

COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN STRONG FAMILIES

By

OTEKA LITTLE BALL
"

Bachelor of Arts

Southern Methodist University

Dallas, Texas

1962

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
May, 1976

Thesis
1976
B187c
cop. 2

AUG 26 1976

COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN STRONG FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett

Thesis Adviser

Althea Wright

Frances Stromberg

Bernice Kayel

D. D. Duster

Dean of the Graduate College

947475

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Nick Stinnett, my adviser, for his guidance, interest, enthusiasm, generous investment of time and patience throughout the study. I would also like to thank him for his faith in me in this endeavor. I would also like to thank Dr. Althea Wright, Dr. Frances Stromberg, and Dr. Bernice Kopel for their critical reading of the manuscript.

Special thanks also goes to Kay and Bob Sauer for their assistance in programming the data. Special thanks are due to Mrs. Anna Gleason for typing of the manuscript.

Sincere appreciation goes to my family. To my father, Reuel Little, for his encouragement of this undertaking. To my mother, Oteka Little, for much volunteered babysitting. Also, to my in-laws, Haskell and Thelma Ball for babysitting. To my son, Jeremy, for his technical assistance supplied above the ability level of most 13 year old's. My thanks to my daughter, Oteka Lyn, for her tolerance of loss of parental communication time. Special mention of appreciation goes to my husband, Jerry, who says I have the only Ph.D. typist at Oklahoma State University. He has endured the role reversal of the husband typing rough draft, helping with clerical details, giving advice, comfort, moral support and encouragement. His total support of me will always be remembered and appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Need for Research	4
Purposes of the Study	5
Hypotheses	6
Definition of Terms	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Family Strengths	8
Clinical Insights into Communication and Family Relationships	12
Communication and Marital Happiness	15
Parent-Child Relationships	18
Summary	23
III. PROCEDURE	26
Selection of Subjects	26
The Instrument	27
Analysis of Data	28
IV. RESULTS	29
Description of Subjects	29
Perceptions of Communication	31
Examination of Hypotheses	34
V. SUMMARY	51
Conclusions and Discussion	52
Recommendations	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58
APPENDIX	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of Subjects	30
II. Degree of Satisfaction with Marital and Parent-Child Communication	32
III. Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Marriage Communication	33
IV. Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Communication Between Respondent and Child	34
V. Differences in Degree of Satisfaction With Marital Communication According to Religious Orientation	36
VI. Differences in Perception Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Marital Communication According to Sex	38
VII. Differences in Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Marital Communication According to Socio-Economic Status	39
VIII. Differences in Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Marital Communication According to Degree of Religious Orientation	41
IX. Differences in Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Marital Communication According to Size of Residence	42
X. Differences in Perceptions of What Has Contributed to Good Parent-Child Communication According to Sex	44
XI. Differences in Perceptions of What Has Contributed to Good Parent-Child Communication According to Socio-Economic Status	45

Table	Page
XII. Differences in Perceptions of What Has Contributed to Good Parent-Child Communication According to Degree of Religious Orientation	47
XIII. Differences in Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed to Good Parent-Child Communication According to Size of Residence	48
XIV. Relationship Between Satisfaction With Marital Communication and Parent-Child Communication	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

There is evidence that one of the important goals of most people is to have a strong satisfying family life (Blood, 1969). However, few guidelines have been established concerning how one can achieve a successful, satisfying, family life. The family traditionally has been the stabilizing influence in the society as well as in the individual. Zimmerman (1972) has noted that when adverse conditions strike societies, those societies with strong family systems tend to recuperate rapidly, while societies with weak family systems have great difficulty recovering. It is therefore important for society as a whole to have healthy families which meet the individual needs of family members. Psychotherapist Eric Fromm (1956) has noted that people have a basic need to relate to each other and overcome separateness, and that overcoming this sense of separation comes through communication. Satir (1972a) asserts that psychotherapists have long recognized the central role communication plays in the mental and emotional health of individuals and families. The observations of Fromm and Satir are not at all surprising for the need for communication has long been recognized. For example, Spitz (1945) indicated that infants deprived of physical handling and other forms of communication tended to become emotionally

unresponsive. Many of these infants began a physical decline and eventually succumbed to disease. The need for touch and other forms of communication continues throughout the life cycle (Berne, 1970).

There seems to be a direct relationship between communication difficulties and emotional disturbance. Carl Rogers has stated:

The whole task of psychotherapy is the task of dealing with a failure in communication. The emotionally mal-adjusted person, the neurotic, is in difficulty first because communication within himself has broken down, and second because as a result of this his communication with others has been damaged. If this sounds somewhat strange, let me put it in other terms. In the neurotic individual, parts of himself which have been termed unconscious or repressed, or denied to awareness, become blocked off so that they no longer communicate themselves to the conscious or managing part of himself. As long as this is true, there are distortions in the way he communicates himself to others, and so he suffers both within himself and in his interpersonal relations (Rogers, 1954, p. 53).

As a child within the family one learns the way to relate to other people and how he can live with other human beings. Perceptions, styles of communication, and modes of interacting are all shaped within the confines of the family--the laboratory of early experience (Satir, 1972b).

Part of the reason for pessimism about family life today is the high rate of dissolution of families through divorce. The divorce rate has gone from one out of twelve marriages in 1900 to approximately one out of three today. (Lederer and Jackson (1968) wrote that in the United States the institution of marriage is in a state of crisis. Many writers note that social problems such as juvenile delinquency, drug abuse, and high suicide rate are associated with unsatisfactory family relationships (Hicks and Platt, 1970). The Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children (1969) suggested that the prevention of serious emotional problems through the strengthening of family life is

of prime importance. Ibister (1973) and others discuss the importance of the family unit to the survival of the human race. Family authorities advance the thesis that good communication is the lifeblood of the marriage relationship as well as the key to family interaction.

Communication among the members is necessary to the successful functioning of the family . . . it should be obvious that needs cannot be satisfied, problems solved, or goals reached without communication (Epstein and Westly, 1959, p. 1).

Satir (1964) asserts that increased recognition is being given to the belief that a positive relationship exists between a couple's capacity to communicate and their marital adjustment.

Many authors in the field of family therapy (Ackerman, 1966; Haley, 1962; Jackson, 1959; Satir, 1972a) agree that many family problems stem from communication distortion, and the main emphasis in family treatment should be put on improvement of intra-family communication.

Marriage counselors also usually spend a great deal of time improving a couples' ability to communicate. People working in the field of marriage enrichment and family life education assume that to improve communication is to strengthen and enrich the marriage and the family. Jourard and other investigators in the field of human communication stress the importance of direct and open communication in interpersonal relations (Egan, 1970).

The assumption that communication is important to the functioning of a family comes from many case studies rather than a large body of empirical data. It is surprising that such a small amount of empirical data on communication is available.

Need for Research

The paucity of research dealing with family strengths and communication is one of the major reasons for the lack of instruction concerning how to have a successful family life. According to A. H. Chapman (1974) satisfying patterns of communication are a basic requirement for happy family relationships. Yet one of the most neglected areas of marriage and family studies is communication, even though some evidence indicates that college students desire more information in the area of communication than in other aspects of marriage (Stinnett, 1971).

According to Otto (1962, 1972) most of the research done in the area of family has placed its accent on the pathology of the family. It is particularly important to expand the understanding of communication in healthy strong families so that family therapists and family life educators, and family enrichment experts could more effectively help families in developing their resources, potentials and strengths. Therapists would be benefited in assessing the positive as well as the negative functioning of family by studies of communication in strong families (Otto, 1964).

To gain greater understanding and knowledge of communication in families and thus promote mental health, it is necessary to obtain information about the perceptions of the husbands and wives of strong families concerning the rating of their success in communicating with spouse and child, as well as their perceptions of what has contributed most to making their husband-wife and parent-child communication rewarding.

Such research would be a contribution to the teaching of marriage

and family living courses and could contribute to a greater awareness of the resources and potentials of positive family life. Hopefully, such research would contribute to the expertise of the family therapist and mental health specialists who work with families and create an atmosphere whereby more families could seek help in developing their potentials.

It is unfortunate that the research concerned with family strengths is very limited. To the author's knowledge most of the writing in the specific area of family strengths has been done by Herbert Otto. The present research was designed to provide increased knowledge and understanding of communication between husbands and wives and between parents and children in high strength families.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were to examine the perception of the members of strong families concerning:

1. Satisfaction with the communication pattern between the respondent and spouse.
2. Satisfaction with the communication pattern between the respondent and child.
3. Contributions to good communication between respondent and spouse.
4. Contributions to good communication between respondent and child.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the communication between respondent and child according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

Hypothesis III

There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

Hypothesis IV

There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

Hypothesis V

There is no significant relationship between respondents' satisfaction with marital communication and satisfaction with parent-child communication.

Definition of Terms

✓ Communication: Communication does not refer to verbal, explicit, and intentional transmission of messages alone, as used in the present study the concept of communication would include all those processes by which people influence one another. All actions and events have communicative aspects as soon as they are perceived by a human being such perception changes the information which an individual possesses and therefore influences him (Tuesch, 1963; Bienvenu, 1975).

✓ Family Strengths: are those forces and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourages the development of the persons' resources and potentials of the family and which make family life satisfying and fulfilling to family members (Otto, 1975a, p. 16).

✓ Strong Families: are those families whose members fulfill each other's needs to a high degree and whose members have a high degree of happiness in the husband-wife and parent-child relationship. The family is also intact with both parents present in the home.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There has been little research conducted concerning communication in high strength families. The following is a review of the available literature concerning (a) family strengths, (b) clinical insights into communication and family relationships, (c) communication and marital satisfaction, (d) parent-child relations.

Family Strengths

There is a scarcity of research concerning what makes a strong family. Otto (1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1972, 1975a, 1975b), and Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) are some of the authors contributing to this area of research.

Otto (1962, 1966) asked 27 families to list what they perceived were their family strengths. The greatest source of family strength was found in the affective aspect of family life, specifically the giving and receiving of understanding and love between spouses and parent-child. Sharing religious convictions and moral values and doing things together as a family unit were important for a strong family also.

Statt (1951) suggested that in the growing family the overall criterion of family success might be the extent to which (a) all 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 developmental tasks.

Otto (1963, 1975) developed the following criteria as a framework in which to view family strengths.

1. The ability to provide for the physical, emotional and spiritual needs of a family.
2. It has family members who are sensitive to each others' needs.
3. The strong family has the ability to communicate.
4. The strong family has the ability to provide support, security, and encouragement.
5. The strong family also has the ability to establish and maintain growth-producing relationship within and without the family.
6. The strong family has 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 parents in strong families grow with and through children.
8. The strong family has an ability for self-help, and the ability to accept help when appropriate.
9. The strong family has an ability to perform family roles flexibly.
10. In strong families there is respect for the individuality of family members, and
11. a concern for family unity, loyalty, and interfamily cooperation.

12. The strong family also has to use crisis or seemingly injurious experience as a means of growth.

To Otto (1962) family strengths are constantly changing elements within the family's subsystem which are constantly interacting and interrelated. The elements when viewed in their totality result in family strength, but each can be identified as a separate strength. The strengths of a family would naturally be expected to vary throughout the family life cycle.

Reeder (1973) developed a model of family characteristics which would aid problem solving behavior in families with a mentally retarded child. He suggested a successful family is: (a) 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.

According to Anthony (1969) a family with a strong background responds to difficulties by pooling its resources and developing together the most constructive solutions.

Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) in their study of successful families found that: (a) successful families have more intimate family friends and have more in common with their friends than do unsuccessful families; (b) 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; (c) 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. That is, the more friends are like each other, the more successful they have been in avoiding divorce, desertion, juvenile arrest records and other phases of the breaking of homes and domestic relations; (d) 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, we must accentuate the positive" (p. 140); (e) 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 this household from the beginning with similar friends who also possess this same ideal; (f) thus, the great totality of all the impressions of life other than parental had been received by those children from these friend families; (g) the 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 voluntatistic, involves common experiences and is not primarily for the appetitive pleasure or political, economic or social gain.

Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) state that successful families in their study allowed only those families who were like them into their circle of friends and home. Depending upon the city, relatives made from three-tenths to almost one-half of the family-group friends.

The family as a whole was able to relate to a wide diversity of family types because the group of friends were not restricted to one stage in the family cycle.

de Lissovoy (1973) in his longitudinal study of high risk marriages, found certain factors help sustain a marriage. They were church activities and a kin network providing psychological and economic support.

According to Miller, Corrales and Workman (1975) recognition of family strengths and of methods for utilizing strengths for enrichment has been a new and enormously important development. Clarke (1970) and Mace (1972) have reported marriage enrichment programs which focus on positive exchanges between a couple and enable couples to recognize and appreciate their strengths. The focus on strengths encourages educators and couples to recognize the potential for continued growth and development as a couple. Hinkle and Moore (1971) and Schlein (1971) have developed a communication framework for utilization by couples in continually developing their relationship.

Clinical Insights into Communication and Family Relationships

Psychotherapists (Ackerman, 1966, 1972; Jackson, 1959, 1972; Brammer and Shostrom, 1960; Boyer, 1960; Haley, 1962, 1963, 1971; Watson, 1963; Elizur, 1969; and Satir, 1972) claim that communication distortions are the main cause of family problems and suggest that improvement of intra-family communication is where the emphasis in family treatment should be. Satir (1965) looks for cognitive and affective change in a client's self perception. She analyzes

communication into such components as: who speaks to whom, who blames or praises, message clarity, and verbal and nonverbal message congruency. The therapist serves as a model to be emulated and teaches communicative techniques didactically. Watson (1963, p. 914) states: "all interpretation will focus on those aspects of the material that relate to the process of communication between spouses."

Several child psychotherapists have written books for parents on ways of establishing good relationships with their children and of enabling their children to actualize their full potential. Dreikurs (1964) an Adlerian theorist has an entire chapter on listening for parents in his book, Children the Challenge. Ginott (1965) suggests that a new code of communication based on respect and skill is the key to establishing a relationship of mutual responsibility, love and respect between parent and child.

Gordon (1970) in his book, Parent Effectiveness Training concludes that when a parent can communicate genuine acceptance of his child, as he is, the parent is fostering a relationship in which the child can achieve, develop, make constructive changes, learn to solve problems, become more productive and creative. Peppin (1963) examined the relationship of parental acceptance to children's academic achievement and found that parents of over-achievers were significantly more accepting of their children than were the parents of under-achievers. Hurley (1965) noted a positive relationship between parental acceptance and children's intelligence.

Other studies also confirm some of Gordon's precepts on power such as parental power assertion and child power assertion may have dangerous side effects. Parental power assertion causes hostility,

rebellion in the child. Hoffman (1960) studied parental power assertion and its impact on the child and found that unqualified power assertion by the mother tends to be associated with the development of hostility in the child which the child in turn tends to displace toward permissive authority figures and peers.

Gordon (1970) contends that when either parent or child asserts power completely, the child does not learn inner controls. If the child exercises power entirely he becomes selfish and demanding.

Lang (1969) in his study of power in families discovered: (a) power exercised entirely by parents is likely to lead children to experience responsibility as external to themselves, (b) children are prone to be preoccupied with their own unmet needs and to remain insensitive or indifferent to the deep needs of others when they exercise the power in families, (c) parents who share power with children enable their children to experience the locus of responsibility within themselves and to become responsive to the needs of others.

Gordon claims that his method of dealing with power struggles in families has something potentially therapeutic because it opens communication channels. There are studies which indicate that open communication in families is indicative of good mental health.

Ferreira and Winter (1968) studied information exchange and silence in normal and abnormal families. The amount of information exchanged among family members was significantly greater for normal than for abnormal families. The schizophrenic child rarely talked even when his turn to talk was designated. It was surmised that the breakdown in communication observed in abnormal families was a characteristic of the whole family. Bateson, Haley, and Wohland (1963), found that

Locus of Control

mothers of schizophrenic children sent conflicting messages to children creating a situation in which the child could not win regardless of what he did. This situation has been called the "double bind." Watzlawich (1967) states that lack of clarity or double-level messages is one of the most common manifestations of disturbed communication.

Communication and Marital Happiness

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) supported this with his finding that divorced couples tended to talk things over less frequently than happily married couples. Then Locke, Sabagh, and Thomes (1956) using the Locke Marital Adjustment Test and the Primary Communication Inventory, found correlations of from .36 to .72 between marital adjustment and communication among randomly selected couples. Karlsson (1963) in his Swedish study found that communication of love and respect is associated with marital happiness. In an effort to investigate the relationship between marital satisfaction and open rewarding communication, Navran (1967) selected 24 happily married couples and 24 couples who sought marital counseling and compared their communication. His findings revealed that happily married couples talked more to each other; made more use of supplementary non-verbal techniques of communication; personalized their language symbols; conveyed the feelings that they understood what was being said to them; had a wider range of subjects available to them; preserved communication channels and kept them open.

Bienvenue (1970) developed a Marital Communication Inventory (MCI) using 172 married couples as subjects. He found several elements which differentiated between good and poor communication including the handling of anger and conflict. Ort (1950) found that happily married couples said they resolved conflict through discussion, while unhappy couples said they used aggression, avoidance of the issue or physical violence. Satir (1972a) and Back (1969) speak to the critical importance of ground rules in approaching interpersonal conflict. The "fight fair" tactics which Bach writes about in his book, The Intimate Enemy, include the discussion of issues and avoidance of loss of esteem to either partner.

Another element which differentiated between good and poor communication was tone of voice. Several authorities found that considerable tension within families is released via the vocal apparatus. Shipman (1960) found that happiness in couples was definitely related to absence of irritation in voice tone.

Role Expectations

Karlsson (1963) found that communication of role expectation is significantly related to marital happiness. Hobart and Klausner (1959) reported similar findings. They concluded that psychological empathy was more closely related to marital happiness than marital role empathy. Kotlar (1965) discovered that marital satisfaction was associated with role specialization along task and expressive lines.

Burr (1971) discerned that both communication of role expectation and role behavior influence marital happiness. He found that the problems arose with some of the couples not because they did not

communicate role expectations, but because their communication of role expectations brought no change in behavior of spouse.

Self-Disclosure

There seems to be a body of evidence that both quantity (Terman, 1938; Locke, 1951; Feldman, 1966) and quality (Hobart and Klausner, 1959; Navran, 1967; Bienevenu, 1970) of communication are related to marital adjustment. However, Udry (1966) cautions that the relationship is at best only a tenuous one. He suggests that selective disclosure is the way to develop a good lasting relationship. Levinger and Senn (1967) found that overall, greater self disclosure occurred between satisfied couples, but report more disclosure of unpleasant feelings among unsatisfied couples. Possibly the communication process should be inhibited sometimes as a safeguard against saying what is hurtful to the listener. And Cutler and Dyer (1965) did find that open communication about violations of expectations between spouses can lead to nonadjustive responses.

Most of the evidence seems to point to a positive relationship between communication and marital adjustment. Other studies which have not already been mentioned are Ely's (1970) and Collins' (1971) which offer further support for the validity of the relationship between communication and marital satisfaction.

Komarovsky (1967) in her study of blue-collar marriages found that men and women who rate "very meager" on self-disclosure are unhappy in marriage. However, full disclosure in couples did not guarantee marital success. In fact, one group of couples appeared unhappy precisely because they communicated all too freely--fully expressing

their hostilities. She also found that self disclosure requires some reciprocity. Jourard (1971) reported a similar finding.

Jourard (1959) discovered that too much disclosure or too little may indicate an unhealthy relationship. Jourard (1964) also claims that insufficient self-disclosure results in insufficient reality testing. Regula (1975) concluded that insufficient self-disclosure weakens growth in intimacy in the marital relationship. He also claimed that one of the gifts of Marriage Encounter, the Catholic Church's weekend experience for enriching marriages, is that through self-disclosure couples move toward intimacy and marital growth.

Parent-Child Relationships

Ball (1970) found that the type of parent-child relationships a child experiences determines to a large extent the basic psychological defense mechanisms or coping strategies he would use in later life. Loving-rewarding parents influenced their children more effectively to follow their parents' own pattern of coping with stressful situations than did demanding, neglecting parents. In examining the pattern of role modeling among adolescents, Elder (1963) noted that parents who are democratic are more likely to have their adolescents model their behaviors than parents who are authoritarian.

Mercer (1969) examined the possibility that a contributing factor in the acquisition of adequate reading skills could be identification with a parental figure. The results indicated that college males and females classified as poor readers identified significantly more with their mothers than they did with their fathers.

Anzimi (1964) examined the assumption that male college students'

preferences for culturally accepted masculine and feminine roles and behavior patterns would be significantly related to the students' perceptions of their parents as projected in their stories to a set of thematic pictures. He found that the preference for culturally accepted masculine and feminine roles and behavior patterns was positively and significantly related to projection of warm mother-son relationship and salient father-son relationship in the thematic stories.

In a study of the relationship of identification among children and child rearing attitudes and practices of parents, Sears, Row, and Alpert (1965), concluded that: (a) the child tends to develop behavior qualities characteristic of the opposite sex when the parent of the opposite sex rewards dependency, and (b) parental attitudes toward the control of the child's behavior influence behavior considered to be masculine or feminine more than any aspect of the availability of masculine or feminine models. For example, it was found that femininity in children was associated with severe parental restrictiveness and punitiveness while masculinity in children was associated with parental permissiveness and non-punitiveness.

Lefkowitz, Walder, and Eron (1963) examined the relationship between type of punishment used by parents and aggression and identification in eight-year old children. The study indicated that aggression in children increases as parents increasingly rely upon physical punishment for controlling the child's behavior. This finding coincides with the concept of imitation or role-modeling as emphasized by the studies of Bandura and Huston (1961). It was also found that identification of the child with the parent decreases as the parents increase the use of physical punishment.

Kohn (1968) found, in comparing sons who identify highly with their fathers and those who do not, that there was a significantly greater tendency for the vocational interests of sons who identify highly with their fathers to resemble their father's occupations.

The association between occupational choice and parent-child relationships has been verified by several research studies. Children who experience their home life as unsatisfactory tend to choose occupations which are non-person oriented while children who experience their family life as warm and accepting generally choose occupations which were person-oriented (Green and Parker, 1965; Schneider, 1968; Porter, 1967).

Children's Orientation to Life

In studying the amount of religious behavior of undergraduates, Cooke (1962) noted that the strongly religious respondents tended not only to view themselves as more similar to both of their parents, but also liked their parents better than those respondents who said they had a low degree of religious convictions. The amount of religious behavior of the students was directly and positively related to the perceived level of the mother's religiosity.

Stinnett and Walters (1967) studied parent-peer orientation of adolescents from low income families and found that adolescents who reported a low evaluation of the family was more likely to be peer-oriented than those students who reported a high evaluation of family. Condry and Siman (1974) found that adult-oriented children receive greater support from both parents than peer-oriented children. They further stated that children experienced parental rejection and neglect when they became peer-oriented and conformed to

socially undesirable peer subcultures.

Children's Achievements

Shaw and White (1965) studied the relationship between child-parent identification and academic underachievement among rural and urban high school students. They reported that female achievers were found to identify much more closely with their mothers than they did with their fathers while male achievers were found to have identified much more closely with their fathers than they did with their mothers. Very high self-perception was revealed by male achievers and their fathers. In terms of similarity of their self-perceptions, achieving females and their mothers tended to agree, while the mothers of under achievers perceived themselves and their children as being quite different.

Clapp (1967) classified a group of four-year old boys as either competent or dependent and then studied the parental treatment of each group. Parents of the competent children were significantly more permissive, warmer, less restrictive, and less hostile. The parents of competent children also treated their sons more as a child and less as an adult.

Crandall, Preston, and Robson (1960) in studying maternal reactions in the development of independence and achievement behavior in young children found that mothers who frequently rewarded achievement in their children were less nurturant and they were less rewarding and acceptant of support-seeking and help-seeking. The rewarding of achievement and independence training were positively related. Children who displayed strong achievement strivings outside the home had mothers

who more often rewarded their children's achievement efforts when the children did not seek approval for their performances. Willmon (1967) found that the development of academic achievement in children was aided by parental involvement in Head Start programs. She suggested that to provide an educational program for the parents and to involve them in the anti-poverty program is a step in upgrading achievement in children.

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 understanding and parental satisfaction with the child. Rau (1967) found that academic progress among educable mentally retarded (EMR) could be related to home influences. High achievers had fathers who were more accepting and understanding than were the fathers of low achievers. Rau noted that the results of the study suggested that fathers may have an unsuspectedly great influence on the progress of their EMR children.

Morrow and Wilson (1961) in a study of high-achieving and under-achieving high school boys and their family relationships discovered that high-achievers' parents shared family recreation, confidences and ideas more often than under-achievers' parents. High-achievers had parents who were more approving, trusting, affectionate, and more encouraging of achievement than under-achievers.

In examining the family relationships and family background of mathematically gifted adolescents, Kennedy and Willcott (1963) found that the mathematically gifted adolescents tended to view their family relationships as bordering on negative and autocratic. The results

indicated that the family of the mathematically gifted adolescent placed great emphasis upon achievement, control, discipline, and regimen.

In his study of leaders and nonleaders among college students, Esty (1968) discovered that the parents were perceived as less neglecting, rejecting, overprotective and more loving by the student leaders than the nonleaders. Female college freshmen who scored high on tests of creative thinking tend to perceive their former parent-child relationships as significantly more loving and less rejecting than those who score low (Richardson, 1965).

Summary

The review of literature concerning communication in high strength families suggests the following:

1. There are few guidelines concerning achievement of a satisfying family life despite the fact that most people consider a satisfying family life as one of their most important goals in life.
2. Various 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 values are strongly associated with marriage and family success.
3. Many family therapists claim that communication distortions are the main cause of family problems, and improvement of intra-family communication is where the emphasis should be in family treatment.

4. Child psychologists claim that listening to children is one of the best ways for parents to establish good parent-child relationships.
5. For the development of the child, it is important that neither parent nor child exert too much power in the family.
6. Happily married couples, when compared to unhappily married couples, have more open channels of communication in that they talk more often, understand what is being said by the other, show sensitivity to the other's feelings, and make more use of non-verbal cues.
7. Elements which differentiated between good and poor communication in couples were the effective handling of anger and conflict through discussion and the absence of irritation in voice tone.
8. Communication of role expectations was found to be significantly related to marital happiness.
9. Self-disclosure is important in the marital relationship but authors disagree on how much is desirable with some suggesting full self-disclosure and other suggesting limiting disclosures which would be negative toward spouse.
10. Children's identification with culturally accepted masculine and feminine roles was found to be significantly related to warm and salient parent-child relationships and rearing practices of parents.

11. Children's achievements were found to be related to parental reward for achievement, parental understanding and satisfaction with child, and amount of shared family recreation, confidences and ideas.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

A letter was sent to the Extension Home Economist in each of the 77 counties in Oklahoma requesting that they recommend two or more families in their county who they believed to be strong families. Guidelines to consider in the selection of these families were provided. The general guidelines were: (a) a high degree of happiness is apparent in the husband-wife and parent-child relationships of the family members, (b) the family members appear to fulfill each others' needs to a high degree, (c) both parents are present in the home, (d) one family member must be a school aged child 21 years of age or younger who is living at home.

A packet containing a cover letter which explained the research study and assured anonymity, a questionnaire for both husband and wife, and a stamped, addressed envelope was sent to approximately 180 families which were obtained through recommendations of the Extension Home Economist in each of the 77 counties in Oklahoma. The questionnaires of 157 subjects representing 99 families (in several cases only one spouse from a family answered the questionnaire) were used for this study. To be included in the study the respondent not only had to be recommended by the County Extension Home Economist, but he also had to rate the husband-wife and parent-child relationship as satisfactory or very

satisfactory on the questionnaire. The data were obtained during the months of March, April, and May, 1975.

The Instrument

The questions from the questionnaire used in this study were developed for use in the Family Strengths Research Project by Dr. Nick Stinnett (1975). The questionnaire was designed to measure various aspects of family life which a review of the literature indicated were important components of family strength. In the process of Stinnett's development of the instrument a panel of four judges, all of whom held advanced degrees in the area of family relations were asked to review the questionnaire and evaluate it according to 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 judges agreed that the items met the four criteria, and the judges' suggestions were incorporated into the final version of the instrument. Further modifications concerning the wording of questions and overall length of the questionnaire were made as a result of a pre-test done with 20 families.

For the present study, data from the following questions of the questionnaire were used: biographical information such as sex, age and place of residence; perception of satisfaction of respondent with

marital and parent-child communication; and various perceptions of what has contributed to making the respondents' communication with spouse and child satisfactory. Fixed alternative and open ended questions were used to obtain the above information.

Analysis of Data

Frequencies and percentages were used to examine the respondents' perception of the following: (a) satisfaction with the communication pattern between respondent and spouse, (b) satisfaction with the communication pattern between respondent and child, (c) what has contributed to good communication between respondent and spouse, (d) what has contributed to good communication between respondent and child.

The chi-square test was used to determine if there were significant differences in the first two perceptions listed above according to: (a) socio-economic status, (b) sex, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence. The chi-square test was used to determine if there was a significant relationship between the respondents' satisfaction with marital communication and the respondents' satisfaction with parent-child communication.

Frequencies and percentages were used to determine if marked differences occurred in perceptions of what has contributed to good marital communication and to good parent-child communication according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 157 respondents representing 99 families who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The subjects consisted of 40.12 per cent males and 59.87 per cent females. Their ages ranged from 20 to over 50 years, with the greatest percentage (30.57) in the 36-40 age range, followed by the 41-45 age range with 28.02 per cent. Almost 80 per cent of the sample was 31-45 years old. The sample was 94 per cent white. Almost half of the subjects (48.40%) lived on a farm and 36.94 per cent lived in small towns under 25,000. The largest per cent was Protestant (81.29%) with 14.19 per cent Catholic. Most (47.09%) considered themselves to have much religion, followed by 29.67 per cent who indicated degree of religion as moderate. No one put "very little" on the religion scale.

A modified form of the McGuire-White Socio-economic Status scale was used to determine social class of the respondents resulting in the largest per cent (41.02%) coming from the upper-middle, with 39.10 per cent coming from the lower middle. The largest per cent (40.12%) had three children, followed by 33.12 per cent with two children.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Sex	Male	63	40.12
	Female	94	57.87
Age	20-25	2	1.27
	26-30	12	7.64
	31-35	33	21.01
	36-40	48	30.57
	41-45	44	28.02
	46-49	8	5.09
	50- over	10	6.36
Race	White	147	94.23
	Black	6	3.84
	Indian	3	1.92
	No response	1	
Religious Preference	Catholic	22	14.19
	Protestant	126	81.29
	Mormon	1	.64
	None	6	3.87
	No response	2	
Socio-Economic Status	Upper	7	4.48
	Upper-middle	64	41.02
	Lower-middle	61	39.10
	Upper-lower	21	13.46
	Lower-lower	3	1.92
	No response	1	
Size of Residence	Farm/country	76	48.40
	Small town under 25,000	58	36.94
	City of 25,000 to 50,000	11	7.00
	City of 50,000 to 100,000	9	5.73
	City over 100,000	3	1.91
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very Much	31	20.00
	Much	73	47.09
	Moderate	46	29.67
	Little	5	3.22
	Very little	0	0.00
	No response	2	

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Number of Children	1	3	1.91
	2	52	33.12
	3	63	40.12
	4	16	10.19
	5	12	7.64
	6	5	3.18
	7	2	1.27
	12	3	1.91
	13	1	.63

Perceptions of Communication

In order to gain knowledge of communication patterns in strong families, information was gathered from strong family members concerning each of the following: (a) satisfaction with communication between respondent and spouse, (b) satisfaction with communication between respondent and child. The response of strong family members concerning the above will now be presented using percentage and frequency.

Degree of Satisfaction with Communication

Between Respondent and Spouse

As Table II illustrates, the majority of the respondents (51.92%) described themselves as being "satisfied" with the communication pattern with their spouse. "Very satisfied" (35.35%) was the second most frequent answer.

TABLE II
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH MARITAL
AND PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION

Degree of Satisfaction	Respondent and Spouse		Respondent and Child	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Very Satisfied	35	35.35	33	21.25
Satisfied	81	51.92	96	61.53
Uncertain	11	7.05	20	12.82
Dissatisfied	9	5.76	7	4.48

Satisfaction With the Communication

Between Respondent and Child

The greatest proportion of the respondents (61.53%) indicated they were satisfied with the communication pattern between them and their child. As Table II indicates, the second most frequent response (21.15%) was "very satisfied."

Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed
to Good Marriage Communication

As Table III shows, "talking out problems together" was the response given most often. The second most frequently given response was "honesty/openness."

TABLE III
 PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO
 GOOD MARRIAGE COMMUNICATION

Variable	No.	Per Cent
Talking out problems together	41	26.11
Honesty/openness	20	12.74
Love	17	10.83
Mutual respect	15	9.55
Willingness and desire to communicate	14	8.92
Sharing decision making	13	8.28
Understanding/empathy	11	7.01
Listening	10	6.37
Controlling one's temper	8	5.10
Religious convictions	4	2.55
Other--satisfied	4	2.55

Perceptions Concerning What Has Contributed
to Good Communication Between Respondent
and Child

Table IV indicates that "listening" was the response given most often, followed by "talking together." The third most frequent response was "express interest in them/participate in their activities."

TABLE IV
 PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO GOOD
 COMMUNICATION BETWEEN RESPONDENT AND CHILD

Variable	No.	Per Cent
Listening	38	24.20
Talking together	27	17.19
Express interest in them/ participate in their activities	22	14.01
Mutual respect	18	11.46
Understanding/empathy	12	7.64
Honesty/openness	12	7.64
Love	10	6.37
Religion	5	3.18
Patience	1	0.64
Other--satisfied	8	5.09

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

The above hypothesis was examined using the chi-square formula. The analysis of each of the specific facets of this hypothesis will now be presented.

Hypothesis I(a): There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to sex.

When the chi-square test was used to examine this hypothesis, it was found that no significant differences existed according to sex. A chi-square value of 6.75 was obtained, which was not significant.

Hypothesis I(b): There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to socio-economic status.

No significant difference in degree of satisfaction with marital communication according to socio-economic status was found. A chi-square value of 20.16 was obtained, which was not significant.

Hypothesis I(c): There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to the degree of religious orientation.

Table V indicates there is a significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to the degree of religious orientation at the .02 level.

In examining the cells of the chi-square analysis, a major difference was that more than twice as many of those respondents who rated themselves "very religious" (48.27%) than those respondents who were classified as "moderate" (22.72%) indicated they were "very satisfied" with marital communication.

TABLE V
DIFFERENCES IN DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH MARITAL
COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Degree of Satisfaction	Degree of Religious Orientation						X ²	Level of Sign
	Very much		Much		Moderate			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Very Satisfied	14	48.27	29	42.64	10	22.72		
Satisfied	14	48.27	29	42.64	33	75.00	15.40	.017
Uncertain	1	3.44	9	13.23	1	2.27		

Hypothesis I(d): There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the marital communication according to size of residence.

No significant differences existed between degree of satisfaction with marital communication and size of residence. A chi-square value of 12.99 was obtained.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with the communication between respondent and child according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

The above hypothesis was examined using the chi-square test. The analysis of each of the specific aspects of the hypothesis was carried out. None of the variables were found to be significantly related to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

Hypothesis III

There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to: (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

The above hypothesis was examined by per cent and frequency.

Hypothesis III(a): There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to sex.

According to Table VI twice as many wives as husbands put "talking out problems together." Twice as many husbands as wives put "understanding/empathy" as being the major contribution to good marital communication. This is a surprising finding because according to Brenton (1966) men have usually not been encouraged to be understanding and empathetic in our society because these traits are seen as feminine. Perhaps an explanation might be that women assume that their role is to be understanding and empathetic so do not consider it a contribution to marital communication, while men think that it is not expected that they be understanding and empathetic, therefore think it is unusual and a good contribution to marital communication. Another possibility is

that men do not possess the qualities of understanding/empathy, but really appreciate these qualities from their wives.

Another surprising finding is that no women put religious convictions as a contribution to marital communication, but five per cent of the men did.

TABLE VI
DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED
TO GOOD MARITAL COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO SEX

Variable	Wives		Husbands	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Talking out Problems Together	29	34.52	12	16.43
Honesty-Openness	11	13.09	9	12.32
Love	7	8.33	10	13.69
Mutual Respect	8	9.52	7	9.58
Willingness and Desire to Communicate	8	8.52	6	8.22
Sharing Decision-making	7	8.33	6	8.22
Understanding/Empathy	4	4.76	7	9.58
Listening	4	4.76	6	8.22
Controlling One's Temper	4	4.76	4	5.48
Religious Convictions	-	--	4	5.48
Other--Satisfied	2	2.48	2	2.73

Hypothesis III(b): There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to socio-economic status.

As Table VII indicates, only 3.33 per cent of the respondents from lower-middle socio-economic status responded with "willingness and desire to communicate," while 13.84 per cent or almost four times as many, upper-middle socio-economic status persons responded with "willingness and desire to communicate." Only 3.07 per cent of the upper-middle status group responded with "sharing decision-making," while 13.33 per cent of lower middle status group responded with "sharing decision-making." Another difference found was that 7.69 per cent of the upper-middle status group responded with "mutual respect" while 13.33 per cent of the lower-middle socio-economic group made that response.

TABLE VII
DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS
CONTRIBUTED TO GOOD MARITAL COMMUNICATION
ACCORDING TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Variable	Upper No.	Middle %	Lower No.	Middle %	Upper No.	Low %
Talking out Problems Together	16	24.62	14	23.33	9	37.50
Honesty/Openness	7	10.76	7	11.66	4	16.66
Love	7	10.76	8	13.33	2	8.33

TABLE VII (Continued)

Variable	Upper Middle		Lower Middle		Upper Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mutual Respect	5	7.69	8	13.33	1	4.16
Willingness and Desire to Com- municate	9	13.84	2	3.33	1	4.16
Sharing Decision- making	2	3.07	8	13.33	3	12.50
Understanding/Empathy	6	9.23	3	5.0	1	4.16
Listening	5	7.69	3	5.0	2	8.33
Controlling One's Temper	4	6.15	3	5.0	1	4.16
Religious Convictions	2	3.07	2	3.33	-	--
Other-Satisfied	2	3.07	2	3.33	-	--

Hypothesis III (c): There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to degree of religious orientation.

The greatest differences were found in the "love" category. As Table VIII illustrates, 2.3 per cent of those who were moderately religious responded with the answer of "love." Of those with "very much" religious orientation, 18.91 per cent gave the response of "love." It is interesting to note that with the category of "listening" the responses were in the opposite direction with the highest frequency of responses being given by those respondents who were moderately

religious (9.30%). The "very much" religious orientation group also had the lowest number of respondents choosing "willingness and desire to communicate" (5.40%).

TABLE VIII
DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED
TO GOOD MARITAL COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO
DEGREE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Variable	Very Much		Much		Moderate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Talking out Problems Together	8	21.62	18	26.08	12	27.90
Honesty-Openness	4	10.68	9	13.04	6	13.95
Love	7	18.91	9	13.04	1	2.30
Mutual Respect	3	8.10	7	10.40	4	9.30
Willingness and Desire to Communicate	2	5.40	7	10.40	5	11.62
Sharing Decision-making	4	10.81	4	5.79	5	11.62
Understanding/Empathy	4	10.81	6	8.69	0	0.00
Listening	1	2.70	3	4.34	4	9.30
Controlling One's Temper	1	2.70	4	5.79	3	6.97
Religious Convictions	1	5.40	2	2.89	0	0.00
Other--Satisfied	1	2.70	0	0.00	3	6.97

Hypothesis III(d): There is no marked difference in perception concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to size of residence.

As Table IX indicates, the biggest differences occurred in the categories of "respect," and "love." As size of residency increases, so does per cent of those who responded with "mutual respect." In the "farm/country" group 5.17 per cent indicated "mutual respect," in the towns under 25,000 group 12.12 per cent indicated "mutual respect," and in the "25,000 to 100,000" group, 15.78 per cent indicated "mutual respect." More than twice as many respondents living in communities under 25,000 (15.15%) as those in the "farm/country" group (7.14%) indicated "love" as being a major factor contributing to good marital communication.

TABLE IX

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED
TO GOOD MARITAL COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO
SIZE OF RESIDENCE

Variable	On Farm/ In Country		Towns Under 25,000		Towns, 25,000 to 100,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Talking Out Problems Together	22	31.42	12	18.18	6	31.57
Honesty/Openness	11	15.71	8	12.12	1	5.26
Love	5	7.14	10	15.15	2	10.52

TABLE IX (Continued)

Variable	On Farm/ In Country		Towns Under 25,000		Towns, 25,000 to 100,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mutual Respect	4	5.71	8	12.12	3	15.78
Willingness and Desire to Communicate	6	8.57	6	9.09	2	10.56
Sharing Decision-making	7	10.00	5	7.57	1	5.26
Understanding/Empathy	3	4.28	6	9.09	2	5.26
Listening	5	7.14	4	6.06	1	5.26
Controlling One's Temper	4	5.71	2	3.03	1	5.26
Religious Convictions	-	--	4	6.06	-	--
Other--Satisfied	3	4.28	1	1.51	-	--

Hypothesis IV

There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to (a) sex, (b) socio-economic status, (c) degree of religious orientation, (d) size of residence.

The above hypothesis was examined by percentage and frequency. Results are presented below.

Hypothesis IV(a): There is no marked difference concerning what had contributed to good parent-child communication according to sex.

Few differences occurred between husbands and wives concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication. Table X shows eight per cent more wives than husbands indicated that talking together had been an important contribution to their good parent-child communication. A higher percentage of husbands (18.18%) than wives (11.88%) responded with "express interest in them/participate in their activities."

TABLE X

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO
GOOD PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO SEX

Variable	Wives		Husbands	
	No.	Per Cent	No.	Per Cent
Listening	26	25.74	13	19.69
Talking Together	21	20.99	8	12.12
Express Interest in Them/ Participate in Their Activities	12	11.88	12	18.18
Mutual Respect	13	12.87	7	10.60
Understanding/Empathy	8	7.92	5	7.57
Honesty/Openness	9	8.91	3	4.54
Love	6	5.94	5	7.57
Religion	2	1.98	3	4.54
Family Closeness	2	1.98	2	3.03
Patience	1	.99	-	--
Other--Satisfied	1	.99	8	12.20

Hypothesis IV(b): There is no marked difference concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to socio-economic status.

According to Table XI, one of the greatest differences in perceptions of what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to socio-economic status occurred in the category "love." In the lower-middle socio-economic status classification, 1.53 per cent responded with "love," while 13.25 per cent in the upper-middle group made this response. The higher the socio-economic class, the higher the percentage of respondents who chose "listening" (upper-middle = 29.41 per cent, lower middle = 16.92 per cent, upper-lower = 10.0 per cent). On the other hand, the lower the economic class, the higher the percentage of respondents who chose "talking together" (upper-lower = 25.0 per cent, lower-middle = 20.0 per cent, upper-middle = 10.0 per cent). In the upper middle group, 7.35 per cent responded with "mutual respect," while in the lower middle group 15.38 per cent chose that response.

TABLE XI

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO
GOOD PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Variable	Upper-Middle		Lower-Middle		Upper-Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Listening	20	29.41	11	16.92	7	10.0
Talking Together	7	10.29	13	20.0	5	25.0

TABLE XI (Continued)

Variable	Upper-Middle		Lower-Middle		Upper-Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Express Interest in Them/Participate in Their Activities	11	16.17	10	15.38	3	15.0
Mutual Respect	5	7.35	10	15.38	3	15.0
Understanding/Empathy	4	5.88	7	10.76	1	5.0
Honesty/Openness	8	8.82	3	4.61	3	15.0
Love	9	13.23	1	1.53	1	5.0
Religion	2	2.94	2	3.07	0	--
Family Closeness	0	---	4	6.15	0	--
Patience	0	---	0	--	1	5.0
Other--Satisfied	4	5.88	4	6.15	1	5.0

Hypothesis IV(c): There is no marked difference in perception concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to degree of religious orientation.

It is interesting that 5.40 per cent of those with "very much" religious orientation responded with "mutual respect," while 13.51 per cent of those with "much" religious orientation responded with "mutual respect." In the "much" religious orientation group 5.40 per cent responded with "love" while 13.51 per cent of those in the "very much" group responded with "love." See Table XII.

TABLE XII
DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED TO
GOOD PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION ACCORDING TO
DEGREE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Variable	Very Much		Much		Moderate	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Listening	11	29.42	15	20.21	11	23.40
Talking Together	5	13.51	13	17.56	10	21.27
Express Interest in Them/ Participate in Their Activities	4	10.81	12	16.21	5	10.76
Mutual Respect	2	5.40	10	13.51	6	12.76
Understanding/Empathy	5	13.51	7	9.45	1	2.12
Honesty/Openness	1	2.7	5	6.75	6	12.76
Love	5	13.51	4	5.40	1	2.12
Religion	2	5.40	2	2.70	1	2.12
Family Closeness	1	2.70	1	1.35	2	4.25
Patience	0	--	0	--	1	2.12
Other--Satisfied	1	2.70	5	6.75	3	6.38

Hypothesis IV(d): There is no marked difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good parent-child communication according to size of residence.

Only 8.95 per cent of those in the "under 25,000" group responded with "mutual respect," while 11.53 per cent of those in the "farm/country" group responded with mutual respect, and 23.53 per cent in the "25,000 - 100,000" group responded with "mutual respect" as a contribution to parent-child communication. In the "under 25,000"

group, 2.98 per cent responded with "honesty/openness," while almost four times as many (11.53%) in the "farm/country" group responded with "honesty/openness" as a contribution to parent-child communication.

TABLE XIII

DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING WHAT HAS CONTRIBUTED
TO GOOD PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION ACCORDING
TO SIZE OF RESIDENCE

Variable	On Farm/ In Country		Towns Under 25,000		Towns, 25,000 to 100,000	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Listening	16	20.51	17	25.37	4	23.53
Talking Together	13	16.66	12	17.91	4	23.53
Express Interest in Them/Participate in Their Activities	11	14.10	11	16.41	2	11.76
Mutual Respect	9	11.53	6	8.95	4	23.53
Understanding/Empathy	5	6.41	8	11.94	0	---
Honesty/Openness	9	11.53	2	2.98	1	5.88
Love	7	8.97	3	4.47	1	5.88
Religion	1	1.28	3	4.47	1	5.88
Family Closeness	2	2.56	2	2.98	0	--
Patience	0	---	1	1.49	0	--
Other--Satisfied	5	6.41	2	2.98	2	11.76

Hypothesis V

There is no significant relationship between respondents' satisfaction with marital communication according to satisfaction with marital communication according to satisfaction with parent-child communication.

The chi-square test was used to examine the above hypothesis. The results of the chi-square test relating the degree of satisfaction with marital communication and the degree of satisfaction with the parent-child communication indicate that there is a significant relationship at the .0001 level.

As Table XIV indicates, 50 per cent of those who were "very satisfied" with marital communication responded with "very satisfied" with parent-child communication, while only 7.5 per cent of those who responded with "satisfied" with marital communication responded with "very satisfied" with parent-child communication.

TABLE XIV

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SATISFACTION WITH MARITAL
COMMUNICATION AND PARENT-CHILD COMMUNICATION

Variable	Satisfaction With Marital Communication						X ²	Level of Sign
	Very Satisfied		Satisfied		Undecided			
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		
Satisfaction With Parent-Child Communication								
Very Satisfied	26	50.0	6	7.5	1	9.09		
Satisfied	23	44.23	61	76.25	8	72.72	178.11	.0001
Undecided	3	5.77	13	16.25	2	18.18		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purposes of this study were to examine the perception of the members of strong families concerning: (a) satisfaction with the communication pattern between the respondent and spouse, (b) satisfaction with the communication pattern between respondent and child, (c) what has contributed to good communication between respondent and spouse, and (d) what has contributed to good communication between respondent and child.

The 157 respondents represented 99 families which were recommended as strong families by Extension Home Economists in all counties in Oklahoma and also indicated on the questionnaire that they rated their husband-wife and parent-child relationships as "satisfactory" or "very satisfactory." The data were collected during the months of March, April, and May, 1975.

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the respondents' perceptions concerning their satisfaction with communication patterns and what has contributed to good communication. They were also used to examine Hypotheses III and IV. The respondents indicated that:

1. They were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the marital communication pattern with spouse.
2. They were "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the parent-child communication pattern with child.

3. "Talking out problems together" and "honesty-openness" were the main contributions to good marriage communication.
4. "Listening," "talking together," and "express interest in them/participate in their activities" were the main contributions to good parent-child communication.

The chi-square test was used to examine Hypotheses I, II, and V.

The results were as follows:

1. A significant difference at the .02 level was found to exist in the degree of satisfaction with marital communication according to the degree of religious orientation.
2. A significant difference beyond the .01 level of probability was found between respondent's satisfaction with marital communication and satisfaction with parent-child communication.

Conclusions and Discussion

A major conclusion of the study is that a large majority of the respondents (87.1%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with their communication with spouse. In addition, a large majority of the respondents (82.68%) were satisfied or very satisfied with their communication with child. This is consistent with Otto (1963, 1975) and Reeder (1973) who both claim that good communication is a necessary characteristic for strong families. It also supports Duvall (1971) who concluded that one of the first developmental tasks of a couple is to establish a good system of marital communication, which must be extended to relationships with the children born to the union.

That a larger per cent (87.17) reported a high degree of

communication with spouse as compared with satisfaction with parent-child communication (82.68%) might be explained by Jourard and Lasakow (1958) who claimed that the most consistent and intimate communication occurs in the marital relationship.

"Talking out problems together" was the response given most often to the question of what has contributed to good marital communication in your family. In fact, more than one-fourth of the respondents gave this response. This is supported by other research. Locke (1951) in his study of divorced and happily married couples found that the happily married couples usually talked things over. Navran (1967) discovered that happily married husbands and wives not only talked more often, but also felt more frequently understood by their spouse, that is, they felt that their messages were getting across, more than unhappily married husbands and wives. Ort (1950) reported that happily married couples said they resolved conflict through discussion, while unhappy couples said they used aggression and avoidance of the issue. Satir (1972a) and Bach (1969) claim that the handling of conflict or problems by discussion is important for the marital relationship.

The second most frequent answer was "honesty/openness." Cavan (1959) and Jourard (1959) have both written on the importance of openness and honesty in the communication between husband and wife. It is interesting to note that less than one-half as many have the second response as gave the first response. Perhaps the reason can be found in the literature. Some research, such as Komarovsky (1967), has indicated that some couples have found that too much honesty and openness in communication is a problem in their relationship.

Cutler and Dyer (1965) found that open communication about certain things was not helpful to the couples in their study. In other words, the literature reports research which suggests honesty and openness in communication between husband and wife is helpful, but there is research which suggests that honesty and openness beyond a certain point may have adverse effects on the marital relationship.

"Listening" followed by "Talking together" was the response given most often to the question of what has contributed to good parent-child communication. Bienvenu (1969) in his study of parent-adolescent communication found that listening was associated with a high degree of communication. Baruch (1949) and Dreikurs (1964) have chapters in their books on listening to children. Gordon (1970) in his course for parents teaches listening skills. Ginott has a chapter in his book, Between Parent and Child, on "Conversing with Children." In other words this finding of the importance of listening and talking together in parent-child communication supports the theories of various psychologists. The third most often given response was "express interest in them/participate in their activities."

Regula (1975) wrote that one of the necessary prerequisites for a person to disclose himself is the feeling that the other person is interested in him. A parent's participation in a child's activities gives an indication of interest in the child which would then facilitate communication.

Differences in perception concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to sex revealed that twice as many wives as husbands put "talking out problems together." 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. Komarovsky (1953, 1967) found that women who cannot share their feelings tended to be less content than men who cannot share their feelings with spouse. She also found that a higher proportion of men than women whose disclosure was "meager" could still enjoy moderate happiness in marriage.

A higher proportion of wives than husbands gave the responses of "listening" and "talking together" concerning the question of what has contributed to good parent-child communication. Perhaps an explanation for the difference can be found in the research of Riverbank (1971). He found that adolescents preferred talking to their mothers. In other words, more wives than husbands would be sought out for talking by children and would therefore envision their contribution to communication as listening.

There were differences in perception concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to socio-economic status. Only 3.33 per cent of the respondents from the lower-middle socio-economic status group responded with "willingness and desire to communicate," while 13.84 per cent or almost four times as many of those in the upper-middle socio-economic status group responded with "willingness and desire to communicate." This supports the findings of Komarovsky (1967) who reported that couples in the lower-middle socio-economic status group did not desire communication with spouse.

The greatest difference in perceptions concerning what has contributed to good marital communication according to degree of religious orientation occurred in the "love" category. Of those

who were in "very religious" category, 18.91 per cent responded with "love," while only 2.3 per cent of those who were in the "moderately religious" category responded with "love." Perhaps an explanation is that religion has traditionally emphasized the value of love.

There was a significant difference in the degree of satisfaction with marital communication according to the degree of religious orientation at the .02 level. A major difference was that more than twice as many of those respondents who rated themselves "very religious" (48.27%) than those respondents who were classified as "moderate" (22.72%) indicated they were "very satisfied" with marital communication. An explanation for this finding may be that churches are sponsoring Marriage Communication laboratories (Otto, 1975b). In fact the Catholic Church has developed Marriage Encounter and the United Methodist Church has developed Marriage Communication laboratories and Marriage Enrichment throughout Oklahoma.

By relating 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. The largest per cent (76.25%) of the respondents were "satisfied" with both marital and parent-child communication. This finding suggests that satisfaction or dissatisfaction with communication pattern with spouse or child may in part reflect degree of communication skills an individual has acquired rather than simply reflecting the quality of interaction between particular individuals. Therefore, these communication skills such as "listening" may contribute to satisfaction with communication in many different kinds of relationships.

Recommendations

There is a need for much more research on high strength families. In order to determine if the perceptions found in this study are general or regional in nature, the study should be done on a national level. If possible, more subjects from larger cities should be obtained as well as more subjects from lower and upper socio-economic groups. One of the problems of obtaining subjects from large cities is that Extension Home Economists and others have less contact with families in large cities. One possibility might be using trained ministers of churches which emphasize family life. It would also be interesting and informative to replicate the study with different ethnic and racial groups. Rather than just relying on self-report, observational techniques could be used for studying communication patterns in high strength families. Another helpful addition to the study might be to have the children of strong families fill out a modified form of the questionnaire or use interviews in getting the children's opinion about family communication.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, N. W. Treating the Troubled Family. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Ackerman, N. W. "Family Psychotherapy--Theory and Practice." In Gerald Erickson and Terrence Hogan (Eds.). Family Therapy An Introduction to Theory and Technique. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Co., 1972, 18-28.
- Anthony, E. J. "The Mutative Impact on Family Life of a Serious Mental and Physical Illness in a Parent." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, XIV (1969), 433-453.
- Anzimi, C. "Masculinity, Femininity, and Perceptions of Warmth and Saliency in Parent-Son Relationships." Dissertation Abstracts, XXV (1964), 2608-2609.
- Ball, M. "An Investigation of Defense Mechanisms and Recalled Parent-Child Relations." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1970.)
- ✓ Bach, G. The Intimate Enemy. New York: Morrow, Inc., 1969.
- Bandura, A., and A. Huston. "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LXIII (1961), 311-318.
- Bateson, G., D. Jackson, J. Haley, and J. Wohland. "A Note on the Double Bind." Family Process, 2 (1963), 154-161.
- Baruch, D. New Ways in Discipline. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1949.
- Bernard, J. "The Adjustments of Married Mates." In H. T. Christenson (ed.). Handbook of Marriage and the Family. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1964, 675-739.
- ✓ Berne, Eric. Sex in Human Loving. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1970
- Bienevenu, M. "Measurement of Parent-Adolescent Communication." The Family Coordinator, XVIII (1969), 117-121.

- ✓ Bienevenu, M. "Measurements of Marital Communication." The Family Coordinator, XIX (1970), 26-31.
- ✓ Bienevenu, M. "A Measurement of Premarital Communication." The Family Coordinator, XXIV (1975), 65-68.
- Blood, R. Marriage. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Boyer, C. L. "Group Psychotherapy with Married Couples." Marriage and Family Living, XXIII (1960), 114-121.
- Brammer, L. M. and E. L. Shostrum. Therapeutic Psychology: Fundamentals of Counseling and Psychotherapy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Brenton, M. The American Male. New York: Fawcett Book Co., 1966.
- ✓ Burr, W. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (1971), 368-372.
- Cavan, R. American Marriage: A Way of Life. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1959.
- Cervantes, L. I. The Dropout. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1966.
- ✓ Chapman, A. H. Marital Brinkmanship. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1974.
- ? Clapp, W. "Dependence and Competence in Children: Parental Treatment of Four Year Old Boys." Dissertation Abstracts, XIX (1967), 1703.
- ✓ Clarke, C. "Group Procedures for Increasing Positive Feedback Between Married Couples." The Family Coordinator, XIX (1970), 324-328.
- Collins, J. D. "The Effects of the Conjugal Relationship Modification Method on Marital Communication and Adjustment." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.)
- Condry, L. and M. L. Simon. "Characteristics of Peers- and Adult-Oriented Children." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXVI (1974), 543-554.
- Cooke, T. "Interpersonal Correlates of Religious Behavior." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1962), 1103.
- Crandall, V. J., A. Preston, and A. Robson. "Maternal Reactions and the Development of Independence and Achievements Behavior in Young Children." Child Development, XXXI (1960), 243-251.

- ✓ Cutler, B. R. and W. G. Dyer. "Initial Adjustment Processes in Young Married Couples." Social Forces, XLIV (1965), 195-201.
- de Lissovoy, V. "Highschool Marriages: A Longitudinal Study." Journal of Marriage and The Family, XXXV (1973), 245-255.
- Dreikurs, Rudolf. Children: The Challenge. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1964.
- ✓ Duvall, E. M. Family Development. Philadelphia and New York: J. P. Lippincott Co., 1971.
- ✓ Egan, G. Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970.
- Elder, G. H. and C. Bowerman. "Family Structure and Child Rearing Patterns: The Effect of Family Size and Sex Composition." American Sociological Review, XXVIII (1963), 891-905.
- Elizur, A. "Analysis and Treatment of Communication Distortions in Family Life: First Stage." Family Coordinator, 18 (1969), 353-361.
- Ely, A. L. "Efficacy of Training in Conjugal Therapy." (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, 1970.)
- ✓ Epstein, N. and W. Westley. "Patterns of Intra-familial Communication." Psychiatric Research Reports, II, 1959, 1-9.
- Esty, J. "Early and Current Parent-Child Relationship Perceived by College Student Leaders and Non-leaders." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX (1968), 1169-1170.
- Feldman, H. "Development of the Husband-Wife Relationship, A Research Report." Mimeographed. Ithaca: Cornell University, 1966.
- Ferreira, A. J. and W. D. Winter. "Information Exchange and Silence in Normal and Abnormal Families." Family Process, VII (1968), 251-276.
- ✓ Fromm, E. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- Ginott, H. Between Parent and Child. New York: Macmillan Co., 1965.
- Gordon, T. Parent Effectiveness Training. New York: Peter Wyden, Inc., 1970.
- Green, L. B. and H. Parker. "Parental Influence Upon Adolescents' Occupational Choice: A Test of An Aspect of Roe's Theory." Journal of Counseling Psychology, XII (1965), 379-383.
- Haley, J. "Whither Family Therapy?" Family Process, 1 (1962), 69-100.

- Haley, J. "Marriage Therapy." Archives of General Psychiatry, VIII (1963), 213-234.
- Haley, J. (Ed.). Changing Families: A Family Therapy Reader. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1971.
- Hicks, M. and H. Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (1970), 553-574.
- Hinkle, J. E. and M. Moore. "A Student Couples' Program." Family Coordinator, XX (1971), 153-158.
- Hobart, C. W. and W. J. Klausner. "Some Social Interactional Correlates of Marital Role Disagreement, and Marital Adjustment." Marriage and Family Living, XXI (1959), 256-263.
- Hoffman, M. "Power Assertion by the Parent and Its Impact on the Child." Child Development, XXXI (1960), 129-143.
- Hurley, J. "Achievement Pressure: An Attitudinal Correlate of College Course Grades." Psychological Reports, X (1962), 695-702.
- Ibister, C. "The Family, Past, Present and Future." Medical Journal of Australia. Sydney. V (1973), 763-764.
- 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 Gerald Erickson and Terrence 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.
- Jourard, S. and P. Lasakow. "Some Factors in Self-Disclosure." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LVI (1958), 91-98.
- Jourard, S. Personal Adjustment: An Approach Through the Study of Healthy Personality. New York: Macmillan Co., 1958.
- Jourard, S. "Healthy Personality and Self-Disclosure." Mental Hygiene, XLIII (1959), 499-507.
- Jourard, S. The Transparent Self. New York: Van Nostrand, 1964.
- Jourard, S. Self-Disclosure. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1971.

- ✓ Karlsson, G. Adaptability and Communication in Marriage. Uppsala: Almquist and Wiksells Roktrycheri, 1963.
- Kennedy, W. and H. Willcott. "Youth-Parent Relations of Mathematically-gifted Adolescents." Journal of Clinical Pathology, XIX (1963), 400-402.
- Kohn, M. L. "Social Class and Parent-Child Relationships: An Interpretation." American Journal of Sociology, XLI (1968) 471-480.
- ✓ Komarovsky, M. Blue Collar Marriage. New York: Random House, 1967.
- ✓ Kotlar, S. L. "Middle Class Marital Role Perceptions and Marital Adjustment." Sociological Social Research, XLIX (1965), 283-293.
- Lang, L. "Responsibility as a Function of Authority in Family Relations." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX (1969), 3668-3669.
- Lederer, W. and D. Jackson. The Mirages of Marriage. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1968.
- Lefkowitz, M., L. Walder, and L. Eron. "Punishment, Identification, and Aggression." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, IX (1963), 159-174.
- ✓ Levinger, G. and D. Senn. "Disclosure of Feelings in Marriage." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, XII (1967), 237-249.
- ✓ Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A Comparison of a Divorced and Happily Married Group. New York: Henry Holt, 1951.
- Locke, H. J., G. Sabagh, and M. M. Thomas. "Correlates of Primary Communication and Empathy." Research Studies of the State College of Washington, XXIV (1956), 116-124.
- Mace, D. and V. Mace. "Marriage Enrichment Through Group Interaction." Behavioral Sciences Center, Bowman Gray Schools of Medicine, Winston, Salem, N. C., 1972. (Unpublished paper.) ✓
- Mercer, C. "Reading and Its Relationship With Parental Identification and Personality in a College Population." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX (1969), 2621-2622.
- McGuire, O. and G. White. "The Measurement of Social Status Research in Human Development, No. 3 (Revised). University of Texas at Austin, 1955. (Research Paper.)
- ✓ Miller, S., R. Corrales, and D. Workman. "Recent Progress in Understanding and Facilitating Marital Communication." The Family Coordinator, XXIV (1975), 143-152.

- Morrow, W. R. and R. C. Wilson. "Family Relations of Bright High Achievers and Underachieving Boys." Child Development, XXXII (1961), 501-510.
- ✓ Navran, L. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, VI (1967), 173-184.
- Norris, N. "Parental Understanding, Parental Satisfaction and Desirable Personality Characteristics in Preadolescent Boys." Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII (1968), 4709-4710.
- ✓ Ort, R. "A Study of Role Conflict as Related to Happiness in Marriage." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XLV (1950), 692-699.
- Otto, H. "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, XXIV, (1962), 77-81.
- Otto, H. "Criteria for Assessing Family Strength." Family Process, II (1963), 329-337.
- Otto, H. "The Personal and Family Strengths Research Projects." Mental Hygiene, XLVIII (1964), 439-450.
- Otto, H. "The Personal and Family Strengths Research Projects." Pastoral Psychology, XVII (1966), 21-28.
- Otto, H. "How Can a Family Deliberately Build Strengths?" International Journal of Religious Education, XLIII (1967), 6-7; 40-41.
- Otto, H. "Has Monogamy Failed?" In Carr, G. B. (Ed.). Marriage and Family in a Decade of Change. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Publishing Co., 1972, 23-30.
- Otto, H. The Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, California: The Holistic Press, 1975a.
- Otto, H. "Marriage and Family Enrichment Programs in North America." The Family Coordinator, XXIV (1975), 137-142.
- Peppin, B. "Parental Understanding, Parental Acceptance and the Self Concept of Children as a Function of Academic Over- and Underachievement." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIII (1963), 4422-4423.
- Porter, J. "The Vocational Choice of Freshmen College Women as Influenced by Psychological Needs and Parent-Child Relationships." Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII (1967), 3730.

- Rau, D. "Parental Teaching of the Educable Mentally Retarded Child as Related to School Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII (1967), 669-678.
- Reeder, D. A. "Model of Family Characteristics for Problem Solving Behavior in Families with a Mentally Retarded Child." Dissertation Abstracts, XXXIVB (1973), 1758B.
- ✓ Regula, R. "Marriage Encounter: What Makes It Work?" The Family Coordinator, XXIV (1975), 153-159.
- Richardson, R. "Parent-Child Relationships and Divergent Students." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIV (1965), 5542.
- Riverbank, W. H., III. "Self-Disclosure Patterns Among Adolescents." Psychological Reports, XXXVIII (1971), 35-42.
- Rogers, C. "Communication: Its Blocking and Facilitation." In S. I. Hayakarva (ed.). Language, Meanings, and Maturity. New York: Harper and Row, 1954.
- Ruesch, J. "The Role of Communication in Therapeutic Transactions." The Journal of Communication, XIII (1963), 132-139.
- Satir, V. Conjoint Family Therapy. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1964.
- Satir, V. "Conjoint Marital Therapy." In B. L. Green (ed.). The Psychotherapies of Marital Disharmony. New York: Free Press, 1965, 24-34.
- ✓ Satir, V., J. Stachowiak, and H. Taschman. Helping Families to Change. New York: Jason Aronson, Inc., 1972a.
- Satir, V. Peoplemaking. Palo-Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1972b.
- Schlein, S. P. "Training Dating Couples in Empathic and Open Communication: An Experimental Evaluation of a Potential Preventative Mental Health Program." (Unpub. Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1971.)
- Schneider, D. "Perceptions of Family Atmosphere and the Vocational Interests of Physically Handicapped Adolescents: An Application of Anne Roe's Theory." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX (1968), 2574.
- Sears, R., L. Row, and R. Alpert. Identification and Child Rearing. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.
- Shaw, M. C. and D. L. White. "The Relationship Between Parent-Child Identification and Academic Underachievement." Journal of Clinical Psychology, XXI (1965), 10-13.

- Shipman, G. "Speech Thresholds and Voice Tolerance in Marital Interaction." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (1960), 203-209.
- ✓ Spitz, R. "Hospitalism: Genesis of Psychiatric Conditions in Early Childhood." Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, I (1945), 53-74.
- Statt, L. H. "The Problem of Evaluating Family Success." Marriage and Family Living, XIII (1951), 149-153.
- Stinnett, N. "Attitudes of College Students Toward Marriage." Journal of Home Economics, LXIII (1971), 33-37.
- Stinnett, N. and J. Walters. "Parental-Peer Orientation of Adolescents From Low Income Families." Journal of Home Economics, LIX (1967), 37-40.
- Stinnett, N. Family Strengths Research Project. Oklahoma State University (1975).
- ✓ Terman, L. M. et al. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Udry, J. R. The Social Context of Marriage. New York: Lippincott and Company, 1966.
- Watson, A. S. "The Conjoint Psychotherapy of Marriage Partners." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXIII (1963), 912-923.
- Watzlawich, P., J. H. Deauin, and D. Jackson. Pragmatics of Human Communication. New York: Norton, Inc., 1967.
- Willmon, B. "The Influence of Parental Participation and Involvement on the Achievement of Pupils Attending the Leon County Head Start Program as Measured by a Reading Readiness List." Dissertation Abstracts, XXVIII (1967), 1638-1639.
- Zimmerman, C. C. "The Future of the Family in America." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIV (1972), 323-333.
- Zimmerman, C. C. and L. T. Cervantes. Successful American Families. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIXES



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

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

74074

February 27, 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 by March 25. 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 not 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 should 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/dw
Enclosures

Oklahoma State University
Division of Home Economics

Department of Family Relations
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 this 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 _____
 4. Husband and wife
 about equally _____
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, royalties, 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:
- Divorce _____
- Death of spouse _____
15. How many children do you have? _____
16. What are their ages? _____
17. Have you been satisfied with the number and spacing of children born to your marriage?
- 1. Yes, I am satisfied _____
 - 2. No, Children were born too soon after marriage _____
 - 3. No, Too many children were born _____
 - 4. No, Spacing of children was too close together _____
 - 5. No, Spacing of children was too far apart _____
 - 6. No, Did not have as many children as desired _____

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 your oldest child living at home.

18. 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

19. What is the age of your oldest child living at home? _____

Is this child boy _____ or girl _____ ?

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

1 2 3 4 5

21. 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

22. 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

23. What would you most like to change about your marriage relationship?

24. What do you feel has contributed most to making your marriage satisfying?

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

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

27. 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

28. (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?

29. 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).

1 2 3 4 5

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

31. 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).

1 2 3 4 5

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

33. 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 degree and 1 represents the least.)

1 2 3 4 5

34. What exactly do you do that makes him/her feel good about himself/herself?

35. How would you rate the degree of 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.	—	—	—	—	—

36. 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.	—	—	—	—	—
3. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness.	—	—	—	—	—
4. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness.	—	—	—	—	—

37. Rate the degree to which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse understands your feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
2. You understand your spouse's feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
3. Your child understands your feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
4. You understand your child's feelings.	—	—	—	—	—

38. Rate the degree of affection 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.	—	—	—	—	—

39. Rate the degree of interest which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse has in you.	—	—	—	—	—
2. You have in your spouse.	—	—	—	—	—

40. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your marriage relationship by circling the appropriate response. There are no right or wrong answers. The response code is as follows: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree:

- | | |
|---|-------------|
| 1. My spouse and I quarrel very often in private. | SA A U D SD |
| 2. My spouse and I quarrel very often in public. | SA A U D SD |
| 3. My spouse and I often put each other down. | SA A U D SD |
| 4. My spouse and I are often sarcastic with each other. | SA A U D SD |
| 5. My spouse and I often ridicule each other. | SA A U D SD |
| 6. My spouse and I often bring up each other's "mistakes" of the past. | SA A U D SD |
| 7. Our marriage satisfaction has declined over the years. | SA A U D SD |
| 8. My spouse and I do not feel as emotionally close to each other now as we did in the earlier period of our marriage. | SA A U D SD |
| 9. My spouse and I spend much less time together now than we did in the earlier period of our marriage. | SA A U D SD |
| 10. My spouse and I enjoy being with each other less now than we did in the earlier period of our marriage. | SA A U D SD |
| 11. In comparison with the earlier years of our marriage much more of the time that my spouse and I now spend together is duty time such as entertaining, participating in the children's activities at school, and participating in various church and civic activities. | SA A U D SD |
| 12. I feel that much of the life has gone out of our marriage. | SA A U D SD |
| 13. From the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have never done many things together. | SA A U D SD |
| 14. From the beginning of our marriage most of the time that my spouse and I have spent together has been "duty" time such as entertaining and participating in various church and civic activities. | SA A U D SD |

15. From the beginning of our marriage I have received less satisfaction from our marriage relationship than from some other areas of life such as homemaking, career, children, and community involvement. SA A U D SD
16. From the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have not had a strong emotional involvement with each other. SA A U D SD
17. Since the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have not experienced a great deal of enjoyment in simply talking with each other. SA A U D SD
18. Since the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have shared few common interests. SA A U D SD
19. While there is little open conflict between my spouse and me, neither is there much to really excite me about the marriage. SA A U D SD
20. My spouse and I enjoy doing many things together. SA A U D SD
21. I enjoy most of the activities I participate in more if my spouse is also involved. SA A U D SD
22. I receive more satisfaction from my marriage relationship than from most other areas of life. SA A U D SD
23. My spouse and I have a positive, strong emotional involvement with each other. SA A U D SD
24. The companionship of my spouse is more enjoyable to me than most anything else in life. SA A U D SD
25. I would not hesitate to sacrifice an important goal in life if achievement of that goal would cause my marriage relationship to suffer. SA A U D SD
26. My spouse and I take an active interest in each other's work and hobbies. SA A U D SD
41. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your spouse satisfying; (rate on following 5 point scale with 5 representing greatest degree of determination and 1 representing the least degree.)

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

45. Please indicate below who usually makes the decision about each of the following:

	Usually Husband	Usually Wife	Husband and Wife about equally
1. Family Finances	_____	_____	_____
2. Childrearing	_____	_____	_____
3. Religious matters	_____	_____	_____
4. Where to spend vacation	_____	_____	_____
5. Whether wife shall work	_____	_____	_____
6. Where to live	_____	_____	_____
7. Whether husband changes jobs	_____	_____	_____

46. Are you satisfied with the way in which you and your spouse make decisions?

No _____ Yes _____

47. When there is a serious disagreement between you and your spouse about a course of action to take who usually gets his/her way?

48. When there is conflict (serious disagreement) between you and your spouse, how does he/she usually deal with it?

49. Please indicate how often your spouse responds to conflict (serious disagreements) in each of the following ways:

	Very often	Often	About half the time	Some- times	Hardly ever
1. Tries to avoid talking about it.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Tries to convince the other person why his viewpoint is wrong.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

	Very often	Often	About half the time	Some- times	Hardly ever
3. Tells the other person off.	___	___	___	___	___
4. Considers disagreements as a game of wits and tries to outmaneuver the other person.	___	___	___	___	___
5. Tries to identify exactly what the problem is, what are the feelings of each person about the problem, and the different ways of solving the problem.	___	___	___	___	___

50. When there is a conflict (serious disagreements) between you and your spouse or another family member, how do you usually deal with it?

51. Please indicate how often you respond to conflict in each of the following ways:

	Very often	Often	About half the time	Some- times	Hardly ever
1. Try to avoid talking about it.	___	___	___	___	___
2. Try to convince the other person why his viewpoint is wrong.	___	___	___	___	___
3. I consider a disagreement as a game of wits and try to outmaneuver the other person.	___	___	___	___	___
4. I try to identify exactly what the problem is, what are the feelings of each person about the problem, and the different ways of solving the problem.	___	___	___	___	___

52. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your spouse: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1 2 3 4 5

53. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your child: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1 2 3 4 5

54. Indicate below how much conflict your spouse experiences with your child: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1 2 3 4 5

55. Rate the degree to which you are satisfied with the communication pattern between you and:

1. Your spouse

2. Your child

Very Satisfied _____
 Satisfied _____
 Uncertain _____
 Dissatisfied _____
 Very Dissatisfied _____

Very Satisfied _____
 Satisfied _____
 Uncertain _____
 Dissatisfied _____
 Very Dissatisfied _____

56. 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?)

57. 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?)

58. We would like to get information about communication patterns in families. Indicate the degree to which each of the following applies to you, your spouse and your child. (5 indicates highest degree; 1 indicates lowest degree).

	You					Your spouse					Child				
1. Listens well	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Tries to see things from the other's point of view	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. Communicates messages that are contradictory.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. Is sensitive to the feelings of others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	You					Your spouse					Child				
5. Likes to talk more than listen.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Rarely shares his/her feelings with others	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Says directly what he/she thinks.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. "Hints" at what he/she wants rather than being direct.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Does not let other know what is bothering him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Checks to be sure he/she understands what others are saying when the communication process is unclear.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

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

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

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

62. 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

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

64. 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

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

66. 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

67. 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

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

69. From the following list of values which are often considered to be important in human development, please check the five (5) values which you consider most important for an individual to learn.

- 1. Determination and perseverance _____
- 2. Self-reliance _____
- 3. Seeing each person as having dignity and worth. (This involves respecting rights and needs of others.) _____
- 4. Moral courage. (Courage to stand by one's inner convictions) _____
- 5. Spiritual development _____
- 6. Cooperation _____
- 7. Honesty and integrity _____
- 8. Loyalty _____
- 9. Self-discipline _____
- 10. Feeling genuine concern and responsibility _____
- 11. Initiative _____
- 12. Intellectual inquisitiveness _____
- 13. Responsibility in performing tasks _____
- 14. Self-respect _____
- 15. Friendliness _____
- 16. Appreciation _____
- 17. Assuming responsibility for the consequences of one's own behavior _____

70. Following are fifteen basic, normal personality needs that everyone has in different degrees. In themselves, none of the needs is either good or bad. They are simply the needs that motivate and influence behavior. Each of these fifteen needs is described below in brief, general terms.

We are interested in how you see yourself in terms of the degree to which you have these needs. This should be what you feel most accurately describes your present level of each need, not the level which you feel you should have or the level which you want to have.

Score yourself on each of the needs. For scoring, use the 1 to 5 point scale. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of that need. Keep in mind that 1 represents the lowest level of the need, while 5 represents the highest level of the need.

1. ACHIEVEMENT - ambition, to succeed, to do one's best to accomplish something of great significance. 1 2 3 4 5
2. DEFERENCE - dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional. 1 2 3 4 5
3. ORDER - neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule. 1 2 3 4 5
4. EXHIBITION - attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself. 1 2 3 4 5
5. AUTONOMY - independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations. 1 2 3 4 5
6. AFFILIATION - need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments. 1 2 3 4 5
7. INTRACPTION - need to know, to understand - what and why, to analyze and empathize. 1 2 3 4 5
8. SUCCORANCE - to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others. 1 2 3 4 5
9. DOMINANCE - to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others. 1 2 3 4 5
10. ABASEMENT - conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority. 1 2 3 4 5
11. NURTURANCE - to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous. 1 2 3 4 5
12. CHANGE - variety, novelty, to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine. 1 2 3 4 5
13. ENDURANCE - perseverance, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful. 1 2 3 4 5

14. SEX - need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex.
15. AGGRESSION - to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others.

Please go back and see if you have answered each question.

«
VITA

Oteka Little Ball

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: COMMUNICATION PATTERNS IN STRONG FAMILIES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Madill, Oklahoma, February 2, 1939, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Reuel W. Little; married September 5, 1959 to The Rev. M. Jerry Ball; son, Jeremy, born December 11, 1962; daughter, Oteka Lyn born March 11, 1967.

Education: Graduated from Hockaday School, Dallas, Texas in May, 1957; received the Bachelor of Arts degree in Home Economics from Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas in May, 1962; completed requirements for Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1976.

Professional Organizations: National Council on Family Relations, Association of Couples for Marriage Enrichment (ACME), American Association of Sex Educators and Counselors, and Phi Kappa Phi.