1 representing the least degree)

        1   2   3   4   5

18. Indicate the degree of closeness of your spouse's relationship with your child (oldest child living at home) on the following five point scale with 5 representing the greatest degree of closeness and 1 representing the least degree).

        1   2   3   4   5

19. Please rate the happiness of your marriage on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the greatest degree of happiness and 1 represents the least degree of happiness.) Circle the point which most nearly describes your degree of happiness.

    1   2   3   4   5

20. Please rate the happiness of your relationship with your child on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the greatest degree of happiness and 1 represents the least degree of happiness.) Circle the point which most nearly describes your degree of happiness.

    1   2   3   4   5

21. What do you feel has contributed most to your marriage dissatisfaction?

22. What one thing do you find most rewarding about your marriage relationship?

23. What do you feel has contributed most to making your relationship with your child strong?

24. What would you most like to change about your relationship with your oldest child living at home?

25. Now we would like to find out how satisfied you are with your mate's performance of certain marriage roles at the present time. please answer each question by circling the most appropriate letter at the left of each item.

    Circle VS if you feel very satisfied; circle S if you feel satisfied; circle U if you feel undecided; circle US if you feel unsatisfied; and VUS if you feel very unsatisfied.

    How satisfied are you with your mate in each of the following areas?

    1. Providing a feeling of security in me.   VS S U US VUS

    2. Expressing affection toward me.   VS S U US VUS

    3. Giving me an optimistic feeling toward
       life.   VS S U US VUS

    4. Expressing a feeling of being emot-
       ionally close to me.   VS S U US VUS

    5. Bringing out the best qualities in me.   VS S U US VUS

    6. Helping me to become a more interest-
       ing person.   VS S U US VUS

    7. Helping me to continue to develop
       my personality.   VS S U US VUS

8. Helping me to achieve my individual potential (become what I am capable of becoming). VS S U US VUS

9. Being a good listener. VS S U US VUS

10. Giving me encouragement when I am discouraged. VS S U US VUS

11. Accepting my differentness. VS S U US VUS

12. Avoiding habits which annoy me. VS S U US VUS

13. Letting me know how he or she really feels about something. VS S U US VUS

14. Trying to find satisfactory solutions to our disagreements. VS S U US VUS

15. Expressing disagreement with me honestly and openly. VS S U US VUS

16. Letting me know when he or she is displeased with me. VS S U US VUS

17. Helping me to feel that life has meaning. VS S U US VUS

18. Helping me to feel needed. VS S U US VUS

19. Helping me to feel that my life is serving a purpose. VS S U US VUS

20. Helping me to obtain satisfaction and pleasure in daily activities. VS S U US VUS

21. Giving me recognition for my past accomplishments. VS S U US VUS

22. Helping me to feel that my life has been important. VS S U US VUS

23. Helping me to accept my past life experiences as good and rewarding. VS S U US VUS

24. Helping me to accept myself despite my shortcomings. VS S U US VUS

26. Some people make us feel good about ourselves. That is, they make us feel self-confident, worthy, competent, and happy about ourselves. What is the degree to which your spouse makes you feel good about yourself? Indicate on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least degree)

1   2   3   4   5

27. (a) What exactly does your spouse do that makes you feel good about yourself?

(b) What exactly does your spouse do that makes you feel bad about yourself?

28. Indicate on the following 5 point scale the degree to which you think you make your spouse feel good about himself/herself. (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least).

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5</div>

29. What exactly do you do that makes your spouse feel good about himself/herself?

30. Indicate on the following 5 point scale the degree to which your child makes you feel good about yourself. (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least).

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5</div>

31. What exactly does he/she do that makes you feel good about yourself?

32. Indicate on the following 5 point scale the degree to which you think you make your child feel good about himself/herself. (5 represents the greatest and 1 represents the least).

<div align="center">1   2   3   4   5</div>

33. What exactly do you do that makes them feel good about himself/herself?

34. How would you rate the commitment of:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse to you	____	____	____	____	____
2. You to your spouse	____	____	____	____	____
3. Your child to you	____	____	____	____	____
4. You to your child	____	____	____	____	____

35. Rate the degree to which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble	____	____	____	____	____
2. You stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble	____	____	____	____	____

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
3. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness	____	____	____	____	____
4. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness	____	____	____	____	____

36. Rate the degree of appreciation expressed by:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse to you	____	____	____	____	____
2. You to your spouse	____	____	____	____	____
3. Your child to you	____	____	____	____	____
4. You to your child	____	____	____	____	____

37. Rate the degree to which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse respects your individuality (that is, respects your individual interests, views, etc	____	____	____	____	____
2. You respect your spouse's individuality	____	____	____	____	____
3. Your child respects your individuality	____	____	____	____	____
4. You respect your child's individuality	____	____	____	____	____

38. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your spouse satisfying: (rate on following 5 point scale with 5 representing the greatest degree of determination and 1 representing the least degree).

           1   2   3   4   5

39. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your child satisfying: (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least).

           1   2   3   4   5

40. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make your marriage relationship satisfying: (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least).

           1   2   3   4   5

41. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make relationship satisfying: (5 representing the greatest degree and 1 representing the least).

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

42. Please indicate below how you and your family usually participate in each of the following:

	Individually	Husband and wife together	Child alone	One parent with child	Both Parents with child
1. Recreational Activities (such as movies, card games)	___	___	___	___	___
2. Vacations	___	___	___	___	___
3. Sports (bowling, etc.	___	___	___	___	___
4. Holidays and special occasions	___	___	___	___	___
5. Church activities	___	___	___	___	___
6. Eating meals	___	___	___	___	___
7. Decisions affecting family	___	___	___	___	___

Some people make us feel comfortable. That is, we feel secure, unthreatened, like we can be ourselves when we are with them. We would like to find out how comfortable people feel with their marriage partners. Please rate questions 43 through 54 on the 5 point scale with 5 meaning the greatest degree of comfortableness and 1 meaning the least degree.

43. Rate how comfortable you and your spouse were with each other during your engagement:

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

44. Rate the degree to which you feel comfortable in sharing your problems with your spouse:

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

45. Rate the degree to which you think your spouse feels comfortable in sharing his/her problems with you:

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5

</div>

46. Rate the degree to which you think your child feels comfortable in sharing his/her problems with you:

    1   2   3   4   5

47. Rate the degree to which you think your child feels comfortable in sharing his/her problems with your spouse:

    1   2   3   4   5

48. Rate how comfortable you now feel with your spouse:

    1   2   3   4   5

49. Rate how comfortable you think your spouse now feels with you:

    1   2   3   4   5

50. Rate how comfortable you now feel with your child:

    1   2   3   4   5

51. Rate how comfortable you think your child now feels with you:

    1   2   3   4   5

52. Indicate below how much conflict (serious disagreement) you experience with your spouse:

    1   2   3   4   5

53. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your child:

    1   2   3   4   5

54. Indicate below how much conflict your spouse experiences with your child:

    1   2   3   4   5

55. Please indicate how often you and your spouse respond to conflict situations in each of the following ways: (5 represents very often; 1 represents very rarely).

	You	Your spouse
1. In specific when introducing a gripe.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Just mainly complains.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
3. Sticks to one issue at a time.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Is intolerant	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Is willing to compromise	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Calls others names (such as neurotic, coward, stupid, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
7. Brings up the past	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	You	Your spouse
8. Uses sarcasm.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
9. Checks to be sure he/she correctly understands the other persons feeling about the disagreement	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
10. Respects the right of other person to disagree	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

56. Rate the degree to which you are satisfied with the communication patterns between you and:

1. Your spouse

Very satisfied	_____
Satisfied	_____
Uncertain	_____
Dissatisfied	_____
Very dissatisfied	_____

2. Your child

Very satisfied	_____
Satisfied	_____
Uncertain	_____
Dissatisfied	_____
Very dissatisfied	_____

57. If the communication pattern between you and your spouse is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what do you think has made it unsatisfactory?)

58. If the communication pattern between you and your child is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what has made it unsatisfactory?)

59. How often do you and your spouse talk together?

60. How often do you and your child talk together?

61. How often does your spouse and child talk together?

62. Indicate the degree to which each of the following behaviors describe you and your spouse: (5 indicates the behavior is very common and 1 indicates the behavior is very rare).

	You	Your spouse
1. Is judgmental toward others.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
2. Does not try to control other's behavior.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

	You	Your spouse
3. Uses strategy (psychological games) to get others to do what he/she wants them to do.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
4. Acts disinterested in others.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
5. Does not act superior toward others.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5
6. Is open minded to the ideas of others.	1 2 3 4 5	1 2 3 4 5

63. How often do you and your spouse do things together (rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely).

       1   2   3   4   5

64. What are two things which you most enjoy doing together?

65. How often do you do things with your child (rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely)?

       1   2   3   4   5

66. What are two things which you most enjoy doing with your child?

67. How often does your spouse do things with your child (rate on the following 5 point scale with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely)?

       1   2   3   4   5

68. How much of a problem is today's busy pace of life for your family? (Rate on the following 5 point scale with 5 indicating it is a great problem and 1 indicating it is little or no problem).

       1   2   3   4   5

69. What things do you do to prevent this problem from hurting your family life?

70. Following are some proverbs and sayings about life. Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each by circling the appropriate letter. The response code is: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree.

1. A wise way to live is to look on the bright side of things.   SA A U D SD

2. For every problem that arises there is usually a solution.   SA A U D SD

3. People rarely get what they want in life.   SA   A   U   D   SD

4. When all is said and done we really have little control over what happens to us in life.   SA   A   U   D   SD

5. To a large degree we are the "captains of our own fate.   SA   A   U   D   SD

6. Whether we are happy or not depends upon the kinds of things that happen to us in life.   SA   A   U   D   SD

7. There is a higher power (God) that operates in the daily lives of people.   SA   A   U   D   SD

8. God answers prayer.   SA   A   U   D   SD

9. There is no power higher than man.   SA   A   U   D   SD

71. Please rate the degree to which you think each of the following persons or groups values a good strong family life:

	Values Strongly	Values	Undecided	Values Little	Values very Little
1. Your friends.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. The people you work with	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Your church	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Your community	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Your relatives (Your parents, in-laws, brothers and sisters, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

72. How often does your family see your:

1. Parents   _____

2. Spouse's parents   _____

3. Other relatives(brothers, sisters, aunts, etc.)   _____

VITA

Kelley Michael Lee Brigman

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: STRONG FAMILIES AND THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Holcomb, Missouri, March 21, 1945. Married Barbara Jane Wilder, February 6, 1970. Father of twin sons: Kelley Michael Lee, II and Konn Micah Lane; also three step-children: Tommy, Joannie Beth, Kathy Dawn.

Education: Graduated from Arbyrd High School, Arbyrd, Missouri, May 1963. Received Associate of Arts degree from Crowley's Ridge College, Paragould, Arkansas, December 1965; Bachelor of Arts degree from Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, May 1968; Master of Divinity degree from Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma, May 1976; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, July, 1977.

Professional Experience: Minister, Church of Christ, Eudora, Arkansas, 1967-1968; English teacher, Holcomb High School, Holcomb, Missouri, 1968-1971; Ordained minister of Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) since 1971: Pastor, First Christian Church, Chaffee, Missouri, 1971-1973; student pastor, First Christian Church, Calumet, Oklahoma, and St. Paul's United Church of Christ, Marshall, Oklahoma, 1973-1976; Pastor, Mustang Christian Church, Mustang, Oklahoma, 1976-1977.