

MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION, LIFE PHILOSOPHIES,
AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
OF STRONG FAMILIES

By

DEBORAH RUTTMAN TRUITT
II

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1972

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1976



Thesis
1976
T866m
cop. 2



MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION, LIFE PHILOSOPHIES,
AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
OF STRONG FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett

Thesis Adviser

Athea Wright

Elaine Jorgensen

Norman D. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

953439

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my adviser, Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, for his guidance, interest, support, and generous investment of time and patience throughout this study.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. Althea Wright, Assistant Professor, Family Relations and Child Development, and to Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, Head of the Department of Home Economics Education, for their help in the critical reading of this study.

Appreciation is expressed to the Oklahoma State University Research Foundation for financial support of this project, to the Cooperative County Extension Home Economists for their help in locating the participants in the study and to those strong family members for their willingness to participate in the study.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Iris McPherson for her assistance in programming the data and to Miss Velda Davis for her accurate typing.

Special appreciation goes to my family. To my husband, Gary, for his support and encouragement of this study. Thanks also to my daughter, Michelle Lee, for her endurance of the loss of time that we could have spent together.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Family Strengths	6
Marital Success Studies	10
Personality Characteristics as Related to Marriage Success	16
Summary	18
III. PROCEDURE	21
Selection of Subjects	21
The Instrument	22
Analysis of the Data	25
IV. RESULTS	27
Description of the Subjects	27
Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (MNSS) Subscores . .	30
Life Philosophy Scale (LPS) Subscores	31
Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation- Behavior (FIRO-B) Subscores	33
Examination of Hypotheses	37
V. SUMMARY	51
Conclusions and Recommendations	54
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	56
APPENDIX	60

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Eighty-Five Subjects	28
II. Marital Need Satisfaction Scale Subscales for the Total Sample	31
III. Life Philosophy Scale Subscale Scores for the Total Sample	32
IV. Expressed Behavior FIRO-B Personality Test Subscale Scores for the Total Sample	35
V. Wanted Behavior FIRO-B Personality Test Subscale Scores for the Total Sample	35
VI. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Sex	38
VII. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to the Employment Status of the Wife	39
VIII. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Age	41
IX. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Number of Years Married	42
X. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Number of Children	43
XI. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Socio- Economic Status	44
XII. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to Degree of Religious Orientation	45
XIII. Differences in Total MNSS Scores According to the Degree that the Busy Pace of Life is a Problem for the Respondent's Family Life	46
XIV. Association Between LPS Subscale Scores and Total MNSS Scores	48

Table		Page
XV.	Association Between Total MNSS Scale Scores and Expressed Behavior FIRO-B Personality Test Subscale Scores . . .	49
XVI.	Association Between Total MNSS Scale Scores and Wanted Behavior FIRO-B Personality Test Subscale Scores . . .	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Family strengths have been defined by Otto (1975) as forces and factors in the relationship which encourage the development of personal resources and potentials of family members which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to its members. One of the most important needs in our society today is strengthening family life. This is becoming a more prominent concern as the divorce ratio continues to increase from one out of 12 in 1900 to approximately one out of three today.

There is evidence that most people consider a strong, satisfying family life important, but there are far too few guidelines to follow concerning what constitutes family strength and how to build stronger families. Research needs to further identify the characteristics of strong families in order to gain more knowledge concerning the development of these strengths and thus strengthen family life (Gabler and Otto, 1964).

Bowman (1974), helps to define marriage success by reporting that a successful marriage is one in which both partners receive a high level of personal satisfaction from the relationship. Success occurs when both partners obtain at least the satisfaction that they expected from

the marriage (Kirkpatrick, 1963). As satisfaction with the marriage increases above this minimum amount, the relationship is considered even more successful (Bowman, 1974). There are many factors, both premarital and postmarital, that are associated with marriage success, but it is necessary that we attempt to further identify factors characteristic of successful marriages and thus provide a positive model for strengthening families.

A marriage is comprised of individuals who bring into this relationship two very distinct personalities and life philosophies. Personality characteristics have been positively associated with marriage success, but there is a need to identify additional personality characteristics which are related to marriage success and family strength (Lantz and Snyder, 1969).

Individuals within marriage relationships also possess their own life philosophies. Often their life philosophies differ causing marital conflict. Life philosophies reflect values and greatly influence goals and behavior. Specifically family interaction is affected by the life philosophies of the family members. Components of life philosophy have included such items as optimism and pessimism, self determination and fatalism as well as the belief in God and atheism. It is important that research be conducted in order to determine those life philosophies associated with strong families. Little research has been done in this area (Lantz and Snyder, 1963; Zimmerman and Cervantes, 1960).

While the majority of Americans are still choosing to marry, the spiraling divorce ratio indicates that goals sought in marriage are often not being attained. A greater understanding of the relationship between family strength and marital need satisfaction, personality

characteristics, and life philosophies could hopefully help to decrease this divorce ratio. Research in this area, which is presently very limited, could also contribute to the expertise of the family therapist and others who work with families.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes of this study are to determine the responses of strong family members to the items in the Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery, 1970), to determine the responses of strong family members to the items in the Life Philosophy Scale (Stinnett, 1975), and to determine the responses of strong family members to the items in the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior personality test (Schutz, 1958).

Secondary purposes are to: (a) determine those areas in which strong family members have the highest and lowest degrees of marital satisfaction by obtaining median subscores for each of the following subscales within the Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (MNSS): love, personality fulfillment, respect, communication, meaning in life, and past life integration; (b) determine those areas in which strong family members have the highest and lowest degrees of life philosophy by obtaining median subscores for each of the following subscales within the Life Philosophy Scale (LPS): optimism vs. pessimism, self determination vs. fatalism, and belief in God vs. atheism; (c) determine those areas in which strong family members have the highest and lowest Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior personality test (FIRO-B) subscores for each of the following six subscales within the FIRO-B: expressed behavior--inclusion, control and affection,

by obtaining median and mean subscores for each subscale.

The following hypotheses will be examined:

- 1) There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to:
 - a) sex
 - b) age
 - c) number of years married
 - d) number of children
 - e) socio-economic status
 - f) degree of religious orientation
 - g) the respondent's perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem to the respondent's family life
 - h) wife's employment status
- 2) There is no significant correlation between the total MNSS scores and each of the following LPS subscale scores:
 - a) optimism vs. pessimism
 - b) self determination vs. fatalism
 - c) belief in God vs. atheism
- 3) There is no significant correlation between the total MNSS scores and the FIRO-B personality test subscale scores:
 - a) expressed behavior--inclusion, control and affection
 - b) wanted behavior--inclusion, control and affection

Definition of Terms

Family Strengths: are those forces and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourage the development of the personal resources and potentials of the family and which make family life satisfying and fulfilling to family members (Otto, 1975, 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 strong families in this study are intact with both parents present in the home.

Marital Need Satisfaction: is the extent of satisfaction within the marital relationship which a husband or wife expresses concerning the fulfillment of certain basic psychological needs by his/her spouse (love, personality fulfillment, respect, communication, meaning in life, and integration of past life experiences).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Family Strengths

The literature and research concerning family strengths is quite limited. Otto (1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1972, and 1975), Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960), Reeder (1973), and Grams (1967), are among the authors contributing to research dealing with family strengths.

Otto (1962, 1966) in an early study in which 27 families were asked to list what they perceived as their family strengths revealed that the affective aspects of family living provided the greatest source of family strength. The giving and receiving of love and understanding between spouses, parents, and children were mentioned the most. Other items considered important for a strong family were doing things together as a family and sharing religious and moral convictions.

In a somewhat later study Otto (1967) revealed that families have latent strengths or capacities which they are not using. Families tend to be more aware of problem areas and difficulties than of capacities and potentials. Otto (1963) finds that family strength is the end product of a series of ever changing related components. He identifies these twelve components which result in family strength:

- 1) The ability to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of a family.
- 2) The ability to be sensitive to the needs of the family members.

- 3) The ability to communicate.
- 4) The ability to provide support, security, and encouragement.
- 5) The ability to establish and maintain growth-producing relationships within and without the family.
- 6) The capacity to maintain and create constructive and responsible community relationships in the neighborhood and in the school, town, local and state governments.
- 7) The ability to grow with and through children.
- 8) An ability for self-help, and the ability to accept help when appropriate.
- 9) An ability to perform family roles flexibly.
- 10) Mutual respect for the individuality of family members.
- 11) The ability to use a crisis or injurious experience as a means of growth.
- 12) A concern for family unity, loyalty, and interfamily cooperation (pp. 333-336).

Reeder (1973) developed a model of family characteristics identified as being helpful for problem solving behavior in families with a mentally retarded child. The successful family: (a) is integrated into society; (b) maintains an internal focus of authority, decision-making and emotional investment; (c) has ties of affection and support among all members; (d) has open channels of communication; (e) has a centralized authority structure to coordinate problem-solving efforts; (f) has the ability to communicate and evaluate conflicting ideas according to their intrinsic merit rather than the status of their source; (g) is able to reach a consensus on family goals and related role expectations; and (h) prefers specific value orientations.

Blackburn (1967) reports that the strong family is the family that has a high degree of satisfaction with husband-wife and parent-child relationships. These relationships within the family also

contribute to making a strong family. Strong husband-wife relationships exist where they have high feelings of mutual respect, affection and love for each other (Cutright, 1971). The individuals comprising strong families usually come from similar economic classes and backgrounds with similar goals and expectations. They are also compatible sexually (Barton, Kawash, and Cattell, 1972).

Successful parent and child relationships also tend to strengthen and bind the family as a unit. Children affect the marital dyad in many ways. Many resources indicate that children actually weaken the family unit, but that the commitment the couple has to the children—to rear them to maturity and to send them out into the world with moral, ethical, spiritual, and religious values, seems to make the family stronger (Blackburn, 1967, and Figley, 1973).

Walters and Stinnett (1971) report that couples without children tend toward extremes in adjustment being either extremely unhappy or extremely happy while those with children approached average in happiness.

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

Strong families have good lines of communication which are open to all family members. Mature love relationships are also present. Most strong families are considered equalitarian in that all family

members contribute to making decisions. The strong family is not afraid to ask for help when it is needed. A weak family waits until it is too late to seek help. The strong family has the ability to cope and to handle stressful situations that arise. Religion plays an important part in the lives of strong families. It functions to support and to make the family stronger (Figley, 1973).

One strength of the American family is that it continues to meet the needs of men and women. These needs range from providing shelter, protection, family development, affection, reproduction, emotional, educational, love, to meeting sexual needs (Barton, Kawash, Cattell, 1972).

The ability of the family to provide companionship is another strength of the family. The family provides a place where members can turn and be accepted, loved and cared for. The family provides for fulfilling emotional and physical needs of its members.

Three main sources exist that support the family according to Grams (1967). One of these is the church. It supports the family structure internally and externally by strengthening the family structure (Crockett, Babchuk, and Ballweg, 1969, and Grams, 1967).

Education is also a source of family strength. Through education, we become more aware of how to successfully live in families (Grams, 1967).

The ability of family members to live in terms of priorities is the third source of family strength. Those families who decide together what things are most important and work together with these priorities in mind are strong families (Grams, 1967).

Marital Success Studies

Of all the goals in life, the achievement of a successful marriage is valued greatly by our society. Success, while so important, can only be determined by those involved in the relationship. A successful marriage occurs when both partners obtain at least the satisfaction that they anticipated from the marriage (Kirkpatrick, 1963). Spanier (1972) goes on to describe a successful marriage as being relatively free of conflict, the husband and wife being in relative agreement on major issues, enjoying the same leisure interests and participating in them together, and showing affection for one another. It is necessary that in order for a marriage to be successful that the marital needs of individuals comprising the relationship must be met. If these needs are not met, the relationship is often dissolved and/or family strength is not allowed to develop.

There are many premarital and postmarital factors associated with marriage success. One of the most important premarital factors to consider is the success or failure of the parent's marriage. If the parents were happily married then the couple has a greater chance of being happily married than if the parents were unhappy or were divorced. Children tend to follow examples set for them. It is important that the example set for them is positive (Bowman, 1970).

Another premarital factor considered important to marital success is an individual's personal happiness in childhood. An individual who was happy in childhood is more likely, as an adult, to have a happy and successful marriage. This finding reemphasizes the importance of good parent-child relationships. If the child is related to in a positive

manner, he will probably relate to others positively, particularly a marriage partner (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Length of acquaintance before marriage is also indicated by research as an important factor related to marital success. The longer the couple has known each other, the more likely the marriage will be successful. Those who knew each other for over one year are more likely to have a happy, successful marriage than those who knew each other for less than one year before marriage. The period of time between meeting and marriage is necessary in order to really get to know each other. Learned during this time are such things as expectations of each other and goals that each have (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Age at marriage has been indicated by research to be another factor related to marital success. Those entering marriage at age 19 or younger have the highest divorce rate and the most problems of any other group. A few reasons for the high rate of divorce in this group is because of such factors as: small income, limited education, continued need for parental support and lack of emotional maturity (Kirkpatrick, 1963, and Burchinal, 1965).

Kirkpatrick (1963) found that parental approval of one's mate is important in order to have a happy and adjusted marriage. Couples need the approval and support of persons close to them. This approval tends to reinforce positive feelings about the marriage.

The primary reason for marriage is also important to the success of the marriage. If this primary reason for marriage was to escape an unhappy home life, or to alleviate loneliness, then the chance of marital failure or unhappiness is greater. If the couple married because of genuine love or because common interests are shared, then

marital success and happiness will more likely be achieved (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

Rollins and Feldman (1970), in their research have identified three keys to marital success. These are:

- 1) Personal readiness for marriage.
- 2) Compatible mate selection.
- 3) Early adjustment to marriage.

Postmarital factors are also related to marriage success. First of all, marital attitudes such as one partner being more dominant than the other, one being extremely jealous of the other, one partner feeling superior to the other or one partner feeling more intelligent than the other, are associated with low marital adjustment and dissatisfaction in marriage. An equalitarian, democratic attitude is more closely associated with marriage success and high marital adjustment (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

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

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

Children can greatly affect the success of a marriage, even before they are conceived (Meyerowitz, 1970, and Figley, 1973). Figley in his 1973 article also noted that the timing of the birth of the first child

affects marriage success. If the bride was premaritally pregnant, or if the couple became pregnant before adjusting to being married, this marriage tends to not be successful. Premarital and early postmarital conception have been found by Hurley and Palonen (1967) to be associated with a high divorce rate. Their research also indicated that there is a significant negative relationship between marital adjustment and child density. The more children the lower the marital adjustment.

Couples with a desire for children indicated a higher degree of satisfaction with their marriage than couples who do not want children; however, having the children is not positively associated with marriage satisfaction. Some research has indicated that childless couples are happier than couples with children (Bernard, 1972).

Hill (1970) conducted a study of the family over three generations, and he found children no longer to be potential financial assets nor can they be expected early to earn their keep. Children, according to Hill, are now only liabilities with mouths to feed, bodies to clothe and minds to educate.

Of 4,452 families surveyed in a study by Renee (1970), those couples currently in the process of raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied with their marriages than couples with no children or whose children were adults and had left home. Parents not having problems rearing children tend to be more satisfied with their marriage than those having behavior problems with the children. Rollins and Feldman (1970) in their research consistently found among wives a decline in marital satisfaction over the first ten years of marriage, or until the children were schoolage. They also found a sharp decline in marital satisfaction during the child's teen years until the child is launched.

Hurley and Palonen (1967) found that the marital relationship reaches a low point in the period just prior to the departure of the children from the home.

Having children tends to be positively associated with marriage stability. Findings by Luckey and Bain (1970) indicate that children are the primary, if not the only satisfaction in the marriages of couples who admit to a low degree of marital bliss. Couples with a low degree of satisfaction may be staying married because of the children.

The more children there are within the family the less likely a divorce is to occur (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1973). These findings may be due to the couple not wanting to make a break while there are children in the home, which may be the reason for so many divorces before children are born and after the last child has been launched.

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

Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970) have identified four basic needs considered important in the marital relationships of all age groups: (a) love, (b) personality fulfillment, (c) respect, and (d) communication. The meeting of these needs by each spouse is positively associated with marital success.

Lines of communication tend to be kept open in successful marriages. It takes lots of work from both sides to develop effective communication patterns. A few of these effective patterns as reported by Navran (1967), are:

- 1) Talking to each other often.
- 2) Understanding what is being said to them.
- 3) Have a wider range of subjects available to them.
- 4) Preserve communication channels and keep them open.
- 5) Are sensitive to each other's feelings.
- 6) Personalize their language symbols.
- 7) Use nonverbal techniques of communication effectively (p. 182).

Lively (1969) indicates that success is determined by remaining married, sharing a residence, having children, as well as the acquisition of prestige giving material goods, the maintenance of a high degree of cleanliness, or the rearing of attractive children and other items correlated with high socio-economic variables.

Marriage success is also positively related to higher levels of income and income stability. Hicks and Platt (1970) report that even in marriages where there is a stable and adequate income, financial management is a major source of conflict. This finding emphasizes the conflicts that are caused by money management. In situations where goals and interests are not the same there is even more frustration concerning money management.

Occupation of both the husband and wife have an important influence upon marriage success. Marriage happiness and stability tend to be higher among the more stable and higher paid occupations according to Bernard (1966). Marriage satisfaction tends to also be associated with job satisfaction which is also associated with a feeling of self worth (Ridley, 1973).

Employment of the wife outside the home can have an adverse affect on the marriage, particularly if the wife is working when she does not

want to or because of financial necessity. Such employment also tends to have an adverse affect on the marriage if she does not enjoy her work and if her husband does not approve of her employment. These conditions can cause great strain and pressure on the marital relationship (Orden and Bardburn, 1969).

Burr (1971) found that there are discrepancies between role expectations and role behavior which influence marital satisfaction. The data for this project were gathered from interviews with 116 middle class, married couples in a major midwestern city. The data showed a high negative relationship between role discrepancies and marital satisfaction.

There is a positive association between religious participation and marriage success. There are fewer divorces among couples with strong religious orientation and participation than among nonreligious couples (Landis and Landis, 1973). In a study by Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) it was found that divorce is four times more likely to occur in families with no religious orientation.

Personality Characteristics as Related to Marriage Success

Research has indicated that personality characteristics of marriage partners are significantly related to marriage failure or success (Lantz and Snyder, 1969). No one type of personality guarantees success in marriage, but clinical evidence suggests that the person with a generally healthy personality will have a better chance for marital success than will the person on the other end of the personality continuum (Stroup, 1963).

Lantz and Snyder (1969) have identified a few personality characteristics as associated with marriage failure or success. These are:

- 1) Emotional maturity and stability.
- 2) Self control.
- 3) Ability to demonstrate affection.
- 4) Considerate of others.
- 5) Optimistic.
- 6) Willingness to take on responsibility.
- 7) Ability to overcome feelings of anger.

Spanier (1972) goes on to describe spouses of successful marriages as being mature, stable, conventional and conforming people who come from untroubled family backgrounds.

Those persons with satisfying marriages tend to have personality characteristics that contribute to positive interpersonal relationships. These persons are considerate, cooperative, emotionally stable, kind towards others, and view their marriage partners as being considerate, cooperative, generous, conventional and responsible. They also see their spouses as having moderate and not extreme personality qualities (Landis and Landis, 1973; Hicks and Platt, 1970; and Allen, 1962).

Adaptability and flexibility are personality characteristics which have been found to be positively associated with marriage success. These characteristics determine the ability or nonability for the partners to resolve conflicts (Hicks and Platt, 1970; Kieren and Tallman, 1972). In Kieren and Tallman research (1972) the wife's adaptability was positively associated with the husband's marital happiness.

Research also indicates that a high degree of marital dissatisfaction is associated with large differences in personality traits;

however, it is not known whether the personality characteristics are the cause of the unhappy marriage or whether the marital problems produce these personality characteristics (Stroup, 1963). Cattell and Nesselroade (1967), identify such traits as enthusiasm, sensitivity, outgoingness and drive. Marriage satisfaction and stability are associated with similarity in emotional stability, enthusiasm, social boldness and conscience.

Those persons dissatisfied with their marriages tend to view their spouses as being impatient, either dictatorial or passive, unkind, blunt, aggressive, gloomy, complaining, slow to forgive and distrustful (Allen, 1962); while those persons who are inconsiderate, selfish, uncooperative, aggressive and moody tend to have unsatisfying marriages (Landis and Landis, 1969).

In studying the differences between stable and unstable marriages, both individuals in the relationship seem to be aware of the affects of certain behaviors upon their spouse; however, the stable couples are more willing to modify their behaviors (Clements, 1967).

Summary

The review of literature concerning marital need satisfaction, life philosophies, and personality characteristics of strong families suggests the following:

- 1) Although most people consider a satisfying family life as a very important goal in life, there are few guidelines concerning the achievement of a satisfying family life.
- 2) Items positively associated with marriage and family success are the presence of such aspects as love, understanding,

sharing a high degree of religious orientation and a sharing of moral convictions.

- 3) Factors identified as strengths resulting in family strength include the ability to provide for and be sensitive to each family member's needs in order to establish and maintain growth producing relationships within and without the family.
- 4) There are six basic needs considered important in marital relationships which are identified as love, personality fulfillment, respect, communication, meaning in life, and past life integration.
- 5) Children, while positively associated with marriage stability, affect the marital relationship before they are born and continue to influence the degree of happiness in the marital relationship until they are successfully launched.
- 6) Communication channels must be left open, couples must talk more and understand what is being said by the other, and be more sensitive to each other's feelings if couples are to be happily married.
- 7) Premarital as well as postmarital factors are associated with marriage success. Three major factors contributing to marital success include a personal readiness for marriage, compatible mate selection, and early adjustment to marriage.
- 8) Employment of the wife outside the home has been shown to not have an adverse affect upon the marriage if the wife wants to work and is not working because of financial necessity, if the husband approves, or if she is only working part time.
- 9) Personality characteristics such as emotional maturity, self

control, ability to demonstrate affection, considerateness, and ability to overcome feelings of anger have been associated with marriage success.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The 85 subjects of this study represent strong families. These subjects were obtained through recommendations of the Extension Home Economist in each of the 77 counties in Oklahoma. Cover letters were sent to approximately 180 families explaining the research study and assuring anonymity. Questionnaires were included for both the husband and wife. They were requested to complete the questionnaires separately and not to compare answers. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with each questionnaire. The data were obtained in 1975 during the months of March, April, and May.

The Cooperative County Extension Service was utilized in collecting the sample. The Extension Home Economists were considered to be valid and reliable professionals to recommend strong families due to their training and competence in the area of home and family life, their degree of contact with families in their county, and their concern for strengthening family life.

The Extension Home Economist in each of the counties in Oklahoma were sent letters asking that they recommend two or more families in their county who they felt were strong families. They were provided with general guidelines for consideration in selecting these families.

The guidelines were:

- 1) The family is intact with both parents present in the home.
- 2) The family must have at least one school age child, 21 years or younger, living at home.
- 3) The family members appear to have a high degree of happiness in the husband-wife and parent-child relationships.
- 4) The family members appear to fulfill each others needs to a high degree.

One additional criteria was that the respondent must rate their marital happiness and satisfaction in the parent-child relationship as satisfactory or very satisfactory on the questionnaire.

The Instrument

The questionnaire was compiled by Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Family Relations and Child Development Department, at Oklahoma State University. The questionnaire, which included several scales, was designed to measure various aspects of family life which a review of the literature indicated were possible components of family strength.

The questionnaire was presented to a panel of four judges, all of whom held advanced degrees in the area of family relations in order that they could rate the items in terms of the following criteria:

- 1) Does the item possess sufficient clarity?
- 2) Is the item sufficiently specific?
- 3) Is the item significantly related to the concept under investigation?
- 4) Are there other items that need to be included to measure the concepts under investigation?

There was a high degree of agreement among the judges that the items met the 4 criteria. Suggestions made were incorporated into the final version of the instrument. A pre-test was done with 20 families and further modifications concerning the wording of questions and overall length of the questionnaire were made as a result of the pre-test.

For the present study the following sections of the questionnaire were used:

- a) background information such as sex, age, and place of residence;
- b) the Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery, 1970);
- c) the Life Philosophy Scale (Stinnett, 1975);
- d) the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations-Orientation-Behavior personality test (Schutz, 1958)

The Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (MNSS) was developed by Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970) to measure marital need satisfaction. It is a Likert-type scale which consists of 24 items. There are five degrees of response ranging from "very satisfied" to "very unsatisfied" allowed for in the scale. The 24 items represent six basic needs in the marital relationship: (a) love, (b) personality fulfillment, (c) respect, (d) communication, (e) finding meaning in life, and (f) integration of past life experiences.

All items in the scale were found to be significantly discriminating at the .001 level of Stinnett et al. (1970). Two indications of the validity of the MNSS which were noted are: (a) that the first four need categories were conceptualized in final form on the basis of a factor analysis, and (b) the findings that husbands and wives who perceived

their marriages as improving received significantly higher scores on the MNSS than did those who perceived their marriage as being unhappy.

The MNSS was further developed in a recent study by Stevenson and Stinnett (1976) of family strengths and marital satisfaction among husbands and wives who were parents of children in day care centers and preschools. In this study it was found that each item in the MNSS significantly differentiated between husbands and wives expressing the highest degree of marital satisfaction and those expressing the lowest degree of satisfaction on the basis of MNSS scores. A split-half reliability coefficient of .97 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the MNSS.

The Life Philosophy Scale (LPS), developed by Stinnett (1975) was designed to measure the respondents life philosophy with regard to:

- a) optimism vs. pessimism.
- b) self determination vs. fatalism.
- c) belief in God vs. atheism.

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

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation (FIRO) scales are self-report questionnaires designed to assess a person's need for inclusion, control, and affection in various aspects of interpersonal situations. These aspects included in the Fundamental Interpersonal

Relations Orientation-Behavior personality test (FIRO-B) are: behavior which he directs towards others and that which he desires others to direct towards himself. In the FIRO-B questionnaire, separate subscales are constructed to assess each of the three needs (inclusion, control, and affection). Subscales also assess each need separately: what is done or felt towards others and what is wanted of others.

Each subscale contains nine single statement items in which each is keyed dichotomously in such a way to maximize the Guttman scale property to which it belongs. There is a high internal consistency of the keyed responses to the items in each subscale.

Internal consistency is high for all subscales. All test retest correlations are over .70. Validity studies on the FIRO-B suggest that its subscales are related to nontest interpersonal behavior as well as to other personality measures (Buros, 1972).

Analysis of the Data

A percentage and frequency count was used to analyze the background characteristics of the subjects.

The Mann-Whitney U test was used to examine the following hypothesis:

- 1) There is no significant difference in the total MNSS scores according to sex.
- 2) There is no significant difference in the total MNSS scores according to the wife's employment status.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance will be used to examine the following hypothesis:

- 3) There is no significant difference between total MNSS scores according to:

- a) age
- b) number of years married
- c) number of children
- d) socio-economic status
- e) degree of religious orientation
- f) respondent's perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem to the respondent's family life.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient will be used to examine the following hypotheses.

- 4) There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and each of the following Life Philosophy Scale subscale scores:
 - a) optimism vs. pessimism scores
 - b) self determination vs. fatalism scores
 - c) belief in God vs. atheism scores.
- 5) There is no significant correlation between the total MNSS scores and each of the following FIRO-B personality test subscale scores:
 - a) expressed behavior—inclusion, control and affection
 - b) wanted behavior—inclusion, control and affection.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Subjects

A detailed description of the 85 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. The sample consisted of 40.00 per cent males and 60.00 per cent females. Their ages ranged from 20 to over 50 years, with the greatest percentage (31.76) in the 36-40 range, followed by the 41-45 age range with 27.06 per cent. Eighty per cent of the sample was 31-45 years old.

The sample was 97.62 per cent white. Most of the sample (81.93%) was Protestant with 12.05 per cent of the sample being Catholic. Most considered themselves to have a high or very high degree of religious orientation (68.23%), followed by 28.23 per cent who indicated degree of religion as moderate. As determined by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955), the sample was primarily from lower-middle (47.62%) and upper-middle (33.33%) socio-economic classes. The largest proportion of the respondents (48.23%) indicated a farm or rural area as their place of residence and another 34.12 per cent indicated their residence as a small town under 25,000 population. The majority of the respondents (69.41%) reported that the wife was not employed outside the home. The largest per cent (40.00%) had three children, followed by 29.41 per cent with two children.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EIGHTY-FIVE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Sex	Male	34	40.00
	Female	51	60.00
Race	White	82	97.62
	Black	1	1.19
	Indian	1	1.19
Age	20-25	1	1.18
	26-30	7	8.23
	31-35	18	21.18
	36-40	27	31.76
	41-45	23	27.06
	46-50	6	7.06
	over 50	3	3.53
Religion	Catholic	10	12.05
	Protestant	68	81.93
	Mormon	1	1.20
	None	4	4.82
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very Much	17	20.00
	Much	41	48.23
	Moderate	24	28.23
	Little	3	3.53
	Very Little	0	0.00
Socio-Economic Class	Upper	1	1.19
	Upper-Middle	28	33.33
	Lower-Middle	40	47.62
	Upper-Lower	15	17.86
	Lower-Lower	0	0.00
Size of Residence	On a farm or in country	41	48.23
	Small town under 25,000	29	34.12
	City of 25,000 to 50,000	8	9.41
	City of 50,000 to 100,000	4	4.71
	City over 100,000	3	3.53
Wife's Employment	Not employed outside home	59	69.41
	Employed full-time	26	30.59

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Number of Children	1	3	3.53
	2	25	29.41
	3	34	40.00
	4	11	12.94
	5	5	5.88
	6	3	3.53
	7	2	2.35
	12	2	2.35
Number of Years Married	Under 5	0	0.00
	5-9	7	8.23
	10-14	18	21.18
	15-19	24	28.23
	20-24	24	28.23
	25-29	10	11.76
	30-34	2	2.35
	35 and over	0	0.00

Marital Need Satisfaction Scale

(MNSS) Subscores

The MNSS consisted of four statements for each of the six categories representing six basic needs in the marital relationship. In order to determine those areas in which the strong family members have the highest and lowest degrees of marital satisfaction, median subscores were obtained for each of the following subscales: (a) love, (b) personality fulfillment, (c) respect, (d) communication, (e) finding meaning in life, and (f) integration of past life experiences.

Table II indicates that the respondents were the most satisfied with the way their spouse provided for the needs of love and meaning in life. The respondents were the least satisfied with the way their spouses provided for the needs of personality fulfillment and communication.

The highest score possible for each MNSS subscale is 20 which indicates that the needs are being most successfully fulfilled by the spouses of these strong family members. It is interesting to note that the median subscores fell within a range from 16 to 18, suggesting that each of these needs are successfully fulfilled to a high degree in high strength families. If low strength families had also been a part of the total sample, these subscores would have varied more.

TABLE II
MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION SCALE
SUBSCORES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE*

Category	Median Subscores Total Sample
Love	18.00
Personality Fulfillment	16.00
Respect	17.00
Communication	16.00
Meaning in Life	18.00
Past Life Integration	17.00

* Median total score: 103.00

Total Sample: 85

Life Philosophy Scale (LPS) Subscores

The LPS consisted of three categories of life philosophy, each of which was represented by three statements. In order to determine those areas in which the strong family members have the highest and lowest degrees of life philosophy, median subscores for each of the following subscales were obtained: (a) optimism vs. pessimism, (b) self determination vs. fatalism, (c) belief in God vs. atheism.

The highest possible score for each of these subscales is 15 which indicates that the respondents are either highly optimistic, believe strongly in self determination, or have a strong belief in God. A score of 15 on the optimism vs. pessimism LPS would indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of optimism while a score of one would

indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of pessimism. A score of 15 on the self determination vs. fatalism LPS would indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of belief in self determination while a score of one would indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of fatalism. A score of 15 on the belief in God vs. atheism LPS would indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of belief in God while a score of one would indicate that the respondents possessed a maximum degree of atheism.

In comparing the three medians they fall within a range from 12-15. Table III indicates that the respondents expressed the highest median score in the subscale, belief in God vs. atheism (15.00), reflecting a maximum score on this subscale and a high belief in God. The lowest degree of life philosophy was obtained in the category of self determination vs. fatalism (12.00). This score possibly indicates (especially when the high degree of religious orientation is taken into consideration as well as the maximum belief in God score) a belief that God, rather than self controls the destiny of their lives.

TABLE III

LIFE PHILOSOPHY SCALE SUBSCALE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Category	Median Subscores Total Sample
Optimism vs. Pessimism	13.00
Self Determination vs. Fatalism	12.00
Belief in God vs. Atheism	15.00

Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-
Behavior (FIRO-B) Subscores

The primary purposes of the FIRO-B are "1) to measure how an individual acts in interpersonal situations; and 2) to provide an instrument that will facilitate the prediction of interaction between people" (Schutz, 1958, p. 58). Two aspects of behavior are assessed by this scale: the behavior the individual expresses towards others (expressed), and the behavior he wants others to express towards him (wanted).

The FIRO-B consists of nine statements representing six categories of behavior which the respondent directs toward others and that which he desires others to direct towards himself. These subscales are: expressed behavior—inclusion, control, affection; and wanted behavior—inclusion, control, and affection. The FIRO-B obtains six scores with the highest score being 9.00 and the lowest score 0.00. Mean scores as well as median scores were used in reporting the FIRO-B responses of strong family members in order to have a more meaningful comparison with the norms which have been established for the FIRO-B which is based upon mean scores. Following is a description of FIRO-B scores.

Scores 0-1 are extremely low scores reflecting the lowest possible degree of this personality characteristic.

Scores 2-3 are low scores reflecting a low degree of this personality characteristic.

Scores 4-5 are average scores with a moderate or average degree of the personality characteristic.

Scores 6-7 are high scores reflecting an above average or high degree of the personality characteristic.

Scores 8-9 are extremely high scores reflecting the highest degree of this personality characteristic (Ryan, 1970).

The inclusion score assesses the degree to which a person associates with others. The concepts of "introversion" and "extroversion" are associated with inclusion. Control scores measure the extent to which a person assumes responsibility for, makes decisions for, or dominates people. The affection score reflects the degree to which a person becomes emotionally involved with others. This test assumes that these three areas are fundamental in understanding and predicting interpersonal behavior even though other factors will influence a person's actions (Ryan, 1970). Mean and median FIRO-B scores for this sample are found in Tables IV and V on page 35.

The expressed inclusion mean score of 3.77 and median score of 4.00 in this sample of high strength families is an average FIRO-B score indicating that the families in this sample operate their lives in such a way as to get their needs met, but are not interested in inclusion beyond that point. This personality characteristic can possibly be explained by the nature of the sample. Perhaps these respondents center their lives around the family, get their emotional needs met through their family relationships and do not feel a strong inclination to be around other people in order to have their needs met.

The wanted inclusion mean subscore of 2.34 and the median subscore of 1.00, indicate that these respondents are not interested in or do not need to be around lots of people to a compulsive, time consuming degree. They possibly have their own friends which are friends for life but they do not have a high need to be with people outside their family. This low score may be due to the nature of the sample. Farm, country and

TABLE IV
EXPRESSED BEHAVIOR FIRO-B PERSONALITY TEST
SUBSCALE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

FIRO-B Subscales	Mean Subscores Total Sample	Median Subscores Total Sample
Inclusion	3.77	4.00
Control	1.89	1.00
Affection	3.61	3.00

TABLE V
WANTED BEHAVIOR FIRO-B PERSONALITY TEST
SUBSCALE SCORES FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

FIRO-B Subscales	Mean Subscores Total Sample	Median Subscores Total Sample
Inclusion	2.34	1.00
Control	3.65	4.00
Affection	5.34	5.00

small community families comprised 82.35% of the sample. Also the close knit nature of these families suggest that they often depend on other family members and only close friends for support and therefore may not feel the need for frequent interaction with others. This finding may also be explained by Stevenson's research (1975), in which it was found that a high degree of commitment was significantly and positively associated with a high degree of marital satisfaction as indicated by MNSS scores. Stevenson's research indicated that those family members who indicated a high degree of family commitment made use of detaching commitment mechanisms in which they increased commitment to the family by limiting relationships and loyalties outside the family; instead they invested themselves much more in the relationships within the family. The results of this study seem to be consistent with Stevenson's (1975) findings.

The expressed behavior control mean score of 1.89 and the median expressed control score of 1.00 coupled with wanted control scores of 3.65 and 4.00, indicate that for this sample the individuals tend to be cautious in independent decision making and in assuming responsibility. They do not avoid making decisions, but also do not become extreme or overbearing in control of others. According to Ryan (1970), there is also a tendency for persons who score within the low range for expressed control and within the average range for wanted control to need reassurance that decisions made are the right ones. This particular combination of wanted and expressed control may contribute to the interdependence of these strong family members and by contributing to this interdependence may be a source of family strength. The expressed control scores may be due to the fact that in these strong families the

couple works together in decision making and attempts to dominate are minimized.

The wanted behavior affection mean score of 5.34 and median score of 5.00 indicates according to the FIRO-B manual that these persons have an average or above average need for affection and sharing of feelings, but that this need is met through interaction among family members. The lower score of expressed affection with a mean score of 3.61 and a median subscore of 3.00 indicates that the families tended to want more affection than they are expressing (Ryan, 1970).

In summary, a profile of the strong family members FIRO-B responses indicates that they have an average expressed inclusion score with a low wanted inclusion score; a low expressed control score with an average wanted control score; an average expressed affection score (when the mean score is rounded) and an average wanted affection score.

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in the total MNSS scores according to sex.

The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in marital need satisfaction between husbands and wives. A z score of -1.78 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .04 level. Table VI illustrates that husbands received a significantly higher median score than wives, reflecting a greater degree of marital need satisfaction than wives. This present finding coincides with research findings by Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970) who found in their study of marital need satisfaction of older husbands and wives that a significant difference did exist

between marital need satisfaction scores according to sex. The husbands in this study also expressed significantly higher MNSS scores. This finding has been explained by the fact that women tend to adjust more in the marriage relationship than do men. This may result in the wife becoming more attentive to the fulfillment of her husband's needs than he is to the fulfillment of the wife's needs, thereby accounting for her lower degree of satisfaction. Husbands may also report higher marital satisfaction scores due to their more conservative expectations of marriage. The present findings are also in agreement with those of Stevenson (1975).

TABLE VI
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO SEX

Variable	No.	md	z	Level of Significance
Male	34	106.50	-1.78	.04
Female	51	102.00		

Hypothesis II. There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to the wife's employment status.

The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in marital need satisfaction between family members who reported that the wife was employed outside the home, and

those who reported that the wife was not employed outside the home. A z score of -1.21 was obtained, indicating that there was not a significant difference between MNSS scores according to the wife's employment status as Table VII illustrates. This finding is contrary to research done by Axelson (1963) who found that there was a greater degree of marital need satisfaction among those reporting that the wife was not employed outside the home. The present research finding however is supported by Orden and Bardburn (1969). Their findings indicate that employment of the wife outside the home will not affect marital satisfaction if she works because she wants to and not because of financial necessity.

The implication of this finding is that the working wife in strong families is able to reconcile the roles of housewife, mother, and employment so that it does not produce any significant strain in her marital relationship.

TABLE VII
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO
THE EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE WIFE

Variable	No.	md	z	Level of Significance
Working	26	105.50	-1.21	n.s.
Non-Working	59	102.00		

Hypothesis III. There is no significant difference between total MNSS scores according to each of the following: (a) age, (b) number of years married, (c) number of children, (d) socio-economic status, (e) degree of religious orientation, (f) degree that the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family life.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the preceding hypothesis. The results are presented below.

Hypothesis III(a): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to age.

As Table VIII indicates an H score of 5.66 was obtained. This value did not represent a significant difference in MNSS scores according to age. This finding differed from research conducted by Rollins and Feldman (1970) who report a high frequency of marital satisfaction at the beginning marriage stage with a decline in satisfaction from childbearing stage through the schoolage stage with some improvement through the later years stage of the family life cycle. They also report that satisfaction with marriage tends to be at a low point while launching their children from home. As soon as the last child is launched, satisfaction levels increase.

The present finding indicates that for high strength families in this sample there is not a period of time over the family life cycle in which the marital satisfaction was significantly higher or lower. This finding can possibly be explained by the coping mechanisms present in high strength families which helps them to keep their degree of marital satisfaction at a relatively constant level.

TABLE VIII
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO AGE

Variable	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
26-30	7	40.21		
31-35	18	31.31		
36-40	27	45.93	5.66	n.s.
41-45	23	45.13		
46-50	6	33.00		

Hypothesis III(b): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to the number of years married.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the preceding hypothesis. An H value of 2.76 was obtained which did not represent a significant difference between MNSS scores according to number of years married. This is illustrated in Table IX. This finding is contrary to those by Rollins and Feldman (1970) who found a significant difference in marital satisfaction according to the number of years married.

TABLE IX
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING
TO NUMBER OF YEARS MARRIED

Variable	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
5-9	7	48.29		
10-14	18	41-47		
15-19	24	37.75	2.76	n.s.
20-24	24	47.02		
25-29	10	36.70		

Hypothesis III(c): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to the number of children.

No significant relationship between MNSS scores and the number of children was found as is shown in Table X. The H score is 2.83. These findings do not coincide with the research of Hurley and Palonen (1967) who found a significant relationship between marital adjustment and child density; the more children the lower the marital satisfaction. Table X indicates, although not at a significant level, that this is true for this sample until five children have been conceived. Then the MNSS score went up again.

TABLE X
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO
NUMBER OF CHILDREN

No. of children	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
2	25	41.32		
3	34	38.60		
4	11	28.23	2.83	n.s.
5	5	38.80		

Hypothesis III(d): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to socio-economic status.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the preceding hypothesis. An H value of .71 was obtained which did not represent a significant difference between MNSS scores according to socio-economic status. These findings are contrary to those by Lively (1969) whose research indicates that marital satisfaction is positively associated with high socio-economic status. Hicks and Platt (1970) also report similar findings, as does Scanzoni (1966).

The findings for this study indicate that among strong family members marital satisfaction is not dependent upon socio-economic status. This may mean that no matter how rich or poor strong family members are, that they remain satisfied with their marital relationship and that their emotional needs are successfully met within the family. These findings are reflected in Table XI.

TABLE XI
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO
SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Variable	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
Upper-Middle	28	38.89		
Lower-Middle	40	43.46	.71	n.s.
Upper-Lower	15	43.90		

Hypothesis III(e): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to the degree of religious orientation.

No significant difference was found between MNSS scores and the degree of religious orientation as is shown in Table XII. The H score was 2.51. Other research utilizing samples with a wide range of marital satisfaction and degrees of religious orientation have found a significant and positive relationship between religious participation and marriage success (Zimmerman and Cervantes, 1960, Blood, 1969, and Landis and Landis, 1973).

This present finding could be due to the fact that all sample members' scores fell within the moderate to very high religious orientation range as well as to the fact that their MNSS scores were all very high. Therefore there was not enough variation to reflect a significant correlation between these two variables.

TABLE XII
DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO
DEGREE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Variable	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
Very Much	17	49.03		
Much	41	40.89	2.51	n.s.
Moderate	24	37.21		

Hypothesis III(f): There is no significant difference in total MNSS scores according to the degree that the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family life.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the preceding hypothesis. As Table XIII indicates there is no significant difference in MNSS scores according to the degree that the busy pace of life is a problem for the respondent's family life. An H value of 8.06 was obtained.

TABLE XIII

DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL MNSS SCORES ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE THAT
THE BUSY PACE OF LIFE IS A PROBLEM FOR THE
RESPONDENT'S FAMILY LIFE

Variable	No.	md	H	Level of Significance
Very Much	5	17.50		
Much	22	36.84		
Moderate	31	46.56	8.06	n.s.
Very Little	13	44.00		

Hypothesis VII. There is no significant relationship between total MNSS scores and each of the following Life Philosophy Scale subscale scores: (a) optimism vs. pessimism scores, (b) self determination vs. fatalism scores, and (c) belief in God vs. atheism scores.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to examine the preceding hypothesis. The results are presented below:

Hypothesis VII(a): There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and optimism vs. pessimism life philosophy subscale scores.

When this hypothesis was examined a significant, positive correlation was found to exist between total MNSS scores and optimism vs. pessimism, life philosophy subscale score. As Table XIV indicates the r_s score is .45 with a .0001 level of significance. A high degree of marital need satisfaction was associated with a high degree of optimism. This finding coincides with other research which has found optimism to

be positively associated with marital satisfaction (Lantz and Snyder, 1969).

Hypothesis VII(b): There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and self determination vs. fatalism life philosophy subscale scores.

No significant association was found between MNSS scores and the self determination vs. fatalism life philosophy subscale scores. A Spearman rank correlation coefficient value of .20 was found as is indicated in Table XIV.

Hypothesis VII(c): There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and belief in God vs. atheism life philosophy subscale scores.

No significant association was found between MNSS scores and the belief in God vs. atheism score. A r_s value of .02 was found as is indicated in Table XIV. This finding is possibly due to the fact that everyone in the sample expressed extremely high belief in God scores (for example the average belief in God LPS score was 14.45; a maximum possible score was 15.00). There was also not enough variation in the individual MNSS scores in order to obtain a significant correlation between the two scores.

TABLE IV
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN LIFE PHILOSOPHY SUBSCALE SCORES
AND TOTAL MNSS SCORES

Life Philosophy Subscales	MNSS Scores r_s	Level of Significance
Optimism vs. Pessimism	.45	.0001
Self Determination vs. Fatalism	.20	n.s.
Belief in God vs. Atheism	.02	n.s.

Hypothesis VIII: There is no significant correlation between the total MNSS scores and each of the following: (a) the expressed behavior FIRO-B personality test subscores, and (b) the wanted behavior FIRO-B personality test subscores.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient will be used to examine the preceding hypothesis. The results are presented as follows:

Hypothesis VIII(a): There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and the expressed behavior FIRO-B personality test subscores.

No significant association was found between MNSS scale scores and expressed behavior FIRO-B personality test subscale scores. As indicated in Table XV the correlation coefficient for expressed inclusion was .05; the correlation coefficient for expressed control was .08; and the correlation coefficient for expressed affection was .15. The MNSS scores were not found to be significantly correlated to the following: expressed behavior—inclusion, control and affection.

TABLE XV
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN TOTAL MNSS SCALE SCORES AND EXPRESSED BEHAVIOR
FIRO-B PERSONALITY TEST SUBSCALE SCORES

FIRO-B Subscales	MNSS Scores r_s	Level of Significance
Inclusion	.05	n.s.
Control	.08	n.s.
Affection	.15	n.s.

Hypothesis VIII(b): There is no significant correlation between total MNSS scores and the wanted behavior FIRO-B personality test scores.

No significant association was found between MNSS scores and wanted behavior FIRO-B personality test subscale scores. As is indicated in Table XVI, the correlation coefficient for wanted inclusion was .01; the correlation coefficient for wanted control was .04; and the correlation coefficient for wanted affection was .06. The MNSS scores were not found to be significantly correlated to the following: wanted behavior—inclusion, control and affection.

TABLE XVI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN TOTAL MNSS SCALE SCORES AND WANTED BEHAVIOR
FIRO-B PERSONALITY TEST SUBSCALE SCORES

FIRO-B Subscales	MNSS Scores r_s	Level of Significance
Inclusion	.01	n.s.
Control	.04	n.s.
Affection	.06	n.s.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the responses of strong families to the Marital Need Satisfaction Scale (MNSS), the Life Philosophy Scale (LPS), and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B) personality test in order to determine those areas in which strong family members have the highest and lowest degrees of marital need satisfaction, life philosophy and personality characteristics. In addition the interrelationships among these factors to selected sociological variables was to be examined.

The 85 respondents represented families which were recommended as strong families by extension Home Economists in all counties in Oklahoma. They 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.

The following parts of the questionnaire were utilized for this study: (a) questions designed to secure background data, (b) the MNSS which measured the degree of need satisfaction in the marriage relationship, (c) the LPS which measured the degree of optimism, self determination and belief in God life philosophies present in the marriage relationship, (d) the FIRO-B personality test which measured expressed and wanted behavior scores—inclusion, control and affection in the

marriage relationship.

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the respondent's background characteristics.

Median subscores of the MNSS, the LPS and the FIRO-B were obtained in order to determine those areas in which the most favorable and least favorable subscores of these scales occurred.

The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized in determining if marital need satisfaction differed significantly according to sex and the employment status of the wife.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized to determine if marital need satisfaction differed according to age, number of years married, number of children, socio-economic status, degree of religious orientation, respondent's perceptions concerning the degree to which the busy pace of life is a problem to his or her family life.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there were significant relationships between marital need satisfaction and the three life philosophy subscale items measuring the degree of optimism, self determination and belief in God present within the marital relationship.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized also in determining if there were significant relationships between MNSS scores and each of the FIRO-B subscores measuring inclusion, control and affection in expressed and wanted behaviors.

The results of the study were as follows:

- 1) Median subscores obtained for the MNSS indicated a higher degree of satisfaction with the way the spouse provided for

the needs of love and meaning in life as compared to the needs of personality fulfillment and communication.

- 2) Median subscores obtained for the LPS indicated a high degree of belief in God and optimism as compared to belief in self determination.
- 3) Mean and median subscores obtained for the FIRO-B indicated that for this study strong family members have: an average expressed inclusion score and a low wanted inclusion score; an extremely low expressed control score and an average wanted control score; a low expressed affection score and an average wanted affection score.
- 4) When the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized it was determined that there was a significant difference between MNSS scores according to sex (.04), with a comparison of the median scores indicating a higher degree of marital need satisfaction for the husband rather than for the wife.
- 5) The Spearman rank correlation coefficient indicated that MNSS scores were significantly and positively related to optimism at the .0001 level.
- 6) No significant difference was found between MNSS scores according to: age, number of years married, number of children, socio-economic status, degree of religious orientation, degree that the busy pace of life is a problem to the respondent's family life, degree of self determination, belief in God, and FIRO-B subscores.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Several conclusions can be drawn from the results of this study. It was found that a positive relationship exists between marital need satisfaction and sex with the husband having a greater amount of satisfaction than the wife. This suggests that his expectations are not as high as hers. A positive relationship was also found to exist between marital need satisfaction and the degree of optimism, indicating that those respondents having their marital needs met to a high degree also have a high degree of optimism.

Perhaps the satisfying family life contributes to the high degree of optimism, however, it is also possible as suggested by previous marriage success studies that optimism may contribute to marriage and family happiness. This finding also raises the question of the possibility of improving marriage and family relationships by developing the quality of optimism among individual family members. Median subscores on the MNSS, the LPS and the FIRO-B suggest that the following are characteristics of strong families: have a high belief in God, are highly optimistic, are having their needs for love met, and have a great sense of meaning and purpose in life. FIRO-B scores indicate that these strong families are having needs met within the family relationships to such a large degree that there is not a strong inclination to develop relationships and loyalties outside the family structure.

Other results of this study indicate that members of strong families tend to possess the following characteristics:

- 1) Have a high degree of religious orientation with a strong belief in God.

- 2) Are highly optimistic.
- 3) Have a high degree of marital needs satisfaction suggesting that the basic needs of love, respect, personality fulfillment, past life integration, communication, and meaning in life, are successfully fulfilled to a high degree in high strength families.
- 4) FIRO-B inclusion scores indicate that these strong family members do not desire to have a high degree of social involvements, suggesting that these family members tend to center their lives around the family, limiting loyalties outside the family.
- 5) Express a low degree of behavior which attempts to control others.

There is a need for more research on family strengths. Such information needs to be included in educational materials as well as in the classroom to help students develop concepts as to what they can do to build strong families. There are also implications for further research being useful to educators, clergymen, counselors, and social workers.

It is suggested that further study on family strengths be broadened in order to meet the needs of more people concerning family strengths to include:

- a) a study including a larger sample,
- b) a study including a larger number of ethnic groups,
- c) a study including a more distributed number of persons representative of all socio-economic levels, and
- d) a study involving the measurement of family strengths over the family life cycle.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Florence A. "Role of the Self-Concept in Student Marital Adjustment." Family Life Coordinator, 11 (1962), 43-45.
- Axelson, Leland. "Marital Adjustment and Marital Role Definitions of Husbands of Working and Non-Working Wives." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 189-195.
- Barton, K., G. Kawash, and R. B. Cattell. "Personality, Motivation, and Marital Role Factors as Predictors of Life Data in Married Couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.
- Bernard, Jessie. "Marital Stability and Patterns of Status Variables." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 421-439.
- Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Company, 1972.
- Blackburn, Clark W. "What is a Strong Family?" International Journal of Religious Education, 43 (May, 1967), 3, 35, 36.
- Blood, Robert O. Marriage. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Bowman, Henry A. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27 (1965), 243-254.
- Buros, Oscar Krisen, ed. The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. Vol. I. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Burr, Wesley R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 368-372.
- Cattell, Raymond B., and John R. Nesselroade. "Likeness and Completeness Theories Examined by Sixteen Personality Factor Measures on Stably and Unstably Married Couples." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7 (1967), 351-361.
- Clements, William H. "Marital Interaction and Marital Stability: A Point of View and a Descriptive Comparison of Stable and Unstable Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 697-702.

- Crockett, H. J., N. Babchuk, and J. A. Ballweg. "Change in Religious Affiliation and Family Stability: A Second Study." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (1969), 464-468.
- Cutright, Phillips. "Income and Family Events. Marital Stability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 291-306.
- Figley, Charles R. "Child Density and the Marital Relationship." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 372-382.
- Gabler, John, and Herbert A. Otto. "Conceptualization of 'Family Strengths' in Family Life and other Professional Literature." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26 (1964), 221-222.
- Grams, Armin. "Sources of Family Strength." International Journal of Religious Education, 43 (9), (May, 1967), 4-5, 41.
- Gurin, Gerald, Joseph Veroff, and Sheila Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Hicks, Mary W., and Marilyn Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1970), 553-554.
- Hill, Reuben. Family Development in Three Generations. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1970.
- Hurley, John R., and Donna P. Palonen. "Marital Satisfaction and Child Density Among University Student Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 483-484.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." American Sociological Review, 33 (1968), 499-516.
- Kieren, Dianna, and Irving Tallman. "Spousal Adaptability: An Assessment of Marital Competence." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 247-256.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford. The Family. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1963.
- Landis, Judson T., and Mary G. Landis. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Lantz, Herman, and Eloise Snyder. Marriage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Lively, E. L. "Toward Concept Clarification: The Case of Marital Interaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (1969), 108-114.

- Luckey, Eleanore B., and Joyce K. Bain. "Children: A Factor in Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 43-44.
- Martin, Sandra. "An Exploratory Study: The Effects of Family Background Variables on the Decision to Remain Childless." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1976.)
- Meyerowitz, Joseph H. "Satisfaction During Pregnancy." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 38-42.
- Navran, Leslie. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, 6 (1967), 173-184.
- Orden, Susan R., and Norman M. Bardburn. "Working Wives and Marriage Happiness." American Journal of Sociology, 74 (1969), 392-407.
- Otto, H. A. "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962), 77-81.
- Otto, H. A. "Criteria for Assessing Family Strength." Family Process, 2 (1963), 329-339.
- Otto, H. A. "The Personal and Family Strength Research Projects—Some Implications for the Therapist." Mental Hygiene, 48 (1964), 439-450.
- Otto, H. A. "The Minister and Family Strengths." Pastoral Psychology, 17 (1966), 21-28.
- Otto, H. A. "How Can a Family Deliberately Build Strengths?" International Journal of Religious Education, 43 (1967), 6-7; 40-41.
- Otto, H. A. "Has Monogamy Failed." In Carr, G. B., (ed.), Marriage and Family in a Decade of Change. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1972, 23-30.
- Otto, H. A. The Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, California: The Holistic Press, 1975.
- Reeder, Darrell Allan. "A Model of Family Characteristics for Problem Solving Behavior in Families with a Mentally Retarded Child." Dissertation Abstracts International, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1973, Univ. M-Film, N. 73-23510.
- Renee, Karen S. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 54-66.
- Ridley, Carl A. "Exploring the Impact of Work Satisfaction and Involvement on Marital Interaction When Both Partners Are Employed." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 229-237.

- Rollins, Boyd C., and Harold Feldman. "Marital Satisfaction Over the Family Life Cycle." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 20-28.
- Ryan, Leo Robert, Ph.D. Clinical Interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1970.
- Scanzoni, John. "Family Organization and the Probability of Disorganization." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 407-411.
- Schutz, W. C. FIRO: A Three-Dimensional Theory of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.
- Spanier, Graham B. "Romanticism and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.
- Stevenson, Paul William. "Family Commitment, Functionality, and Marital Need Satisfaction." (Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1975.)
- Stevenson, Paul, and Nick Stinnett. "Family Commitment: Application of a Theoretical Framework." Home Economics Research Journal. (Accepted for publication April, 1976.)
- Stinnett, Nick, Janet Collins, and James E. Montgomery. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 428-433.
- Stinnett, Nick. Family Strengths Research Project. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1975.
- Stroup, Atlee L. Marriage and Family: Developmental Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- U. S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1973, (94th Edition). Washington, D. C., 1973.
- Walters, James, and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (February, 1971), 70-111.
- Zimmerman, Carle C., and Lucius F. Cervantes. Successful American Families. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960.

APPENDIX



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

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

74074

August 12, 1975

Dear Friend:

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

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

Your answers are anonymous and confidential since you are asked 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/jg

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 the questionnaire. Please be as honest in your answers as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Family Member: Mother _____ Father _____
2. Race:
 1. White _____
 2. Black _____
 3. Indian _____
 4. Oriental _____
 5. Other _____
3. Age: _____
4. What church do you attend?
5. Who earns most of the income for your family?
 1. Husband _____
 2. Wife _____
 3. Other _____
6. What is the educational attainment of the husband?
7. What is the educational attainment of the wife?
8. Husband's Occupation:
9. Wife's Occupation:
10. Major source of income for the family:
 1. Inherited savings and investments _____
 2. Earned wealth, transferable investment _____

- 3. Profits, 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:

- 1. Divorce _____
- 2. Death of spouse _____

15. How many children do you have? _____

16. What are their ages? _____

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

21. What would you most like to change about your marriage relationship?
22. What do you feel has contributed most to making your marriage satisfying?
23. What do you feel has contributed most to making your relationship with your child strong?
24. What would you most like to change about your relationship with your oldest child living at home?

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

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

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

- | | |
|---|-----------------------|
| 1. Providing a feeling of security in me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 2. Expressing affection toward me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 3. Giving me an optimistic feeling toward life. | VS S U US VUS |
| 4. Expressing a feeling of being emotionally close to me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 5. Bringing out the best qualities in me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 6. Helping me to become a more interesting person. | VS S U US VUS |

- | | |
|--|---------------|
| 7. Helping me to continue to develop my personality. | VS S U US VUS |
| 8. Helping me to achieve my individual potential (become what I am capable of becoming). | VS S U US VUS |
| 9. Being a good listener. | VS S U US VUS |
| 10. Giving me encouragement when I am discouraged. | VS S U US VUS |
| 11. Accepting my differentness. | VS S U US VUS |
| 12. Avoiding habits which annoy me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 13. Letting me know how he or she really feels about something. | VS S U US VUS |
| 14. Trying to find satisfactory solutions to our disagreements. | VS S U US VUS |
| 15. Expressing disagreement with me honestly and openly. | VS S U US VUS |
| 16. Letting me know when he or she is displeased with me. | VS S U US VUS |
| 17. Helping me to feel that life has meaning. | VS S U US VUS |
| 18. Helping me to feel needed. | VS S U US VUS |
| 19. Helping me to feel that my life is serving a purpose. | VS S U US VUS |
| 20. Helping me to obtain satisfaction and pleasure in daily activities. | VS S U US VUS |
| 21. Giving me recognition for my past accomplishments. | VS S U US VUS |
| 22. Helping me to feel that my life has been important. | VS S U US VUS |
| 23. Helping me to accept my past life experiences as good and rewarding. | VS S U US VUS |
| 24. Helping me to accept myself despite my shortcomings. | VS S U US VUS |
| 26. Some people make us feel good about ourselves. That is, they make us feel self-confident, worthy, competent, and happy about ourselves. What is the degree to which your spouse makes you feel good about yourself? Indicate on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the <u>greatest</u> degree and 1 represents the <u>least</u> degree) | |

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

34. 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.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

35. Rate the degree to which:

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

- | | Very high | High | Average | Low | Very low |
|--|-----------|-------|---------|-------|----------|
| 3. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
36. Rate the degree of appreciation expressed by:
- | | Very high | High | Average | Low | Very low |
|------------------------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|----------|
| 1. Your spouse to you. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. You to your spouse. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Your child to you. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. You to your child. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
37. Rate the degree to which:
- | | Very high | High | Average | Low | Very low |
|---|-----------|-------|---------|-------|----------|
| 1. Your spouse respects your individuality (that is, respects your individual interests, views, etc.) | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 2. You respect your spouse's individuality. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Your child respects your individuality. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 4. You respect your child's individuality. | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
38. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your spouse satisfying: (rate on following 5 point scale with 5 representing greatest degree of determination and 1 representing the least degree.)
- | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 39. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your child satisfying: (5 representing the <u>greatest</u> degree and 1 representing the <u>least</u>). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 40. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make your marriage relationship satisfying: (5 representing the <u>greatest</u> degree and 1 representing the <u>least</u>). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |
| 41. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make relationship with child satisfying: (5 representing the <u>greatest</u> degree and 1 representing the <u>least</u>). | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ | _____ |

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

	Individ- ually	Husband and wife together	Child Alone	One parent with child	Both par- ents with child
1. Recreational Activities (such as movies, card games)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Vacations	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Sports (bowling, etc.)	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Holidays and Special Occasions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
5. Church Activities	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. Eating meals	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Decisions affecting family	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

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

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

1. Your spouse

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

2. Your child

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

57. If the communication pattern between you and your spouse is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what do you think has made it unsatisfactory?)
58. If the communication pattern between you and your child is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what has made it unsatisfactory?)
59. How often do you and your spouse talk together?
60. How often do you and your child talk together?
61. How often does your spouse and child talk together?
62. Indicate the degree to which each of the following behaviors describe you and your spouse: (5 indicates the behavior is very common and 1 indicates the behavior is very rare).
- | | You | | | | | Your spouse | | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Is judgemental toward others. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | You | Your spouse |
|--|-----------|-------------|
| 2. Does not try to control other's behavior. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. Uses strategy (psychological games) to get others to do what he/she wants them to do. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. Acts disinterested in others. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. Does not act superior toward others. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. Is open minded to the ideas of others. | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
63. How often do you and your spouse do things together (rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely)?
- 1 2 3 4 5
64. What are two things which you most enjoy doing together?
65. How often do you do things with your child (rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely)?
- 1 2 3 4 5
66. What are two things which you most enjoy doing with your child?
67. How often does your spouse do things with your child (rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely)?
- 1 2 3 4 5
- Many families today experience the pressure of having to do many different things in day to day living.
68. How much of a problem is today's busy pace of life for your family? (Rate on the following 5 point scale with 5 indicating it is a great problem and 1 indicating it is little or no problem).
- 1 2 3 4 5
69. What things do you do to prevent this problem from hurting your family life?

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

- | | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. A wise way to live is to look on the bright side of things. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 2. For every problem that arises there is usually a solution. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 3. People rarely get what they want in life. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 4. When all is said and done we really have little control over what happens to us in life. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 5. To a large degree we are the "captains of our own fate." | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 6. Whether we are happy or not depends upon the kinds of things that happen to us in life. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 7. There is a higher power (God) that operates in the daily lives of people. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 8. God answers prayer. | SA | A | U | D | SD |
| 9. There is no power higher than man. | SA | A | U | D | SD |

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

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

72. How often does your family see your:

- | | |
|--|-------|
| 1. Parents | _____ |
| 2. Spouse's parents | _____ |
| 3. Other relatives
(brothers, sister, aunts,
etc.) | _____ |

For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1. I try to be with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 9. I try to include other people in my plans. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 2. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 10. I let other people control my actions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 3. I join social groups. | <input type="checkbox"/> 11. I try to have people around me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 12. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity. | <input type="checkbox"/> 13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 14. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 7. I try to be included in informal social activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 15. I try to avoid being alone. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 16. I try to participate in group activities. |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 17. I try to be friendly to people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 23. I try to get close and personal with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 18. I let other people decide what to do. | <input type="checkbox"/> 24. I let other people control my actions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant. | <input type="checkbox"/> 25. I act cool and distant with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 20. I let other people take charge of things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 26. I am easily led by people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 21. I try to have close relationships with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 22. I let other people strongly influence my actions. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. most people 2. many people 3. some people 4. a few people 5. one or two people 6. nobody

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 28. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 29. I like people to act close and personal with me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 38. I like people to act friendly toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 32. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 40. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 34. I like people to include me in their activities. | |

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

1. usually 2. often 3. sometimes 4. occasionally 5. rarely 6. never

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people. | <input type="checkbox"/> 48. I like people to include me in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 42. I like people to invite me to things. | <input type="checkbox"/> 49. I like people to act close and personal with me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 43. I like people to act close toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 44. I try to have other people do things I want done. | <input type="checkbox"/> 51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 45. I like people to invite me to join their activities. | <input type="checkbox"/> 52. I like people to act distant toward me. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me. | <input type="checkbox"/> 53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions. | <input type="checkbox"/> 54. I take charge of things when I'm with people. |

VITA[✓]

Deborah Ruttman Truitt

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION, LIFE PHILOSOPHIES, AND PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS OF STRONG FAMILIES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Woodward, Oklahoma, on September 11, 1951, the daughter of Mr. John A. Ruttman and the late Bonnie M. Ruttman; married December 24, 1970, to Gary Wayne Truitt; daughter, Michelle, born February 14, 1975.

Education: Graduated from Mooreland High School, Mooreland, Oklahoma, in May, 1969. Graduated from Oklahoma State University, December 29, 1972, with majors in General and Vocational Home Economics Education; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1976.

Professional Experience: Assistant to Home Economist in Extension in Ellis County summer of 1970; volunteer for Helping Hands Program in Oklahoma City Public Schools, spring of 1973; substitute teacher for Oklahoma City Public Schools and Midwest City and Del City Schools, spring of 1973; Home Economics teacher, Tuttle High School and Tuttle Junior High, Tuttle, Oklahoma, 1973 until present.

Professional Organizations: National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association, Home Economics division of Oklahoma Education Association, Grady County Unit of Oklahoma Education Association, National Vocational Association, Oklahoma Vocational Association, American Home Economics Association and Omicron Nu.