FAMILY COMMITMENT, FUNCTIONALITY, AND

MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION

By

PAUL WILLIAM STEVENSON

Bachelor of Arts
The University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1971

Bachelor of Science in Education
The University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma
1971

Master of Arts
The University of Tulsa
Tulsa, 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, 1975

FAMILY COMMITMENT, FUNCTIONALITY, AND

MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett
Thesis Adviser

Frances Stromberg

Althea Wright

N N Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

> One fine day human society may realize that the part-time
> family, already a prominent part of our social landscape,
> has undergone a qualitative transformation into a system
> of mechanized and bureaucratized child rearing (since) an
> institutional environment can be...warmer than a family
> torn by obligations its members resent (Moore, 1960,
> pp. 393-4).

The viability of the American family as an institution has become

a matter of serious debate. Authors such as Cooper (1970) view the

family as obsolete and barbaric and view its demise as not only

inevitable but desirable.

Many authors, such as Hobart (1971) and Ogburn (1968), have

observed that the family has declined in importance as many of its

functions have been taken over by other sectors of society. Nimkoff

(1965) and others note that while the family has lost many of its

functions the degree and importance of the psychological functions

have increased. Litwak and Szelenyi (1971) however, point out that

the heavy reliance on the nuclear family for the fulfillment of affec-

tive functions produces an inherently weak structure.

While much thought has been given to the vital subject of family

functionality and a tremendous amount of speculative and theoretical

literature has been accumulated, the question of functionality has,

curiously, been neglected by researchers. The functionality of the

1

extended family has been investigated rather extensively, however, the functionality of the nuclear family itself has been left unexamined. Since functionality is vital for the very existence of the family, it is of utmost importance that this neglected area be examined.

Hobart (1961) states that rather than consciously giving up their functions, families have simply let them be eroded away as they are taken over by institutions. He views the problem as one of confused and misplaced values, which put social efficiency above personal loving involvement. With more knowledge of the nature and importance of family functions, families of the future will, perhaps, be able to recognize the cost of the continued loss of family functions for the sake of social efficiency and be able to make rational choices based on their systems of values. Without understanding of this vital aspect of family life, there can be no alternative but the continued slipping away of functions leaving the family weakened at a time of rapid social change when the stability and direction which a strong family can provide are greatly needed.

Central to the stability of a strong family is a strong sense of commitment. Commitment is a complex process whereby individuals willingly give their energy and loyalty to social relations which are seen as self-expressive. Committed family members work hard, participate actively, derive love and affection from the family, and believe strongly in what the family stands for. Through commitment, person and family are inextricably linked. The problem of commitment is thus crucial to the survival of the family. Kanter (1968) states that many of the social problems in our society are seen as stemming from a lack of commitment.

Parsons (1951) has theorized that an individual's personality is the sum total of his "selections" or commitments. The far reaching importance of the concept of commitment is discussed by Gouldner (1960):

> It seems obvious that the problem of organizational commitment involves an issue of basic sociological interest concerned as it is with the diverse ways in which individuals attach themselves to groups. In one way or another many investigations, including research in group cohesiveness, integration, influence, and morale either are implicitly premised on, or explicitly use this concept as a dependent, independent, or intervening variable. It seems likely, therefore, that the identification of distinct forms of organizational commitment will increase our knowledge about some of the basic group process (pp. 169-70).

Becker (1960) states that the term commitment has been often used in regard to a wide range of phenomena, but:

> In spite of its widespread use, the appearance of the concept of commitment in sociological literature has a curious feature the reader with an eye for trivia will have noticed. In articles studied with citations to previous literature on such familiar concepts as power and social class, commitment emerges unscathed by so much as a single reference. This suggests what is in fact the case: there has been little formal analysis on the concept of commitment and little attempt to integrate it explicitly with current sociological theory.... The ultimate remedy for this injustice will be a classification and clarification of the whole family of images involved in the idea of commitment (p. 32).

While some tentative steps have been made in the direction of formulating a theoretical framework for understanding the commitment process, much is left to be done. There has been little attempt to utilize the concept of commitment in organizational research (Kanter, 1968). The commitment process as it operates in the family has never been systematically studied (Hilsdale, 1962). Since commitment is central to the understanding of both human motivation and to the very existence of the family, an understanding of the ways in which an individual commits himself to a family and those things which

facilitate this commitment could be of great value in strengthening family life.

Americans are getting married with greater frequency than ever before. This is often seen as an indication of the increasing significance of companionship and emotional security within the family today. The family, despite the loss of many of its functions remains an attractive vision for the overwhelming majority of Americans. The ever spiraling divorce rates, however, suggest that the goals implicit in the vision are often unattained. A greater understanding of the functionality of the family, the role it plays in meeting the needs of the family members, and commitment, the process whereby the individual and family are joined together, are vital for an understanding of those things which create strong families.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the degree of functionality, commitment, and the presence of commitment mechanisms in families and to examine the interrelationships among these factors, the relationship of these factors to marital need satisfaction and to selected sociological variables.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. To develop an instrument, the Family Functionality Scale (FFS), to measure the individual's perceptions concerning the degree of functionality which characterizes his nuclear family. The following three areas of functionality will be measured by this instrument.

A. Instrumental functionality which includes those functions concerned with the physical maintenance of the family.

B. Affective functionality which includes those functions concerned with the emotional maintenance of the family.

C. Moral functionality which includes those functions concerned with the maintenance of family and social values, purposes, directions, and meanings, including the socialization process of children.

2. To develop an instrument, the Family Commitment Scale (FCS), to measure the individual's degree of total commitment to the family. This instrument will measure the following three types of commitment:

A. Instrumental commitment which is commitment to remain within and maintain the family.

B. Affective commitment which is emotional attachment to the members of the family.

C. Moral commitment which is commitment to the values and expectations of the family.

3. To develop an instrument, the Family Commitment Mechanism Scale (FCMS), to measure the degree to which commitment mechanisms are present in the individual's relationship to his family. This instrument will measure the following six commitment processes which were identified by Kanter (1972):

A. Sacrifice in which a member gives up something as a price of membership in the family.

B. Investment in which a member commits his time, energy, and money to the family.

C. Renunciation in which a member relinguishes relationships that are potentially disruptive to family cohesion.

D. Communion in which a member connects himself to the group, mingling the self in the group.

E. Mortification in which a member reduces his sense of a separate, private, unconnected ego, taking on an identity based on his membership in the family.

F. Transcendence in which a member comes to feel that the family is a part of something greater than itself.

4. To examine the following hypotheses:

A. There is no significant relationship between the degree of family commitment and sex, age, the number of years married, the number of children, socio-economic status, religious preference, type of religious orientation, degree of religious orientation, and the wife's employment status.

B. (1) There is a significant positive association between the degree of commitment and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms.

(2) There is no significant association between the degree of instrumental commitment and the degree of presence of instrumental commitment building processes.

(3) There is no significant association between the degree of affective commitment and the degree of presence of affective commitment building processes.

(4) There is no significant association between the degree of moral commitment and the degree of presence of moral

commitment building processes.

C. There is a significant positive association between the degree of commitment and the degree of marital need satisfaction.

D. There is no significant association between the degree of commitment and the degree of functionality in the family.

E. There is no significant association between the degree of functionality and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms.

F. There is a significant positive association between the degree of functionality and the degree of marital need satisfaction.

G. There is no significant relationship between the degree of marital need satisfaction and sex, age, the number of years married, the number of children, socio-economic status, religious preference, type of religious orientation, degree of religious orientation, and the wife's employment status.[1]

---

[1]Because need satisfaction is an integral part of the theoretical framework of the commitment process utilized in this study, the sociological variables related to marital need satisfaction will be examined in detail. This examination will be undertaken in order to determine if the relationship between marital need satisfaction and various sociological variables are consistent with the relationship between family commitment and the same sociological variables.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Commitment

While it is central to the existence of the family and other
social structures, the concept of commitment has received very little
attention by theorists or researchers. The area of commitment to the
family has been almost totally neglected in current research.

Hobart (1961) discusses the urgent need for commitment in the
family. There are many factors in modern American society which tend
to weaken the family. Many of these factors limit the quality and
duration of other interpersonal relationships. He notes:

> The very importance of these manifold relationships
> heightens the need for some relationships which are
> dependable; which can be, invariably, counted on; which
> will not be weakened or destroyed by the incessant mov-
> ing about of people. Such secure relationships can
> only be found, given the structural peculiarities of
> our society today, within the family. Actualization
> of this security within the family depends upon commit-
> ment, a commitment symbolized in the phrase "in sick-
> ness and in health, for better or for worse, for richer
> or for poorer, till death do you part" (p. 48).

He finds that the unconditional commitment of family members which is
the manifestation of love and concern is directly challenged by the
success and achievement values of the society, which imply that a person
is valued because of what he owns and what he achieves rather than
because of what he is.

Hilsdale (1962) in a study of the individual's personalized image of marriage found that there were two types of personal commitment: ideal and existential. Ideal commitment is the commitment to the goal or ideal of marriage. The ideal for marriage is a permanent and exclusive union. In existential commitment to marriage the individual recognizes that something might go wrong, and the individual commits himself to making an attempt at the ideal goal yet recognizes that he may not achieve it. In existential commitment the individual binds himself only to making a serious effort at living as husband and wife, knowing that if love or understanding die and life together becomes intolerable, he can end the marriage and try again.

Gouldner (1960) in a study of organizational commitment defines commitment as "...those kinds of constraints which are generated by the actor's own motivations, orientations, and behaviors" (p. 469). She discovered that commitment to the specific values of an organization is distinct from commitment to the organization as a whole. Commitment is not a homogeneous and unidimensional variable but is a multidimensional phenomenon.

Becker (1960) states that the concept of commitment has been frequently used by sociologists as a variable to explain "consistent behavior." He identifies three characteristics of this type of behavior: (a) it persists over some period of time; (b) it involves great diversity of activities which are seen by the actor as activities which, whatever their external diversity, serve him in pursuit of his goal; and (c) a rejection by the actor of other feasible alternatives.

Commitment involves the making of "side bets." The major elements of Becker's (1960) side bet theory of commitment are: (a) prior actions

of the person staking some originally extraneous interest on his follow-
ing a consistent line of activity, (b) a recognition by him of the
involvement of this originally extraneous interest in his present
activity, and (c) the resulting consistent line of activity. There
are numerous ways, many indirect, in which side bets are made. Since
side bets involve values, it is necessary to discover the systems of
value within which the mechanisms and processes of commitment operate.
Becker notes the limitations of his conception of commitment and calls
for further efforts in the development of this concept.

Sherif and Sherif (1964) state that attachments among individual
members of a group are patterned with respect to effective initiative
or control, mutual liking, and particular functions in activities
which are positively related to the motivations of the members.

Parsons, Shils, Allport, Kluckhohn, Murry, Sears, Sheldon,
Stouffer, and Tolman (1951) state that the orientations of action of
the individual to social objects entails selection and possibly choice
among alternatives. This means that the processes which determine
whether or not an individual will become committed, as well as the
type and degree of commitment, to persons or groups (social objects)
involve selection and perhaps choice between alternative possibilities
for commitment. An orientation of action is the way in which one
orients himself in relation to a person or group in terms of his
commitment. An individual with a positive orientation of action toward
his family would be committed to it. An individual who has a negative
orientation of action toward his family would be uncommitted or even
hostile toward it.

According to Parsons, et al. (1951), orientations discriminate among objects and describe their value to the individual in terms of their relevance to the satisfaction of his drives. Cathectic orientations represent an emotional state with respect to persons or groups with commitment to objects which are gratifying and rejection of those which are noxious. Evaluative orientations refer to standards of judgment which may be either cognitive standards of truthfulness, appreciative standards of appropriateness (on an emotional level), or moral standards of rightness.

Kanter (1972), in her study of commitment in 19th century American utopian communities, states that the primary issue which a utopian community must face in order to have the strength and solidarity to endure is one of commitment. Committed members work hard, participate actively, derive love and affection from the group, and believe strongly in what the group stands for. She defines commitment as:

> The willingness of people to do what will help maintain the group because it provides what they need. In sociological terms, commitment means the attachment of the self to the requirements of social relations that are seen as self-expressive (p. 66).

She identifies three aspects of a social system that involve commitment: continuance, cohesion, and social control. These are three analytically distinct problems with potentially independent solutions. In specific situations or social systems, any one of these three problems may be of paramount importance. A person orients himself to a social system instrumentally, affectively, and morally;

> ...he orients himself with respect to the rewards and costs involved in participating in the system, with respect to his emotional attachment to the people in the system, and with respect to the moral compellingness of the norms and beliefs of the system (p. 68).

These relate to the three processes by which an individual orients himself to a social object; cognition, cathection, and evaluation, developed by Parsons, et al. (1951).

A system can organize itself in such a way as to maximize its positive value for the person around each orientation, and if it does, it gains commitment in the three areas that are essential for the maintenance of the system. There are three types of commitment (Kanter, 1972), each of which has different consequences for the system and for the individual.

1. Positive cognition or <u>instrumental commitment</u> will tend to produce groups which will hold their members. The individual will tend to become invested in it and find his membership rewarding.

2. Positive cathexis or <u>affective commitment</u> will tend to produce groups with strong emotional bonds which can withstand threats to its existence. The individual will gain strong social ties, relatedness, and a sense of belonging.

3. Positive evaluation or <u>moral commitment</u> will produce groups which obey the authority of the group, and support its values. The individual will gain purpose, direction, and meaning, a sense that his acts stem from essential values.

The group which produces all three types of commitment, that is, <u>total commitment</u>, will be most successful in its maintenance and in the maintenance of its members.

A group may organize itself to promote and sustain the three kinds of commitment. According to Kanter (1972), for each commitment there are two processes at work: the reduction of the value of other possible

commitments and the increase in the value of commitment to the group.
The person must thus give up something as well as get something in
order to be committed. Commitment involves choice, the discrimination
and selection of possible courses of action.

The strength of commitment depends upon the extent to which a
group contains or institutes processes that increase the unity, coher-
ence, and possible gratification of the group itself, at the same time
that it reduces the value of other possibilities. Thus, there are six
commitment building processes (Kanter, 1972), a detaching process and
a securing process for each of the three types of commitments:

1. The process of sacrifice asks members to give up something as
   a price of membership. It is the detaching process of instru-
   mental commitment.

2. Through the process of investment the individual commits his
   "profit" to the group, so that leaving it would be costly.
   Investment can be a simple economic process involving tangible
   resources or it can involve intangibles like time and energy.
   It is the securing process of instrumental commitment.

3. Renunciation involves the relinguishing of relationships that
   are potentially disruptive to group cohesion, thereby heighten-
   ing the relationship of the individual to the group. It is the
   detaching process of affective commitment.

4. Connectedness, belonging, participation in a whole mingling of
   the self in the group, equal opportunity to contribute and to
   benefit, all are part of communion. It is the securing process
   of affective commitment.

5. <u>Mortification</u> processes provide a new identity for the person that is based on the power and meaningfulness of group membership; the processes reduce his sense of a separate, private, unconnected ego. They facilitate a moral commitment on the part of the person to accept the control of the group, binding his inner feelings and evaluations to the group's norms and beliefs. It induces openness and trust. It is the detaching process of moral commitment.

6. <u>Transcendence</u> is the process whereby a person comes to feel that the group is part of something greater than itself. It is the securing process of moral commitment.

Commitment mechanisms are concrete practices that help generate and sustain the commitment of the members to the group. Every aspect of group life has implications for commitment which can function to increase commitment or have no value for commitment. Kanter (1972) found in her study of 19th century communes that the presence of commitment mechanisms was positively related to the communities' endurance.

Functionality of the American Family

Parsons and Bales (1955) view the American family as "isolated" and "nuclear." With increasing technological change has come increasing specialization. This has resulted in the transfer of many family functions to institutions outside of the kinship group. According to Parsons and Bales (1955), the family has become almost completely functionless and, for its members, retains only the functions of the socialization of children and the stabilization of adult personalities. Parsons

(1971) states that "The process by which non-kinship units become of prime importance in a social structure inevitably entails 'loss of function' on the part of some or even all of the kinship units" (p. 9).

Linton (1971) states that the outstanding feature of modern American kinship is the almost complete breakdown of the consunaguine family as a functional unit. "The average city dweller recognizes his extended ties of relationship only in the sending of Christmas cards and in the occasional practice of hospitality to visiting kin" (pp. 63-4).

Sussman and Burchinal (1971) find that because of the existence of modern communication and transportation systems which facilitate interaction among members, the extended family is still feasible. They note that while the theory stresses the social isolation and social mobility of the nuclear family,

> ...findings from empirical studies reveal an existing and
> functioning extended-kin family system closely integrated
> within a network of relationships and mutual assistance
> along bilateral kinship lines and encompassing several
> generations (p. 99).

Sussman (1953) in a study of help patterns in 97 middle class families found a high degree of financial assistance between parents and their adult children, often given in indirect ways. He further found that the existence of economic cooperation between generational families paralleled closer relationships between them. Thus families which had strongly functional relationships were found to be closer than those which were less functional. Ferkiss (1969) while noticing the loss of functionality in many areas, states that the extended kinship group continues to provide material and emotional support to its members.

In a study of kinship patterns in London, Djamour and Firth (1956) conclude that in the final analysis kin interaction and preference were a matter of personal preference more than simply a matter of relationship. Personal preference and interaction were strongly related to the functionality of the relationship.

Many investigators emphasize the extent to which U.S. and British urban families of the working and middle classes are not isolated. They find that these families although nuclear, engage in considerable interaction with kin households and that this interaction not only provides a large part of the off-the-job social life of the family members but also provides instrumental aid in illness and at other times of crisis and need. The extended family, therefore, retains a considerable degree of functionality (Townsend, 1957; Young and Willmott, 1957; Litwak, 1960; Key, 1961; Mitchell, 1961; Rogers and Leichter, 1964). Sussman and Burchinal (1962a; 1962b) and Goode (1963) have summarized much of this literature.

Goode (1963) synthesizes two points of view by stating that while the social forces of industrialization and urbanization seem to be altering the family in the direction of some type of conjugal family pattern, "...toward fewer kinship ties with distant relatives and a greater emphasis on the 'nuclear' family unit of couple and children" (p. 1), this change is not absolute. "The extended kin network continues to function and to include a wide range of kin who share with one another, see one another frequently, and know each other" (p. 75).

Winch and Blumberg (1968) state that when a system becomes completely functionless, it ceases to exist. There is considerable variation in the degree of functionality from family to family and

within a single family over a period of time.

Homans (1950) notes that the term function has been used in two different ways. First, it has been used to refer to consequences of activities which contribute to the survival of social systems as systems, and second, to consequences of activities that meet the needs of individuals. Winch (1963) has integrated both of these uses into a single two sided concept of function as both system-serving and individual-serving.

Winch (1962) argues that the consequences of functions can be viewed as resources, that when cathected (internalized by the individual because they are gratifying) become rewards. The person or group which exercises control over resources has the potential capability to influence the behavior of others. He also makes the distinction between instrumental functions such as the reproductive and economic and the expressive functions such as the religious, socializing, and emotionally gratifying functions.

Farmer (1970) states "...the continued existence and influence of the family as a social institution is accounted for in terms of the functions it performs on behalf of society and which contribute to the maintenance of society" (p. 14). Ogburn (1968) also states that the family is bound together by its functions. If the functionality of the family did not exist, there would be no family.

Hobart (1961), observing the family from an institutional perspective, sees it as weakening, largely because of misplaced values which cause the family to allow its functions to be taken over by institutions. The family is no longer a necessary economic unit, and only continues to provide for the socialization of children and for

companionship, yet even in these two functions, the family is abdicating its significance to impersonal institutions outside the family.

Good (1964) identifies five functions of the family: (a) reproduction of the young, (b) physical maintenance of family members, (c) social placement of the child, (d) socialization, and (e) social control. He finds that "The strategic significance of the family is to be found in its <u>mediating</u> function in the larger society. It links the <u>individual</u> to the larger social structure" (p. 2).

Farmer (1970) lists six functions of the family: (a) reproduction, (b) socialization of children, (c) education--at least of young children, (d) social control--teaches the limits of tolerated behavior, (e) molds taste (aesthetic, etc.) and (f) status giving.

Ogburn (1968) maintains that the dilemma of the modern family is due to its loss of function and notes that prior to modern times the power and prestige of the family was due to the seven functions it performed which served to bind the family together: (a) economic, (b) status giver, (c) education, (d) protection, (e) religious function, (f) recreation, and (g) affection and procreation.

Goode (1968) states that although one form of family organization is being transformed into another type, the major functions of the family remain the same and continue as a foundation of the larger societal structure. He emphasizes the function of "emotional maintenance" as being of increasing importance as a function of the family.

Porterfield (1962) attempts to identify expectations of marriage function which are universal and not limited to one culture: (a) cultural recognition of family and children, (b) protection against outsiders and (c) care for the aged. Murdock (1949) gleans four

universal family functions from anthropological material: (a) reproduction, (b) sex, (c) socialization, and (d) economic cooperation. Cavan (1969) sees the family as weakened by its loss of social functions. The functions which she identifies as remaining are: (a) companionship, (b) love, (c) sexual satisfaction, (d) children, (e) security, (f) personality formation for children, (g) socialization for the adolescent, and (h) material needs and utilitarian functions.

Brin (1968) discusses the importance of the family in the inculcation of patterns of sexual behavior appropriate to the individual, the family, and the society.

Cooper (1970) calls for the end of the family and identifies four functions and factors operating in the family, all of which serve to deprive our acts of any genuine spontaneity: (a) the glueing together of people based on the sense of one's own incompleteness, (b) the formations of roles for its members rather than the laying down of conditions for the free assumption of identity, (c) as primary socializer of the child the family instills social controls in its children that are patently more than the child needs to navigate his way through life, and (d) instilation of an elaborate system of taboo in each child.

Farber (1964) notes that the most frequently named functions are: (a) reproduction, (b) biological maintenance, (c) socialization, (d) economic cooperation, and (e) status ascription.

Ferkiss (1969) states that contraception makes the traditional family simply one among many possible ways of ordering sexual relations without disrupting society, and paves the way for real emancipation and equality for women. He also notes that the lessened economic significance of the family as a productive unit, the increasing encroachment

upon children's time of a variety of educational institutions, and the growing moral influence of the peer group, have led many sociologists to predict that the family as it has been will become extinct.

Parsons (1971) suggests that there has been a transfer of a variety of functions from the nuclear family to other structures of the society, especially the occupationally organized sectors of it. He states:

> This means that the family has become a more specialized agency than before, probably more specialized than it has been in any previously known society. This represents a decline of certain features which traditionally have been associated with families; but whether it represents a "decline of the family" in a more general sense is another matter; we think not (p. 49).

Rather than declining, the family has become more specialized but not less important because the society is more exclusively dependent on it for the performance of certain of its vital functions. In the early thirties, Elmer (1932) stated that functions which were formerly the province of the family had been taken over by institutions. Those remaining were primarily the affective functions.

Nimkoff (1965) notes that there has been a tendency toward an equalitarian status of husband and wife. Socialization of children is shared with outside agencies and personal happiness has come to be regarded as the key to a successful family. Economic ties within the family, with more women working outside the home, have weakened, thus there is greater reliance on ties of psychological interdependence.

Ryder (1974) states that the obligation of the conjugal family to provide its individual members with emotional support increases in salience with the level of economic development. He maintains that:

> The consequences of participation in the organized society
> give the conjugal family particular importance for individ-
> ual well-being. The competitive and impersonal environment
> of an occupational structure (for the adult) or of an educa-
> tional structure (for the child) is psychologically burden-
> some because it asks much of the individual in discipline
> and returns little in psychological security. The adequate
> functioning of individuals in the economic system, and thus
> of the system itself, requires effective maintenance of their
> emotional equilibrium. The conjugal family serves as an
> oasis for the replenishment of the person, providing the
> individual with stable, diffuse and largely unquestioning
> support, assuaging the bruises of defeat and otherwise
> repairing whatever damage may have been done in the achieve-
> ment oriented struggles of the outside world (pp. 127-8).

Ryder (1974) notes that the bonds between husband and wife are inherently
fragile since emotionality alone is an unstable foundation for an endur-
ing arrangement. He further points out that many of the traditional
structural supports which link parent and child have now largely
vanished.

Litwak and Szelenyi (1971) point out that a key structural feature
of the isolated nuclear family is its lack of human resources. The
heavy reliance on the nuclear family for the fulfillment of affective
functions creates many problems. Because the nuclear family is limited
in size, it is limited in its ability to deal with tension management
problems between the husband and wife, in which neither adult is able
to provide succor to the other. Thus the family's isolation combined
with its extreme self-reliance for the affective functions can place
severe strains on family relationships.

Young (1973) notes that in a time of rapid cultural change such as
we are now experiencing, the family in its "splendid isolation" is
extremely vulnerable. It is unable to fill all of the functions
necessary for the maintenance of its members.

Family Strength and Marital Satisfaction

Otto (1971) finds that family strength is the end product of a series of ever-changing factors or components. These components are fluid, interacting, and related. He identifies eleven strengths which, taken as an aggregate, 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 to perform family roles flexibly.

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

10. Mutual respect for the individuality of family members.

11. A concern for family unity, loyalty, and interfamily cooperation (pp. 278-279).

Reeder (1973) developed a model of family characteristics hypothesized as being operationally 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 allocations and expections; and (h) prefers specific value orientations.

Anthony (1969) states that the family with a strong background responds to difficulties by pooling its resources and working out the most constructive solutions together.

Navran (1967) noted significant differences between happily married couples and unhappily married couples. Happily married couples:

> (a) talk more to each other; (b) convey the feelings that they understand what is being said to them; (c) have a wider range of subjects available to them; (d) preserve communication channels and keep them open; (e) show more sensitivity to each other's feelings; (f) personalize their language symbols; and (g) make more use of supplementary nonverbal techniques of communication (p. 182).

Chilman and Meyer (1966) found that in a group of undergraduate students, love and companionship in marriage received a far higher rating from the married group than sex satisfaction, living conditions, and academic pursuits. Levinger (1964) discovered that both husband and wife place a higher value on the affective aspects of task performance than on the instrumental aspects.

Leninger (1968) in a study of divorce applicants found that spouses in middle-class marriages were more concerned with psychological and emotional interaction, while the lower-class partners were more concerned with financial problems and unstable physical actions of their partners. This suggests that until the instrumental needs are met in marriage, the partners cannot be concerned with the psychological and emotional aspects of marriage.

Cuber and Harroff (1963) found that stable marriages are not always stable because they are satisfying. They note that a

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

They suggest that one reason for the stability of unsatisfying marriages might be a lack of attractive alternatives.

Levinger (1965), theorizing on marital cohesiveness, states that:

> The strength of the marital relationship is proposed to
> be a direct function of hypothetical attraction and
> barrier forces inside the marriage, and an inverse func-
> tion of such influences from alternate relationships
> (p. 28).

From an extensive review of the literature, he identifies three major factors in cohesion: affectional rewards, barrier strength, and alternate attraction.

Affectional rewards (Levinger, 1965) include esteem for spouse, desire for companionship, and sexual enjoyment; socio-economic rewards include husband's income, home ownership, husband's education, and husband's occupation; and similarity in social status, which includes religion, education, and age.

Levinger (1965) also identified three major sources of "barrier strength" (the barriers which hold the individual within the group): feelings of obligation to dependent children and to the marital bond; moral proscriptions including proscriptive identification with religion and joint church attendance; and external pressures including primary group affiliations, community stigma either rural or urban, and legal and economic barriers.

Levinger (1965) identified two sources of alternate attraction:
affectional rewards including a preferred alternate sex partner, disjunc-
tive social relations, and opposing religious affiliations; and economic
rewards including the wife's opportunity for independent income.

<center>Correlates of Marital Happiness</center>
<center>and Satisfaction</center>

Luckey (1960) found that satisfaction in marriage is related to
the congruence of the husband's self-concept and that held of him by
his wife. The same relationship does not exist for the wife.

Stuckert (1963) also found that it is important for marital satis-
faction that the wife have an accurate perception of her husband, but
that there was not an important relationship between satisfaction and
the husband's perception of his wife. For wives, marital satisfaction
correlated highest with the extent to which their perception of their
husband's expectations correlated with the husband's actual expectations.
For the husbands, similarity between their own role concepts and
expectations and those of their wives is the single most important
factor in marital happiness.

Katz, Goldstein, Cohen, and Stucker (1963) found a positive rela-
tionship between marital happiness and the favorableness of the husband's
self-description. Burr (1971) found that role discrepancies explain a
considerable amount of variation in marital satisfaction. In addition,
evidence was found that it is meaningful to take this important variable
into account in understanding the relationship between role discrepancy
and marital satisfaction. Hurvitz (1965) found that wives conform more

to their husband's expectations than do the husbands to the expectations of their wives.

Kolb and Straus (1974) found that families above the median in husband-to-wife power tend to be high in marital happiness but no difference in marital happiness was found when families with low-power and high-power wives were compared. High parent-to-child power was associated with high marital happiness, but high child-to-parent power was associated with low marital happiness.

Blood and Wolf (1960) found that an important source of marital satisfaction for the wife is the husband's prestige or social standing in the community. The higher the status, the greater was the wife's satisfaction.

Axelson (1963) found that marital adjustment was poorer when the wife works outside the home. It was also poorer when the wife works full time rather than part time. Nye (1961) discovered that marriages of employed mothers were more likely to be characterized by conflict. The husband's disapproval of his wife's status, either working or not working, was related to poor marital adjustment.

Hurley and Palonen (1967) found evidence that the higher the ratio of children per years of marriage, the less satisfactory the marital experience will be. Luckey (1966), however, found no relationship between the number of children and marital satisfaction.

Landis and Landis (1963) in a study of couples married an average of 20 years found that the care and discipline of children ranked next to sexual adjustment among those problems for which couples had not reached a mutually satisfactory adjustment. Figley (1973) noted a dramatic decrease in marital adjustment and marital communication during

the childrearing period. A low point was reached in the marital rela-
tionship in the period just prior to the departure of the children
from the home. Gould (1975) found a decrease in positive perceptions
of marriage between the ages of 22 and 51 with the lowest point reached
at about age 35. In a comparison of couples who had a child with those
who did not, Ryder (1973) found that wives who had a child felt that
their husbands were not paying enough attention to them.

deLissovoy (1973) in a longitudinal study of high risk marriages
found that a kin network of economic and psychological support and
church activities were found to produce marriage sustaining forces.
Lee (1974) found a positive correlation between normlessness and marital
dissatisfaction. Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) found that successful
American Families allow into their homes and circles of intimacy only
other families remarkably like themselves. Whitehurst (1968) found
that higher involvement in family activities and more conventional
lifestyles were associated with higher marital adjustment. Solomon
(1972) notes that there is a positive correlation between emotional
stability and a good family identity.

Renee (1970) found that blacks and others with low incomes and
education had a greater degree of marital dissatisfaction. She also
found that people raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied
with their marriages than people who never had children or whose
children had left home regardless of age, race, or income level.

Gurin, Veroff and Feld (1960) found evidence that feelings of
happiness in marriage are clearly related to the extent to which a
person is satisfied or frustrated in the interpersonal aspects of his
marriage. Those who are unhappy tend to concentrate on the situational

aspects of marriage such as the home, children, or social life as sources of their marital happiness. Those who are happy in marriage tend to focus on situational sources for any unhappiness, while those who are not happy tend to stress difficulties in the relationship as the source of their difficulties.

Parent-Child Relationship

Chaiklin and Frank (1973) state that when the family functions well, there is accuracy in self-other perceptions and this in turn is related to better child adjustment. Norris (1968) found that parental satisfaction and understanding of the child was positively related to the child's achievement of basic skills, school grades, and favorable teachers' comments for pre-adolescent boys.

Esty (1968) in a study of college student leaders and non-leaders found that leaders perceive their parents as more loving and less neglecting, rejecting, and over-protecting than non-leaders. Elder (1963) found that adolescents more often model their roles after parents who are democratic than after parents who are either permissive or authoritarian.

Stinnett and Walters (1967) found that subjects who reported a low evaluation of family tended to be more peer-oriented than subjects who reported a high evaluation of family. In an examination of the basis of peer-compliance and parental-compliance in adolescent girls, Brittain (1967) found that (a) the adolescent tends to be peer-compliant in choices perceived to be of high importance in the eyes of the peers; conversely, they tend to be parent-compliant concerning choices perceived to be important in the eyes of the parents, and (b) it was also

found that the choices tend to be parent-compliant when they are perceived to be important in the eyes of both peers and parents, and conversely, the choices tend to be peer-compliant when they are perceived as being relatively unimportant in the eyes of both peers and parents.

Stinnett, Talley, and Walters (1973) found that black adolescents experienced closer parent-child relationships than whites even though black youths were much less likely to have both parents at home. They also found more mother-oriented environments among black families.

Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971a) found a striking contrast in the degree of mutual support and affection in the family between maladaptive and adaptive groups of boys. This quality rather than the presence or absence of two parents in the home seems to be most important.

Tracey (1971) states that one must assume that when parent-child relationships are improved, then the ability to cope with stress from other relationships is also enhanced. Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971b) found that all characteristics of family life studies, family cohesiveness was most significantly associated with late adolescent adjustment.

Definition of Terms

From the review of literature the following definitions have been delineated for use in this study:

Functionality--the degree to which the family fulfills those functions necessary to the maintenance of the individual and the continuance of the family.

Instrumental Functionality--functionality in those things concerned
with the physical maintenance of the family, such as the provision of
food, shelter, and care for children.

Affective Functionality --functionality in those things concerned
with the emotional maintenance of the family such as affection and
companionship.

Moral Functionality--functionality in those things concerned with
the maintenance of family and social values, purposes, directions, and
meanings, including the socialization process of children.

Commitment--the attachment of the self to the requirements of
social relations that are seen as self-expressive.

Instrumental Commitment--commitment to remain within and to the
continuance of the family as a unit.

Affective Commitment--emotional attachment to the members of the
family.

Moral Commitment--commitment to the values and expectations of the
family.

Total Commitment--commitment in all three areas of commitment:
instrumental, affective, and moral.

Commitment Mechanism--a behavior, attitude, belief, or feeling
which facilitates commitment.

Commitment Process--a process by which an individual becomes
committed.

Sacrifice--a commitment process in which a member gives up some-
thing as a price of membership in the family.

Investment--a commitment process in which a member commits his
time, energy, and money to the family.

Renunciation--a commitment process in which a member relinguishes relationships that are potentially disruptive to family cohesion.

Communion--a commitment process in which a member connects himself to the family, mingling the self in the family.

Mortification--a commitment process in which a member reduces his sense of a separate, private, unconnected ego, taking on an identity based on his membership in the family.

Transcendence--a commitment process in which a member comes to feel that the family is part of something greater than itself.

Marital Need Satisfaction--the degree to which the marriage relationship meets the needs of the individual.

Securing Commitment Mechanisms--those commitment mechanisms which secure the individual to the family: investment, communion, and transcendence.

Detaching Commitment Mechanisms--those commitment mechanisms which increase commitment to the family by limiting relationships and loyalties outside of the family: sacrifice, renunciation, and mortification.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were husbands and wives with children in day care centers or preschools in Tulsa, Oklahoma. The sample consisted of 126 parents of children in a selected group of licensed day care centers and preschools in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Centers and schools were selected to represent a broad socio-economic spectrum and to obtain variation in maternal employment.

Collection of the Data

The Director of the center or school was asked to distribute the questionnaires to all two-parent families, recording the names of those receiving the questionnaires, and checking them off as the questionnaires were returned and placed in a large manila envelope. The Director was asked to remind those who failed to return the questionnaires promptly and to supply duplicate questionnaires if needed. The questionnaires contained a cover letter, which explained the research study and assured anonymity, and an unmarked envelope in which to seal the completed questionnaire.

Description of the Instruments

The questionnaire, which was designed by the author to investigate commitment, functionality, and marital need satisfaction included a general information section and four major scales. The four scales were: (a) <u>Family Functionality Scale</u> (FFS), (b) <u>Family Commitment Scale</u> (FCS), (c) <u>Family Commitment Mechanism Scale</u> (FCMS), and (d) <u>Marital Need Satisfaction Scale</u> (MNSS). The first three scales were developed by the investigator.

The questionnaire was presented to a panel of four judges, all of whom held advanced degrees in Family Relations and Child Development. They were asked to rate the items in terms of the following criteria:

1. Does the item possess sufficient clarity?

2. Is the item sufficiently specific?

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

There was a high level of agreement among the judges that the items met the three criteria. Suggestions made by the judges were incorporated into the final versions of the scales.

General Information Section

The general information section of the questionnaire consisted of questions designed to obtain certain background information from the respondents such as sex, age, race, religious preference, residence, number of years married, number of children, education, and occupation.

Family Functionality Scale

The Family Functionality Scale (FFS) was developed by the author to identify the degree to which various functions were perceived by the subject as being performed in his nuclear family.

The FFS, a Likert-type scale, consists of 18 items which are characterized by five degrees of response ranging from "very little" to "very great." All 18 items were gathered from a review of literature dealing with family functions. Each item was classified by the author according to the type of the function: instrumental, which includes those things concerned with the physical maintenance of the family; affective, which includes those things concerned with the emotional maintenance of the family; and moral functionality, which includes those things concerned with the maintenance of family and social values, purposes, direction, and meanings, including the socialization process of children. There are thus three subscores: (a) instrumental functionality, (b) affective functionality, and (c) moral functionality, as well as the total score which indicates the total degree of functionality.

Family Commitment Mechanism Scale

The Family Commitment Mechanism Scale (FCMS) was developed by the author to identify the degree to which commitment mechanisms and processes were present in the nuclear family. The FCMS, a Likert-type scale, consists of 24 items which are characterized by five degrees of response ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The scale items included both positive and negative statements in order to avoid response set. The scale is divided into six sub-sections designed

to measure the degree of presence of the six commitment processes:

1. Sacrifice, in which a member gives up something as a price of membership in the family;

2. Investment, in which a member commits his time, energy, and money to the family;

3. Renunciation, in which a member relinguishes relationships that are potentially disruptive to family cohesion;

4. Communion, in which a member connects himself to the family, mingling the self in the family;

5. Mortification, in which a member reduces his sense of a separate, private, unconnected ego, taking on an identity based on his membership in the family; and

6. Transcendence, in which a member comes to feel that the family is part of something greater than itself.

There are thus six subscores and the total score which reflects the total degree of presence of commitment mechanisms in the family.

Family Commitment Scale

The Family Commitment Scale (FCS) was developed by the author to measure the degree of commitment to his/her nuclear family. The FCS, a Likert-type scale, consists of 18 items characterized by five degrees of response ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." The scale items included both positive and negative statements in order to avoid response set. The scale is divided into three sub-sections designed to measure the three types of commitment:

1. Instrumental commitment, which is commitment to remain within and to the continuance of the family as a unit;

2. Affective commitment, which is emotional attachment to the
   members of the family; and

3. Moral commitment, which is commitment to the values and expec-
   tation of the family.

There are thus three subscores and the total score which reflects the
degree of total commitment to the family.

Marital Need Satisfaction Scale

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

The scores on the MNSS were ranked and the upper and lower quar-
tiles obtained. All subjects whose scores fell within the upper quar-
tile were considered as having a high degree of marital need
satisfaction. Those whose scores fell within the lower quartile were
considered as having a low degree of marital need satisfaction.

All items were found by Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970)
to be significant at the .001 level. Two possible 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 per-
ceived their marriages as very happy as well as those who perceived

their marriages as improving over time received significantly higher
scores on the MNSS.

Analysis of the Data

A percentage and frequency count was used to analyze the background
information. The chi-square test was used in the item analysis of the
scales. The split-half reliability coefficient, using the Spearman-
Brown correction formula, was utilized to measure reliability of items
in these scales.

The Mann-Whitney U test, the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of
variance, and the Spearman rank correlation coefficient were the statis-
tical tests used to examine the hypotheses.

1. The Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine whether two
    independent groups were drawn from the same population when
    ordinal level of measurement was achieved.

2. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to
    compare three or more groups when ordinal level measurement
    was achieved.

3. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to measure
    the degree of association between two sets of ordinal level
    data for the same person.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

Table I presents a detailed description of the 126 husbands and wives who served as subjects for this study. Forty-six percent of the respondents were males and 54 percent were females. The respondents ranged in age from 19 to 52 years with a mean age of 31.87. The sample was predominantly Protestant (79 percent) and white (98 percent). The husband was the main provider of income in 96 percent of the respondent's families. According to the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955), the respondents were classified primarily as upper-middle (45 percent) and lower-middle (27 percent) with 14 percent each classified in the upper and upper-lower categories. Fifty percent of the respondents reported that the wife was employed outside the home. The number of years married ranged from 1 to 33 with a mean of 9.26. A large percentage (87.2 percent) reported that they had not been previously married. The number of children in the family ranged from 1 to 6 with a mean of 2.15 children.

The Item Analysis

In order to obtain an index of the validity of the items in the MNSS, the FCS, the FCMS, and the FFS, the chi-square test was utilized to determine if each item significantly differentiated between those

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Sex	Male	58	46
	Female	67	54
Race	White	123	98
	Black	1	.8
	Oriental		.8
Religious Preference	Roman Catholic	18	14
	Protestant	100	79
	None	3	2
	Other	5	4
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very Religious	15	12
	Religious	65	52
	A Little Religious	43	34
	Non-Religious	2	2
Type of Religious Orientation	Orthodox/Fundamentalist	14	11
	Conservative	35	28
	Middle-of-Road	47	37
	Liberal	25	20
	None	4	3
Primary Wage Earner	Husband	121	96
	Wife	4	3
	Other	1	.8
Socio-Economic Status	Upper	17	14
	Upper-Middle	55	45
	Lower-Middle	33	27
	Upper-Lower	17	14
Wife's Employment	Outside of Home	62	50
	Housewife/Mother	62	50
First Marriage	Yes	109	87
	No	16	13

subjects scoring in the upper quartile and those subjects scoring in the lower quartile of each scale on the basis of the total score from that scale.

As indicated in Table II, all of the items in the MNSS were found to be significantly discriminating. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown correction formula, of .97 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the MNSS.

As indicated in Table III, all the items in the FCS were found to be significantly discriminating. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown correction formula, of .89 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the FCS.

As indicated in Table IV, 22 of the 24 items in the FCMS were found to be significantly discriminating. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown correction formula, of .84 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the FCMS.

As indicated in Table V, all the items in the FSS were found to be significantly discriminating. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown correction formula, of .95 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the FFS. A high degree of construct validity was indicated by the strong relationship between the scales and subscales. As is indicated in Appendix B a frequency and percentage distribution of responses were compiled for all scales.

TABLE II

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF THE UPPER
AND LOWER QUARTILES OF TOTAL MNSS SCORES

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
1. Providing a feeling of security in me.	4	36.63	.0001
2. Expressing affection toward me.	4	39.20	.0001
3. Giving me an optimistic feeling toward life.	4	32.15	.0001
4. Expressing a feeling of being emotionally close to me.	4	55.23	.0001
5. Bringing out the best qualities in me.	4	51.82	.0001
6. Helping me to become a more interesting person.	4	39.84	.0001
7. Helping me to continue to develop my personality.	4	38.60	.0001
8. Helping me to achieve my individual potential (become what I am capable of becoming).	4	47.00	.0001
9. Being a good listener.	4	38.64	.0001
10. Giving me encouragement when I am discouraged.	4	42.81	.0001
11. Accepting my differentness.	4	36.83	.0001
12. Avoiding habits which annoy me.	4	33.52	.0001
13. Letting me know how he or she really feels about something.	4	26.36	.0001
14. Trying to find satisfactory solutions to our disagreements.	4	47.56	.0001
15. Expressing disagreement with me honestly and openly.	4	25.95	.0001

TABLE II (CONTINUED)

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
16. Letting me know when he or she is displeased with me.	4	18.27	.001
17. Helping me to feel that life has meaning.	4	47.55	.0001
18. Helping me to feel needed.	4	54.89	.0001
19. Helping me to feel that my life is serving a purpose.	4	58.31	.0001
20. Helping me to obtain satisfaction and pleasure in daily activities.	4	51.33	.0001
21. Giving me recognition for my past accomplishments.	4	41.35	.0001
22. Helping me to feel that my life has been important	4	45.20	.0001
23. Helping me to accept my past life experiences as good and rewarding.	4	42.91	.0001
24. Helping me to accept myself despite my short-comings.	4	39.50	.0001

TABLE III

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF THE
UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES OF
TOTAL FCS SCORES

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
1. My spouse and I are married "til death do us part."	4	39.21	.0001
2. Even if I became unhappy with my marriage I would want to stay married for the good of the children.	4	9.63	.05
3. I might someday get a divorce if things got bad enough.	4	23.74	.0001
4. I would get a divorce if I found something better.	4	43.39	.0001
5. Something else could meet my needs just as well as my family does.	4	32.91	.0001
6. My spouse usually expresses great affection toward me.	3	27.75	.0001
7. My spouse usually expresses a feeling of being emotionally close to me.	4	42.05	.0001
8. My spouse usually understands my feelings.	4	34.83	.0001
9. I usually understand my spouse's feelings.	4	22.13	.0005
10. I usually understand my children's feelings.	3	11.36	.01
11. I usually express great affection toward my spouse.	4	29.23	.0001
12. I usually express great affection toward my children.	3	19.29	.0005
13. Often romantic love "cools off" after marriage. This has happened in my marriage.	4	36.88	.0001

TABLE III (CONTINUED)

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
14. There are often serious conflicts among my family.	4	29.73	.0001
15. In my family we rarely see eye to eye on moral matters.	3	39.84	.0001
16. I doubt some of the values my spouse believes to be very important.	4	33.76	.0001
17. When my spouse's expectations of me are bothersome, I think it is all right to ignore them.	3	34.24	.0001
18. I always do pretty much what I want to do no matter what my spouse wants me to do.	3	19.64	.0005

TABLE IV

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF
THE UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES OF
TOTAL FCMS SCORES

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
1. I often do without things I would like for the good of the family.	3	10.06	.05
2. I often give up time doing things I enjoy in order to be with my family.	3	22.54	.0001
3. I have given up some of the things I wanted in life for the good of the family.	4	15.31	.005
4. I make very few sacrifices for my family.	4	14.24	.01
5. I spend little time with my family.	3	17.91	.001
6. I consider the money that I earn as belonging to me rather than belonging to the whole family.	3	10.55	.05
7. I often work on projects at home which benefit my family.	4	21.74	.001
8. I believe that, for me, "marriage is forever."	4	42.55	.0001
9. I have friends with whom I feel as close as I do to my family members.	4	7.69	N.S.
10. If my family does not like a particular friend of mine, I continue that friendship anyway.	4	16.90	.01
11. My spouse and I have many separate friends.	4	18.87	.001
12. My parents have a much less important place in my life now than they did before I was married.	4	11.96	.05
13. My spouse and I share similar values (such as religious or political beliefs).	4	20.45	.0005

TABLE IV (CONTINUED)

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
14. My family often works together on household chores.	4	25.56	.0001
15. My family often goes on family outings (picnics, movies, trips, etc.)	4	15.47	.005
16. When an important decision is to be made, my family and I usually discuss it together.	4	30.48	.0001
17. I am usually willing to share my weaknesses and failings with my spouse.	3	23.96	.0001
18. I am usually willing to accept criticism from my spouse.	4	17.97	.005
19. Members of my family are very independent.	4	5.19	N.S.
20. The decisions I make and the things I do are strongly influenced by my family.	4	23.36	.0001
21. I believe that there is a great religious meaning in marriage.	4	36.02	.0001
22. The happiness of my family is more important to me than my own happiness.	5	30.02	.0001
23. I often experience a really overpowering feeling of love for my mate.	5	27.73	.0001
24. We have many family traditions.	5	18.49	.005

TABLE V

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF
THE UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES OF
TOTAL FFS SCORES

Item	df	x^2	Level of Sig.
1. Someone with whom to share secrets and personal problems.	4	32.00	.0001
2. Continuing financial support	5	24.78	.001
3. Help in a financial crisis	5	26.78	.0001
4. Companionship	5	52.68	.0001
5. Recreation	5	31.82	.0001
6. Affection	4	55.97	.0001
7. Meals	5	37.05	.0001
8. Care when ill	5	24.26	.001
9. Teaching children limits of acceptable behavior	4	26.84	.0001
10. Care for children	5	20.25	.005
11. A sense of security when I grow old	5	52.64	.0001
12. A sense of purpose of life	5	42.76	.0001
13. Sexual fulfillment	5	43.59	.0001
14. Religious education and worship	5	26.35	.0001
15. Teaching children right from wrong	3	23.01	.0001
16. Teaching children what they will need to know when they grow up	4	25.94	.0001
17. Help in times of emotional stress	5	49.09	.0001
18. Provide models of manliness and womenliness for the children to imitate	4	34.19	.0001

Subscores of FCS and FCMS

The FCS consisted of six statements for each of the three types of commitment. Median subscores were obtained in order to determine those areas in which the respondents possessed the highest degree of commitment as well as the lowest degree of commitment. Table VI lists the total median scores and the median subscores. The most favorable subscore was obtained in the category of affective commitment (md 30) indicating the highest degree of commitment to the family in this area. Less favorable were the categories of instrumental (md 19) and moral (md 20) commitment, indicating a much lower degree of commitment to the family in these areas.

TABLE VI

FCS SUBSCORES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE*

Category	Median Subscores Total Sample
1. Instrumental commitment	19.0
2. Affective commitment	30.0
3. Moral commitment	20.0

*Median total score: 68.5   Total Sample: 126

That the median subscore for affective commitment was much greater than the subscores for the other types of commitment is a very important

finding. It supports much of the theoretical work which has been done on changes in the American family. Ryder (1974), for instance, states that the primary importance of the modern family is in the emotional, affective areas. Nimkoff (1965) reports that many societal trends have tended to weaken other family functions while strengthening the reliance on ties of emotional interdependence. Chilman and Meyer (1966) found that in a group of undergraduate students, love and companionship were considered to be the most important functions in marriage. As pointed out by Litwak and Szelenyi (1971) heavy reliance on the affective aspects of marriage can place severe strains on family relationships. The ever increasing rate of divorce may be laregly a result of the heavy reliance on affective commitment, the most fragile of the three types of commitment, to bind the family together, while the other types of commitment have come to play a lesser role.

The FCMS consisted of four statements for each of the six types of commitment mechanisms. The six types of commitment mechanisms also were grouped into pairs to determine the degree of presence of the three commitment building processes. Median subscores were obtained in order to determine those areas in which the respondents possessed the highest degree of presence of commitment mechanisms and commitment building processes as well as the lowest degree of presence of commitment mechanisms and commitment building processes. Table VII lists the total median score and the median subscores. The most favorable mechanism subscore was obtained in the category of investment mechanisms (md 17) indicating a high degree of presence of commitment mechanisms in this area. The least favorable was reflected in the category of

Renunciation (13)
mortification mechanisms (md 14), indicating a lower degree of presence

of commitment mechanisms in this area. The most favorable process subscore was obtained in the category of instrumental processes (md 31), indicating the highest degree of presence of commitment building processes in this area. Less favorable subscores were reflected in the categories of affective (md 29) and moral (md 29) processes, indicating a somewhat lower degree of presence of commitment building processes in these areas.

Perhaps the most interesting finding in the comparison of these subscores is seen in a comparison of the securing and detaching types of commitment mechanisms. Securing commitment building mechanisms are those mechanisms which secure the individual to the family. Investment, communion, and transcendence are the securing mechanisms. Detaching commitment mechanisms increase commitment to the family by limiting relationships and loyalties outside the family. Sacrifice, renunciation, and mortification are the detaching mechanisms. The median score for the securing mechanisms, as illustrated in Table VII, was 48 compared to a median score of 42 for the detaching mechanisms, indicating a higher degree of securing mechanisms than detaching mechanisms. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the high value placed on individuality in American society. While securing mechanisms involve giving of oneself to the family group, detaching mechanisms involve a voluntary limitation of freedom and a certain amount of loss of individual identity and sense of independence.

TABLE VII

FCMS SUBSCORES FOR TOTAL SAMPLE*

Category	Median Subscores Total Sample
Commitment Mechanisms	
1. Sacrifice Mechanisms (Detaching)	15
2. Investment Mechanisms (Securing)	17
3. Renunciation Mechanisms (Detaching)	13
4. Communion Mechanisms (Securing)	16
5. Mortification Mechanisms (Detaching)	14
6. Transcendence Mechanisms (Securing)	15
Types of Commitment Mechanisms	
1. Securing Commitment Mechanisms	48
2. Detaching Commitment Mechanisms	42
Commitment Building Processes	
1. Instrumental Processes	31
2. Affective Processes	29
3. Moral Processes	29

*Median total score: 89   Total sample: N=126

Examination of Hypotheses and

Discussion of Results

Hypothesis A (1). Family commitment is independent of age. The
Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used in determining if there
was a significant relationship between family commitment and age. A
rho score, .18, was obtained, indicating that the relationship was
significant at the .05 level. The positive rho score indicates that
family commitment increases with age.

Viewed through the theoretical framework developed by Kanter (1972),
age would tend to act as an investment mechanism tending to produce com-
mitment. The older the person the greater would be the degree of invest-
ment in the marriage since the options outside the marriage would become
more limited, and the individual would, therefore, have a greater stake
in the relationship. One would also expect that older husbands and
wives would have been married longer and have more children. This
finding coincides with the research of Stinnett, Collins, and Montgom-
ery (1972) indicating that the majority of older husbands and wives
in their study perceived their marriage happiness as being greater
during the later years than in any previous period of life. Considera-
tion of Hypothesis A (2) reveals that there is an even higher positive
level of significance in the relationship between family commitment and
the number of years married. Results of testing Hypothesis A (3)
demonstrate that the degree of family commitment increases with the
number of children. Both of these factors operate as strong investment
mechanisms.

Hypothesis A (2). Family commitment is independent of the number of years married. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there was a significant relationship between family commitment and the number of years married.

A rho score of .28 was obtained, indicating that the relationship was significant at the .005 level. This finding indicates that the level of family commitment increases with the number of years married. This finding coincides with the results reported in Hypothesis A (1) that family commitment was positively and significantly related to age.

Commitment logically tends to increase with time through the process of investment (Kanter, 1972) by which an individual commits his time and energy, his "profit", to the group, so that leaving it is costly. A secondary factor could also be the probability that uncommitted relationships would not be as likely to survive over a period of time as those which were highly committed.

Hypothesis A (3). Family commitment is independent of the number of children. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there was a significant relationship between family commitment and number of children. A rho score of .21 was obtained, indicating that the relationship was significant at the .05 level. A positive rho score indicates that the level of family commitment increases with the number of children.

Children can be seen to be an investment mechanism which binds the individual to the family. Children also serve as facilitators of the mortification process whereby the individual takes on a new identity based on the meaningfulness of family membership, in this case, the identity of parent.

This finding coincides with the statistics which show that the divorce rate decreases as the number of children increases (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1973).

Hypothesis A (4). Family Commitment is independent of socio-economic status. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in family commitment among members of different socio-economic status groups. An H score of 8.11 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .05 level. Table VIII illustrates that there is a positive relationship between family commitment and socio-economic status.

TABLE VIII

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN FCS SCORES ACCORDING
TO SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Description	No.	md	N	Level of Sig.
Upper	17	69.24		
Upper-Middle	55	67.92		
Lower-Middle	33	47.11	8.11	.05
Upper-Lower	17	60.94		

Kanter (1972) states that commitment, and therefore the continued existence of the group, rests on its ability to provide for the needs

of its members. The family which is perceived by its members as providing for their needs and wants would therefore be expected to command a greater degree of commitment than a family which did not meet these needs and wants to the member's satisfaction.

This finding is related to several research studies showing a positive, significant relationship between marriage success and socioeconomic status (Hicks and Platt, 1970). The apparent anomaly illustrated in the median scores of the lower-middle (47.11) and the upper-lower (60.94) status groups suggests a difference in the perception of needs and wants between the groups. It would appear that the perception of financial well being is of greater importance than the actual degree of affluence.

Hypothesis A (5). *Family commitment is independent of the type of religious orientation.* The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in family commitment according to type of religious orientation. An H score of 25.82 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .0001 level. Table IX illustrates that family commitment is strongly related to the type of religious orientation possessed by the family member. As indicated by the median scores in Table IX, the more conservative the reported type of religious orientation the greater the degree of commitment to the family. Likewise, the more liberal the reported type of religious orientation the lower the level of family commitment. This strong relationship can perhaps be accounted for by the association of conservative religion with traditional values including a high degree of emphasis on the home and family. This finding is also related to the research indicating the

personality trait of conservatism is positively related to marriage

happiness (Luckey, 1964; Lantz and Snyder, 1969).

TABLE IX

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN FCS SCORES ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Description	No.	md	H	Level of Sig.
Orthodox/Fundamentalist	14	82.82		
Conservative	35	76.03	25.82	.0001
Middle-of-Road	47	56.91		
Liberal	25	35.42		

Hypothesis A (6). Family commitment is independent of the degree

of religious orientation. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of

variance test was utilized in determining if there was a significant

difference in family commitment according to degree of religious

orientation. An H score of 18.72 was obtained, indicating that the

difference was significant at the .001 level. Table X illustrates

that family commitment is strongly related to the degree of religious

orientation possessed by the family member. The median scores illus-

trated in Table X indicate that the greater the reported degree of

religiousity, the greater tended to be the degree of commitment to

the family. The median FCS score of those who identified themselves

as "very religious" (89.40) was almost 100 percent greater than the median FCS score of those who reported that they were "a little religious" (45.83). This finding is consistent with several research studies showing that marriage happiness and stability is significantly higher among those families who have a high degree of religious orientation (Zimmerman and Cervantes, 1960; Bowman, 1974).

TABLE X

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN FCS SCORES ACCORDING
TO DEGREE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Description	No.	md	H	Level of Sig.
Very Religious	15	89.40		
Religious	65	66.38	18.72	.001
A Little Religious	43	45.83		

Strong religious beliefs would act as a strong transcendence mechanism in the commitment process. Strong religious beliefs give a religious meaning to marriage and thus contribute to the belief that the family is a part of something greater than itself (Blood, 1964). The present results may be explained by the fact that commitment is stressed heavily by religion. Participation in religious activities as a family would tend to be a commitment building mechanism by simply being a joint family activity. This finding may also be due to the tendency

of religious participation to provide friendship support for marriage
stability and commitment. As Blood (1964) suggests, religious partici-
pation puts a family in contact with other families who value commit-
ment and family stability. These families serve as a reinforcing agent
for each other to maintain a high level of commitment to the family.

Hypothesis A (7). Family commitment is independent of the wife's
employment status. The Mann-Whitney U test was utilized in determining
if there was a significant difference in family commitment 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 -2.14 was obtained, indicating that the difference
was significant at the .05 level. Table XI illustrates that family
members reporting a non-working wife received a significantly higher
median score (md 70) than those who reported that the wife was
employed outside the home (md 66), reflecting a greater degree of
family commitment than family members who reported working wifes.

TABLE XI

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN FCS SCORES ACCORDING
TO THE EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE WIFE

Description	No.	md	z	Level of Sig.
Working	62	66		
			-2.14	.05
Non-Working	62	70		

This finding is related to those research studies showing a lower degree of marital adjustment among wives who are employed than among wives who are not employed (Axelson, 1963; Hicks and Platt, 1970).

According to Kanter's (1972) theoretical framework, any commitment to anything outside the group diminishes the level of commitment to the group. A wife (or husband) who is strongly committed to a job outside of the home would therefore tend to be somewhat less committed to the family. This thesis is supported by the research of Ridley (1973) which indicated that when either the wife or the husband became highly involved in their jobs, it tended to have an adverse effect upon the marriage relationship.

When Hypothesis A was tested, the following variables were found to have no significant relationship to the FCS scores: (a) sex, and (b) religious preference.

Hypothesis B (1). There is a significant positive relationship between the degree of commitment and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between Family Commitment Scale scores and Family Commitment Mechanism Scale scores. A rho score of .60 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who had expressed a high degree of family commitment also reported a high degree of presence of commitment mechanisms.

The family has a number of ways in which to organize so as to promote and sustain commitment. Kanter (1972) states:

> The group builds commitment to the extent that it clearly
> cuts off other possible objects of commitment, becomes
> an integrated unity tying together all aspects of life

> within its borders, develops its own uniqueness and
> specialness, and becomes capable, by itself, of con-
> tinuing the person's gratification. The strength of
> commitment, then, depends on the extent to which groups
> institute processes that increase the unity, coherence,
> and possible gratification of the group itself, at
> the same time that they reduce the value of other
> possibilities (p. 71).

Commitment mechanisms are thus part of the processes which reduce the

value of other possible commitments and increase the value of commit-

ment to the family. The very high correlation between the FCS scores

and the FCMS scores supports the theoretical framework of commitment

developed by Kanter (1972) and provides a strong indication of construct

validity for both scales.

Hypothesis B (2). There is no significant relationship between

the degree of instrumental commitment and the degree of presence of

instrumental commitment building processes. When the Spearman rank

correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found

that a significant, positive relationship existed between the instru-

mental commitment subscore of the FCS and the instrumental commitment

building process subscore of the FCMS. A rho score of .34 was obtained.

The correlation was significant at the .0005 level, indicating that

those who expressed a high degree of instrumental commitment also

expressed a high degree of presence of instrumental commitment building

processes.

Commitment to continued participation in the family involves posi-

tive cognition (Parsons, et al., 1951) which discriminates among

objects and describes their value to the individual in terms of their

relevance to the satisfaction of drives. Cognitive orientations are

those that rationally determine the positive or negative value of

relationships in terms of energy and resources. As is suggested by the

high degree of association between the instrumental subscore of the FCS and the FCMS, instrumental commitment building processes facilitate instrumental commitment. The high degree of association also provides a strong indication of construct validity for both scales.

Hypothesis B (3). There is no significant relationship between the degree of affective commitment and the degree of presence of affective commitment building processes. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between the affective commitment subscore of the FCS and the affective commitment subscore of the FCMS. A rho score of .55 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who expressed a high degree of affective commitment also expressed a high degree of presence of affective commitment building processes.

An emotional commitment to the family involves positive cathection, which represents an emotional state with respect to objects which are gratifying and rejection of those which are noxious. Cathective orientations are those which determine the positive or negative value of relationships in terms of their potential for emotional gratification. This type of commitment is aided by renunciation (a detaching process) and communion (an attaching process). As is suggested by the high degree of association between the affective subscores of the FCS and the FCMS, affective commitment building processes facilitate commitment. This association provides a strong indication of construct validity for both scales.

Hypothesis B (4). There is no significant relationship between the degree of moral commitment and the degree of presence of moral commitment building processes. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between the moral commitment subscore of the FCS and the moral commitment subscore of the FCMS. A rho score of .43 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who expressed a high degree of moral commitment also expressed a high degree of presence of moral commitment building processes.

Commitment to the norms and values of the family involves positive evaluation and thus acceptance of its authority and willingness to support its values, based on the extent to which family life can offer "identity, personal meaning, and the opportunity to grow in terms of standards and guiding principles that the member feels are expressive of his own inner being" (Kanter, 1972, p. 73). As suggested by the high degree of association between the moral subscores of the FCS and the FCMS, moral commitment building processes facilitate moral commitment. Construct validity is also strongly indicated for both scales.

Hypothesis C. There is a significant positive relationship between the degree of commitment and the degree of marital need satisfaction. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between the degree of family commitment and the degree of marital need satisfaction. An rho score of .72 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who expressed a high degree of family commitment also expressed a high

degree of marital need satisfaction.

Commitment has been defined by Kanter (1972) as:

...the willingness of people to do what will help maintain
the group because it provides what they need. In socio-
logical terms, commitment means the attachment of the self
to the requirements of social relations that are seen as
self-expressive (p. 66).

Commitment is thus dependent on the satisfaction of needs. The very

high degree of association between family commitment and marital need

satisfaction tends to support the validity of Kanter's definition of

commitment.

Hypothesis D. There is no significant correlation between the

degree of commitment and the degree of functionality in the family.

When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this

hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation

existed between Family Commitment Scale scores and Family Functionality

Scale scores. A rho score of .60 was obtained. The correlation was

significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who had expressed

a high degree of family commitment had also perceived that their families

were highly functional.

Commitment and functionality are strongly linked. The functions

which the family has for the individual contribute to the creation of

a positive orientation toward the family which produces commitment.

The more of the individual's needs that are fulfilled by the family,

the greater are the rewards for participation in it. Winch (1962)

states that the consequences of functions can be viewed as resources

that when cathected become rewards. The group which controls these

resources has the potential capability to influence the behavior of

others. As is stated by Ogburn (1968), the family is bound together

by its functions. The extremely high degree of association between the FCS scores and the FFS scores indicates that the degree of the individual's family commitment is highly related to the degree of functionality which the family has for that individual.

Hypothesis E. There is no significant relationship between the degree of functionality and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between the degree of family functionality and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms. A rho score of .53 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who expressed a high degree of family functionality also expressed a high degree of presence of commitment mechanisms. This correlation supports the finding revealed when Hypothesis D was tested that there is a strong positive association between the degree of functionality and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms. The correlation furthermore serves as an indication of construct validity.

Hypothesis F. There is a significant positive relationship between the degree of functionality and the degree of marital need satisfaction. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied to this hypothesis, it was found that a significant, positive correlation existed between the degree of family functionality and the degree of marital need satisfaction. A rho score of .63 was obtained. The correlation was significant at the .0001 level, indicating that those who expressed a high degree of family functionality also expressed a high degree of marital need satisfaction.

Homans (1950) notes that the term function has been used to refer to consequences of activities that meet the needs of individuals. Since marital need satisfaction is based on the ability of the marital relationship to fulfill the needs of the family members, one would expect a high degree of correlation between this and the degree to which the family is functional for the individual. The high degree of association between FCS and FFS scores indicates that this relationship does exist.

Hypothesis G (1). The degree of marital need satisfaction is independent of 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 -2.47 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .01 level. Table XII illustrates that husbands (97.5) received a significantly higher median score than wives (95.0), reflecting a greater degree of marital need satisfaction than wives.

The finding that husbands received significantly higher marital need satisfaction scores than wives is consistent with the findings of Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970). These findings may be due to a number of factors. The wife may depend more on the marriage relationship for the fulfillment of her emotional and psychic needs than the husband who may receive more need satisfaction from his occupation. Since 50 percent of the wives were employed, these wives could have experienced a considerable amount of role tension between their occupational and traditional homemaker roles. With the recent emphasis on women's liberation, many wives who are not employed may feel some degree of dissatisfaction since the women's movement has consistently

stressed the value of occupations while presenting a rather negative
view of women who chose to be housewives.

TABLE XII

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN MNSS SCORES
ACCORDING TO SEX

Description	No.	md	z	Level of Sig.
Husbands	58	97.5		
			-2.47	.01
Wives	67	95.0		

Hypothesis G (2). Marital need satisfaction is independent of
the number of years married. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient
was utilized in determining if there was a significant relationship
between marital need satisfaction and number of years married. A
rho score of .21 was obtained, indicating that the relationship was
significant at the .05 level. A positive rho score indicates that the
degree of marital need satisfaction increases with the number of years
married.

This finding correlates with Hypothesis A (2) in which it was
determined that family commitment increases with the number of years
married. The increase in marital need satisfaction with the number
of years married may be due to a process of natural selection by which

unsatisfactory marriage relationships would be terminated, with those enduring tending to be the most satisfactory.

Hypothesis G (3). Marital need satisfaction is independent of the number of children. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there was a significant relationship between marital need satisfaction and number of children. A rho score of .18 was obtained indicating that the relationship was significant at the .05 level. The positive rho score indicates that marital need satisfaction increases with the number of children.

This finding is in conflict with most of the research which has been done on this subject. Hurley and Palonen (1967) found that the higher the ratio of children per years of marriage, the less satisfactory the marital experience. Landis and Landis (1963) found that the care and discipline of children was a major source of conflict between husbands and wives. Luckey (1966) found no relationship between the number of children and marital satisfaction. The finding that marital need satisfaction increases with the number of children is supported by the finding of Hypothesis A (3) of this study which found that the degree of family commitment also increased with the number of children.

Hypothesis G (4). Marital need satisfaction is independent of the type of religious orientation. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized in determining if there was a significant difference in marital need satisfaction according to type of religious orientation. An H score of 15.23 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .01 level. Table XIII illustrates that marital need satisfaction is related to the type of religious orientation of the family member. As indicated by the median scores in

Table XIII, the more conservative the reported type of religious orienta-
tion the greater the degree of marital need satisfaction. Likewise, the
more liberal the type of religious orientation, the lower the level of
marital need satisfaction. This finding is indirectly supported by
a study done by Whitehurst (1968) who found that conventional lifestyles
were associated with high marital adjustment.

TABLE XIII

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN MNSS SCORES ACCORDING
TO TYPE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Description	No	md	H	Level of Sig.
Orthodox/Fundamentalist	14	76.43		
Conservative	35	73.93		
Middle-of-Road	47	56.68	15.23	.01
Liberal	25	42.38		

Hypothesis G (5). Marital need satisfaction is independent of the
degree of religious orientation. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis
of variance test was utilized in determining if there was a significant
difference in marital need satisfaction according to degree of religious
orientation. An H score of 7.69 was obtained, indicating that the
difference was significant at the .05 level. Table XIV illustrates that
marital need satisfaction is related to the degree of religious

orientation of the family member. As indicated by the median scores in Table XIV, the greater the religious orientation of the family member, the greater was the degree of marital need satisfaction. This finding coincides with that of Hypothesis A (5) which determined that a very strong relationship existed between a high degree of religious orientation and a high degree of family commitment.

TABLE XIV

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN MNSS SCORES ACCORDING
TO DEGREE OF RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Description	No.	md	H	Level of Sig.
Very Religious	15	80.40		
Religious	65	64.38	7.69	.05
A Little Religious	43	51.98		

Hypothesis G (6). The degree of marital need satisfaction is independent of 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 -2.47 was obtained, indicating that the difference was significant at the .01 level. Table XV illustrates that those reporting non-working wives received a

significantly higher median score than those who reported working wives, reflecting a greater degree of marital need satisfaction for those reporting that the wife was a housewife than for those reporting the wife's employment outside the home.

TABLE XV

DIFFERENCES IN MEDIAN MNSS SCORES ACCORDING
TO THE EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE WIFE

Description	No.	md	z	Level of Sig.
Working	62	92.5	-2.47	.01
Non-Working	62	102.0		

The finding that there is a greater degree of marital need satisfaction among those who reported that the wife was not employed outside the home supports the research done by Axelson (1963). Nye (1961) found that marriages of employed mothers were more likely to be characterized by conflict. The present finding also agrees with research showing more favorable marital adjustment among wives employed part-time than among wives who are employed full-time (Hicks and Platt, 1970). The attempt by the wife to reconcile the roles of housewife and mother with that of her employment can produce severe strain in her marital relationship.

When hypothesis G was tested the following variables were found to have no significant relationship to the MNSS scores: (a) age, (b) socio-economic status, and (c) religious preference.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the degree of
commitment, functionality, and presence of commitment building processes
in families and to examine the interrelationships among these factors,
the relationship of these factors to marital need satisfaction, and
to selected sociological variables.

The sample was composed of 126 parents of children in a selected
group of licensed day care centers and preschools in Tulsa, Oklahoma.
They were a diverse group with a wide range in age and socio-economic
status. Fifty percent reported that the wife was employed outside the
home.

The questionnaire included an information section for securing
various background data and four scales: the MNSS which measured the
degree of need satisfaction in the marriage relationship, the FCS which
measured the degree of commitment to the family, the FCMS which measured
the degree of presence of commitment building processes, and the FFS
which measured the degree of functionality of the family.

In order to obtain an index of the validity of the items in the
MNSS, the FCS, the FCMS, and the FFS, the chi-square test was utilized
to determine if each item significantly differentiated between those
subjects scoring in the upper quartile and those subjects scoring in
the lower quartile on each scale on the basis of the total score from
that scale.

Median subscore of the FCS and the FCMS 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 and family commitment scores differed significantly according to sex and the employment status of the wife.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there were significant relationships between marital need satisfaction and family commitment according to age, number of years married, and number of children.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized to determine if marital need satisfaction and family commitment differed significantly according to socio-economic status, type and degree of religious orientation, and religious preference.

The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was utilized in determining if there were significant associations between the scales.

The results of the study were as follows:

1. All items of the MNSS were found to be significantly discriminating between the upper quartile and the lower quartile groups.

2. All items of the FCS were found to significantly discriminating between the upper quartile and the lower quartile groups.

3. Twenty-two of the twenty-four items of the FCMS were found to be significantly discriminating between the upper quartile and the lower quartile groups.

4. All items of the FFS were found to be significantly discriminating between the upper quartile and the lower quartile groups.

5. A high degree of correlation between the scales indicated construct validity.

6. Median subscores obtained for the FCS indicated a significantly higher degree of affective commitment than instrumental or moral commitment.

7. Median subscores obtained for the FCMS indicated that the area of the greatest degree of presence of commitment mechanisms was in the area of investment. The area of the least degree of presence of commitment mechanisms was in the area of mortification.

8. When the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized it was determined that there was a significant relationship between family commitment and the wife's employment status (.05), with a comparison of the median subscores indicating a higher degree of family commitment for those reporting non-working wives.

9. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient indicated that family commitment was significantly and positively related to age (.05), number of years married (.005), and number of children (.05).

10. When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized it was determined that there were strong positive relationships between a high degree of family commitment and high socio-economic status (.05), conservative religious orientation (.0001), and highly religious orientation (.001).

11. There were no significant relationships between family commitment and sex or religious preference.

12. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied, it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of commitment and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms (.0001).

13. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of instrumental commitment and the degree of presence of instrumental commitment building processes (.0005).

14. It was found, when the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied, that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of affective commitment and the degree of presence of affective commitment building processes (.0001).

15. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of moral commitment and the degree of presence of moral commitment building processes (.0001).

16. Through the application of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient it was found that a significant positive relationship existed between the degree of commitment and the degree of marital need satisfaction (.0001).

17. When the Spearman rank correlation coefficient was applied it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of commitment and the degree of functionality in the family (.0001).

18. It was found through the application of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, that a significant positive

relationship existed between the degree of functionality and the degree of presence of commitment mechanisms (.0001).

19. Through the application of the Spearman rank correlation coefficient, it was found that there was a significant positive relationship between the degree of family functionality and the degree of marital need satisfaction (.0001).

20. When the Mann-Whitney U test was utilized, it was determined that there was a significant relationship between marital need satisfaction according to sex (.01) and the wife's employment status (.01) with a comparison of the median sub-scores indicating a higher degree of marital need satisfaction for husbands and for subjects reporting non-working wives.

21. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was used to determine that there were significant positive relationships between a high degree of marital need satisfaction and number of years married (.05) and number of children (.05).

22. When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test was utilized, it was determined that there were strong positive relationships between a high degree of marital need satisfaction and conservative religious orientation (.01) and highly religious orientations (.05).

23. There were no significant relationships between marital need satisfaction and age, socio-economic status, or religious preference.

Conclusions

Several major conclusions may be drawn from the results of this study. It has demonstrated that very strong positive relationships exist between commitment to the family, the degree to which commitment building processes are present in the family, and marital need satisfaction. Strong positive relationships also exist between instrumental commitment and instrumental commitment processes, between affective commitment and affective commitment processes, and between moral commitment and moral commitment processes. It was found that family commitment is related to age, the number of years married, the number of children, socio-economic status, the degree and type of religious orientation, and the wife's employment status. It was found that marital need satisfaction is related to sex, number of years married, the number of children, the degree and type of religious orientation, and the wife's employment status.

Exploring, as it did, several relatively uncharted areas, several recommendations for future research present themselves.

1. Since this study was limited to families with young children, it would be valuable to repeat the study with families at different points on the family life cycle.

2. It would be of interest to expand the Family Functionality Scale to differentiate between the degree of functionality perceived by the family member as originating from related social structures outside the family, such as the extended family, the church, government agencies or other social structures. A comparison could then be made, in terms of family commitment and marital need satisfaction, between those

perceiving much support coming from outside the family with those who perceived most support coming from within the family.

3. Findings suggest that certain behaviors are part of the commitment processes which facilitate commitment. A further explanation of these processes could result in the development of therapeutic strategies for strengthening commitment in families.

4. Commitment is a part of all social systems. It is the binding force which links the individual to the system. This study has explored the commitment process as it applies to the family system. An extensive exploration of the commitment process could be undertaken applying the theoretical structure of the commitment process to a variety of societal institutions. An understanding of the commitment process could be used (or misused) by organizations, businesses, or governments to increase the level of commitment to those structures.

5. The findings of this study suggest that an exploration of the relationships which exist between the commitment process and behavioral psychology could be very rewarding and perhaps form a basis for a related "behavioral sociology."

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlstrom, Winston M. and Robert J. Havighurst. "The Family in Child-hood." in 400 Losers, Ed. Winston M. Ahlstrom. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1971a, 34-48.

Ahlstrom, Winston M. and Robert J. Havighurst. "Family Life in Mid-Adolescense." in 400 Losers, Ed. Winston M. Ahlstrom. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1971b, 114-40.

Anthony, E. James. "The Mutative Impact on Family Life of Serious Mental and Physical Illness in a Parent." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 14 (1969), 433-53.

Axelson, Leland. "Marital Adjustment and Marital Role Definitions of Husbands of Working and Non-Working Wives." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 189-95.

√ Becker, Howard S. "Notes on the Concept of Commitment." American Journal of Sociology, 66 (1960), 32-40.

Blood, Robert O. "Kinship Interaction and Marital Solidarity." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 15 (1969), 171-84.

Blood, Robert O. and Donald M. Wolf. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Brin, Orville G., Jr. "Family Structure and Sex-Role Learning by Children." in A Modern Introduction to the Family, Rev. Ed., Ed. Norman W. Bell and Ezra F. Vogel. New York: The Free Press, 1968, 526-40.

Brittain, Clay V. "An Exploration of the Basis of Peer-Compliance in Adolescents." Adolescence, 2 (1967), 445-58.

Burr, Wesley R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 368-72.

Cavan, Ruth Shoulde. The American Family. 4th ed. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1969.

Chailklin, Harris and Carol Landau Frank. "Separation, Service Delivery, and Family Functioning." Public Welfare, 31 (1973), 2-7.

Chilman, Catherine S. and Donald L. Meyer. "Single and Married Under-
    graduates Measured Personality Needs and Self-Rated Happiness."
    Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 67-76.

Cooper, David. The Death of the Family. New York: Random House, 1970.

Cuber, John F. and Peggy B. Harroff. "The More Total View: Relation-
    ships Among Men and Women of the Upper Middle-Class." Journal of
    Marriage and the Family, 2 (1963), 140-5.

deLissovoy, Vladimir. "High School Marriage: A Longitudinal Study."
    Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 245-55.

Djamour, J. and R. Firth. "Kinship in South Borough." in Two Studies of
    Kinship in London, Ed. R. Firth. London: Athlone Press, 1956, pp. 1-93.

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

Elmer, Manuel Conrad. Family Adjustment and Social Change. New York:
    Ray Long and Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1932.

Esty, Jonathan F. "Early and Current Parent Child Relationships Per-
    ceived by College Student Leaders and Non-Leaders." Dissertation
    Abstracts, 29 (1968), 1169-70.

Farber, Bernard. Family: Organization and Interaction. San Francisco:
    Chandler Publishing Company, 1964.

Farmer, Mary. The Family. London: Longman's, Green and Co., Ltd.,
    1970.

Ferkiss, Victor C. Technological Man: The Myth and the Reality. New
    York: Mentor Books, 1969.

Figley, Charles R. "Child Density and the Marital Relationship."
    Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 272-82.

Goode, William J. The Family. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
    Hall, Inc., 1964.

Goode, William J. "The Role of the Family in Industrialization." in
    Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family, Ed. Robert F. Winch
    and Louis Wolf Goodman. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
    Inc., 1968, 64-70.

Goode, William J. World Revolution and Family Patterns. New York: The
    Free Press, 1963.

Gouldner, Helen P. "Dimensions of Organizational Commitment." Adminis-
    trative Science Quarterly, 4 (1960), 468-87.

Gould, Roger. "Adult Life Stages: Growth Toward Self-Tolerance." Psychology Today, 8 (1975), 74-8.

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), 553-4.

Hilsdale, Paul. "Marriage as a Personal Existential Commitment." Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962), 137-42.

✓ Hobart, Charles W. "Commitment, Value Conflict and the Future of the American Family." in People as Partners, Ed. Jacqueline P. Wiseman. New York: Harper and Row Pub., Inc., 1961, 486-97.

Homans, George C. The Human Group. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1950.

Hurley, John R. and Donna P. Palonen. "Marital Satisfaction and Child Density Among University Student Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 483-4.

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

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." American Sociological Review, 33 (1968), 499-516.

✓ Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Commitment and Community: Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Katz, Irwin, Judith Goldstein, Melvin Cohen, and Solomon Stucker. "Need Satisfaction, Perception, and Cooperative Interactions in Married Couples." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 209-13.

Key, William H. "Rural-Urban Differences and the Family." Sociological Quarterly, 3 (1961), 49-56.

Kolb, Trudy M. and Murray A. Straus. "Marital Power and Marital Happiness in Relation to Problem-Solving Ability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, (1964), 756-66.

Landis, Judson T. and Mary G. Landis. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Lantz, Herman and Eloise Snyder. Marriage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.

Lee, Gary R. "Marriage and Anomie: A Causal Argument." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (1974), 523-32.

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

Levinger, George. "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applicants for Divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (1968), 803-7.

Levinger, George. "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry, 27 (1964), 433-48.

Linton, R. "The Family in Urban-Industrial America." in Sociology of the Family, Ed. Michael Anderson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971, 63-5.

Litwak, Eugene. "Occupational Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion." American Sociological Review, 25 (1960), 9-21.

Litwak, Eugene and I. Szelenyi. "Kinship and Other Primary Groups." in Sociology of the Family, Ed. Michael Anderson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Inc., 1971, 149-63.

Lucky, Eleanore B. "Marital Satisfaction and Its Association With Congruence of Perception." Marriage and Family Living, 22 (1960), 49-54.

Lucky, Eleanore B. "Marital Satisfaction and Personality Correlates of Spouse." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26 (1964), 217-20.

Lucky, Eleanore B. "Number of Years Married as Related to Personality Perception and Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 44-8.

Mitchell, William E. "Descent Groups Among New York City Jews." Jewish Journal of Sociology, 3 (1961), 121-8.

Moore, Barrington. "Thoughts on the Future of the Family." in Identity and Anxiety, Ed. Maurice R. Stein, Arthur J. Vidich and David M. White. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1960, 393-4.

Murdock, George Peter. Social Structure. New York: MacMillan, 1949.

Navran, Leslie. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, 6 (1967), 173-84.

Nimkoff, M. E. "The American Family." in Comparative Family Systems, Ed. M. E. Nimkoff. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, 329-39.

Norris, Nancy P. "Parental Understanding, Parental Satisfaction and Desirable Personality Characteristics in Preadolescent Boys." *Dissertation Abstracts*, 28 (1968), 4709-10.

Nye, Ivan F. "Maternal Employment and Marital Interaction: Some Contingent Conditions." *Social Forces*, 40 (1961), 113-9.

Ogburn, William F. "The Changing Functions of the Family." in *Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family*, Ed. Robert F. Winch and Louis Wolf Goodman. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968, 53-63.

Otto, Herbert A. "What Is a Strong Family." in *People as Partners*, Ed. Jacqueline B. Wiseman. New York: Harper and Row, Pub., Inc., 1971, 277-305.

Parsons, Talcott. "The Family in Urban-Industrial America." *Sociology of the Family*, Ed. Michael Anderson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971, 43-62.

Parsons, Talcott and Robert Bales. *Family Socialization and Interaction Process*. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

✓ Parsons, Talcott, Edward A. Shils, Gordon W. Allport, Clyde Kluckhohn, Henry A. Murray, Jr., Robert R. Sears, Richard C. Sheldon, Samuel A. Stouffer, and Edward C. Tolman. "Some Fundamental Categories of the Theory of Action: A General Statement." in *Toward A General Theory of Action*, Ed. Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1951, 3-29.

Porterfield, Austin L. *Marriage and Family Living as Self-Other Fulfillment*. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis Co., 1962.

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, No. 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), 229-37.

Rogers, Candace L. and Hope J. Leichter. "Laterality and Conflict in Kinship Ties." in *Readings on the Family and Society*, Ed. William J. Goode. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964. 213-8.

Ryder, Norman B. "The Family in Developed Countries." *Scientific American*, 231 (1974), 123-32.

Ryder, Robert G. "Longitudinal Data Relating Marriage Satisfaction and Having a Child." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 604-6.

Solomon, Joseph C. "Family Identity." Adolescense, 7 (1972) 511-8.

Sherif, Muzafer and Carolyn W. Reference Groups. New York: Harper and Row, 1964.

Stinnett, Nick and James Walters. "Parent-Peer Orientation of Adolescents From Low-Income Families." Journal of Home Economics, 59 (1967), 37-40.

Stinnett, Nick, Janet Collins, and James E. Montgomery. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 428-33.

Stinnett, Nick, Linda Carter, and James Montgomery. "Older Persons' Perceptions of Their Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 665-670.

Stinnett, Nick, Sharon Talley, and James Walters. "Parent-Child Relationships of Black and White High School Students: A Comparison." Journal of Social Psychology, 91 (1973), 349-50.

Stuckert, R. P. "Role Perception and Marital Approach." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 415-9.

Sussman, Marvin B. "The Help Pattern in the Middle Class Family." American Sociological Review, 18 (1953), 22-28.

Sussman, M. G. and L. B. Burchinal. "The Kin Family Network in Urban-Industrial America." in Sociology of the Family, Ed. Michael Anderson. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Inc., 1971, 99-119.

Sussman, Marvin B. and Lee Burchinal. "Kin Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualization of Family Functioning." Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962a), 331-40.

Sussman, Marvin B. and Lee Burchinal. "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning." Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962b), 320-332.

Townsend, Peter. The Family Life of Older People: An Inquiry in East London. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul Ltd., 1957.

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

U. S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1973, (94th Edition), Washington, D.C., 1973.

Whitehurst, Robert N. "Pre-Marital Reference-Group Orientations and
     Marriage Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30
     (1968), 397-401.

Winch, Robert F. Identification and Its Familial Determinants. Indiana-
     polis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1962.

Winch, Robert F. The Modern Family, Rev. Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart,
     and Winston, Inc., 1963.

Winch, Robert F. and Rae Lesser Blumberg. "Societal Complexity and
     Familial Organization." in Selected Studies in Marriage and the
     Family, Ed. Robert F. Winch and Louis Wolf Goodman. New York:
     Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1968, 70-92.

Young, Leontine. The Fractured Family. New York: McGraw-Hill Book
     Co., 1973.

Young, Michael and Peter Willmott. Family and Kinship in East London.
     New York: The Free Press, 1957.

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

APPENDIX A

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY LETTERHEAD

March 20, 1975

Dear Parent:

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 conduct-
ing a statewide research project which is attempting to gain greater
understanding of family relationships.

It is hoped that the information gained from this research can help
those who work with families such as ministers, counselors, and day
care centers to be better able to serve families. Your cooperation
is requested because we feel that families like yours have a greater
knowledge of the rewards and problems of family life than does anyone
else.

If you would be kind enough to assist us in this research, you (both
husband and wife) are asked to fill out the enclosed questionnaires.
The two questionnaires are identical; one is for the husband to fill
out and one is for the wife to fill out. When you finish please seal
the questionnaires in the attached unmarked envelopes and return them
to the director of your child's day care center or preschool. It and
other sealed questionnaires will be placed in a large envelope and
your name will be checked off a list of those who have been chosen to
participate in the study. You are asked to return the questionnaires
at the earliest possible date. Please return them no later than
April 15.

As you answer the questions please do not consult with each other or
compare answers. Your answers are confidential. You are asked <u>not</u>
to put your name on the questionnaire, you are encouraged to answer
all the questions as honestly as possible. 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.

Your assistance with this research is greatly appreciated. It is
through the participation of individuals such as you that we gain greater
knowledge and understanding of family life as it is today.

Sincerely yours,

Paul W. Stevenson, B.A., B.S.ed., M.A.   Nick Stinnett, Ph.D.
Dept. of Family Relations and   Associate Professor
  Child Development   Dept. of Family Relations and
Oklahoma State University   Child Development
                                            Oklahoma State University

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

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

      Please check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question.
Your answers are <u>confidential</u> and <u>anonymous</u> 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: Husband_____   Wife _____

2. Race   _____1. White
             _____2. Black
             _____3. Indian
             _____4. Oriental
             _____5. Other

3. Age:_____

4. Religious Preference

             _____1. Roman Catholic
             _____2. Protestant
             _____3. Jewish
             _____4. None
             _____5. Other

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

             _____1. Husband
             _____2. Wife
             _____3. Other

6. Educational Attainment:

Husband   Wife
_____   ____ 1. Less than grade 8
_____   ____ 2. Completed 9th
_____   ____ 3. Attended high school, but didn't graduate
_____   ____ 4. Graduated from high school
_____   ____ 5. Attended college two or more years
_____   ____ 6. Graduated from 4-year college
_____   ____ 7. Completed graduate work

7. Husband's Occupation:_____

8. Wife's Occupation:_____

9. 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, yearly)
   _____ 5. Hourly wages, weekly checks
   _____ 6. Odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity
   _____ 7. Public relief or charity

10. 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

11. Indicate below your family's degree of religious orientation:

   _____ 1. Very religious
   _____ 2. Religious
   _____ 3. A little religious
   _____ 4. Non-religious
   _____ 5. Anti-religious

12. Indicate below your family's present type of religious orientation:

   _____ 1. Orthodox/fundamentalist
   _____ 2. Conservative
   _____ 3. Middle-of-road
   _____ 4. Liberal
   _____ 5. None

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?_____

17. Indicate the degree of closeness of your relationship with your children 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. 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

19. 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

20. 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 right 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 exper-
    iences as good and rewarding.   VS   S   U   US   VUS

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

21. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your family life by circling the response which most nearly describes your feelings. There are no right or wrong answers. The response code is as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree.

1. My spouse and I are married "til death do us part." SA A U D SD

2. Even if I became unhappy with my marriage I would want to stay married for the good of the children. SA A U D SD

3. I might someday get a divorce if things got bad enough. SA A U D SD

4. I would get a divorce if I found something better. SA A U D SD

5. Something else could meet my needs just as well as my family does. SA A U D SD

6. My spouse usually expresses great affection toward me. SA A U D SD

7. My spouse usually expresses a feeling of being emotionally close to me. SA A U D SD

8. My spouse usually understands my feelings. SA A U D SD

9. I usually understand my spouse's feelings. SA A U D SD

10. I usually understand my children's feelings. SA A U D SD

11. I usually express great affection toward my spouse. SA A U D SD

12. I usually express great affection toward my children. SA A U D SD

13. Often romantic love "cools off" after marriage. This has happened in my marriage. SA A U D SD

14. There are often serious conflicts among members of my family. SA A U D SD

15. In my family we rarely see eye to eye on moral matters. SA A U D SD

16. I doubt some of the values my spouse believes to be very important.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

17. When my spouse's expectations of me are bothersome, I think it is all right to ignore them.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

18. I always do pretty much what I want to do no matter what my spouse wants me to do.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

22. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your family life by circling the response that most nearly describes your feelings. There are no right or wrong answers. The response code is as follows: SA=Strongly Agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided, D=Disagree, SD=Strongly Disagree.

1. I often do without things I would like for the good of the family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

2. I often give up time doing things I enjoy in order to be with my family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

3. I have given up some of the things I wanted in life for the good of the family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

4. I make very few sacrifices for my family.　　　SA A U D SD

5. I spend little time with my family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

6. I consider the money that I earn as belonging to me rather than belonging to the whole family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

7. I often work on projects at home which benefit my family.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

8. I believe that, for me, "marriage is forever."　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

9. I have friends with whom I feel as close as I do to my family members.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

10. If my family does not like a particular friend of mine I continue that friendship anyway.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

11. My spouse and I have many separate friends.　　SA A U D SD

12. My parents have a much less important place in my life now than they did before I was married.　　　　　　　SA A U D SD

13. My spouse and I share similar values (such as religious or political beliefs). SA A U D SD

14. My family often works together on household chores. SA A U D SD

15. My family often goes on family outings (picnics, movies, trips, etc.) SA A U D SD

16. When an important decision is to be made, my family and I usually discuss it together. SA A U D SD

17. I am usually willing to share my weaknesses and failings with my spouse. SA A U D SD

18. I am usually willing to accept criticism from my spouse. SA A U D SD

19. Members of my family are very independent. SA A U D SD

20. The decisions I make and the things I do are strongly influenced by my family. SA A U D SD

21. I believe that there is a great religious meaning in marriage. SA A U D SD

22. The happiness of my family is more important to me than my own happiness. SA A U D SD

23. I often experience a really overpowering feeling of love for my mate. SA A U D SD

24. We have many family traditions. SA A U D SD

23. Indicate the degree to which the following are supplied by your nuclear family (you, your spouse, and your children living in your home) 5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least degree.

1. Someone with whom to share secrets and personal problems

1 2 3 4 5
very   very
little   great

2. Continuing financial support

1 2 3 4 5
very   very
little   great

3. Help in a financial crisis

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

4. Companionship

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

5. Recreation

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

6. Affection

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

7. Meals

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

8. Care when ill

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

9. Teaching children the limits of
acceptable behavior

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

10. Care of children

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

11. A sense of security when I grow old

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

12. A sense of purpose in life.

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

13. Sexual fulfillment

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

14. Religious education and worship

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

15. Teaching children right from wrong

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

16. Teaching children what they will need
    to know when they grow up.

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

17. Help in times of emotional stress

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

18. Provide models of manliness and
    womenliness for the children to
    imitate.

    1 2 3 4 5
    very   very
    little   great

APPENDIX B

TABLE XVI

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES
TO THE MNSS ITEMS

Items	Satisfied N	%	Uncertain N	%	Unsatisfied N	%
1. Providing a feeling of security in me.	108	85.72	7	5.56	11	8.73
2. Expressing affection toward me.	98	77.78	13	10.32	15	11.91
3. Giving me an optimistic feeling toward life.	95	75.40	19	15.08	12	9.53
4. Expressing a feeling of being emotionally close to me.	98	77.78	13	10.32	15	11.90
5. Bringing out the best qualities in me.	90	71.43	17	13.49	19	15.08
6. Helping me to become a more interesting person.	92	73.02	21	16.67	13	10.32
7. Helping me to continue to develop my personality.	95	77.4	18	14.29	13	10.32
8. Helping me to achieve my individual potential (Become what I am capable of becoming)	98	77.6	16	12.8	12	9.6
9. Being a good listener	106	76.19	11	8.73	19	15.08
10. Giving me encouragement when I am discouraged.	100	79.37	12	9.52	14	11.11
11. Accepting my differentness.	94	74.60	16	12.7	16	12.7
12. Avoiding habits which annoy me.	89	62.7	22	17.46	27	19.84
13. Letting me know how he or she really feels about something.	91	72.22	15	11.91	20	15.87

TABLE XVI (CONTINUED)

Items	Satisfied N	Satisfied %	Uncertain N	Uncertain %	Unsatisfied N	Unsatisfied %
14. Trying to find satisfactory solutions to our disagreements.	96	79.19	16	12.7	14	11.11
15. Expressing disagreement with me honestly and openly.	104	82.54	14	11.11	8	6.35
16. Letting me know when he or she is displeased with me.	95	75.4	22	17.46	9	7.14
17. Helping me to feel that life has meaning.	102	80.95	17	13.49	7	5.56
18. Helping me to feel needed.	106	84.13	15	11.91	5	3.97
19. Helping me to feel that my life is serving a purpose.	102	80.95	14	11.11	10	7.94
20. Helping me to obtain satisfaction and pleasure in daily activities.	93	73.81	20	15.87	13	10.32
21. Giving me recognition for my past accomplishments.	103	81.75	11	8.73	12	9.44
22. Helping me to feel that my life has been important.	103	81.75	15	11.91	8	6.35
23. Helping me to accept my past life experiences as good and rewarding.	102	80.95	12	9.52	12	9.52
24. Helping me to accept myself despite my shortcomings.	149	79.57	19	15.08	8	6.35

TABLE XVII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES
TO THE FCS ITEMS

Items	Agree N	Agree %	Uncertain N	Uncertain %	Disagree N	Disagree %
1. My spouse and I are married "til death do us part."	100	79.37	7	5.56	19	15.08
2. Even if I became unhappy with my marriage I would want to stay married for the good of the children.	53	42.06	22	17.46	51	40.48
3. I might someday get a divorce if things got bad enough.	64	50.79	32	25.4	30	23.81
4. I would get a divorce if I found something better.	11	8.73	11	8.73	104	82.54
5. Something else could meet my needs just as well as my family does.	5	4.	10	8.	137	88.
6. My spouse usually expresses great affection toward me.	88	69.84	13	10.32	25	19.84
7. My spouse usually expresses a feeling of being emotionally close to me.	88	69.84	18	14.29	20	15.87
8. My spouse usually understands my feelings.	80	63.49	23	18.25	23	18.25
9. I usually understand my spouse's feelings.	87	69.05	22	17.46	17	13.49
10. I usually understand my children's feelings.	106	84.13	17	13.49	3	2.38

TABLE XVII (CONTINUED)

Item	Agree N	Agree %	Uncertain N	Uncertain %	Disagree N	Disagree %
11. I usually express great affection toward my spouse.	90	71.43	15	11.91	21	16.67
12. I usually express great affection toward my children.	118	93.65	6	4.76	2	1.59
13. Often romantic love "cools off" after marriage. This has happened in my marriage.	51	40.48	11	8.73	66	52.38
14. There are often serious conflicts among members of my family.	23	18.25	11	8.73	92	73.02
15. In my family we rarely see eye to eye on moral matters.	10	7.94	8	6.35	108	85.71
16. I doubt some of the values my spouse believes to be very important.	22	17.46	14	11.11	90	74.43
17. When my spouses's expectations of me are bothersome, I think it is all right to ignore them.	19	15.08	12	9.52	95	75.40
18. I always do pretty much what I want to do no matter what my spouse wants to do.	22	17.46	8	6.35	22	76.19

TABLE XVIII

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES
TO THE FCMS ITEMS

Item	Agree		Uncertain		Disagree	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. I often do without things I would like for the good of the family.	95	75.4	11	8.73	20	15.87
2. I often give up time doing things I enjoy in order to be with my family.	94	74.6	13	10.32	19	15.08
3. I have given up some of the things I wanted in life for the good of the family.	78	61.91	12	9.52	36	28.57
4. I make very few sacrifices for my family.	16	12.70	18	14.29	92	73.02
5. I spend little time with my family.	7	5.56	7	5.56	112	88.89
6. I consider the money that I earn as belonging to me rather than belonging to the whole family.	3	2.38	5	3.97	118	93.65
7. I often work on projects at home which benefit my family.	101	80.16	13	10.32	12	9.52
8. I believe that, for me, "Marriage is forever."	96	76.19	14	11.11	16	12.7
9. I have friends with whom I feel as close as I do to my family members.	37	29.37	11	8.73	78	61.91

TABLE XVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	Agree N	Agree %	Uncertain N	Uncertain %	Disagree N	Disagree %
10. If my family does not like a particular friend of mine I continue that friendship anyway.	45	52.38	5	3.97	55	43.65
11. My spouse and I have many separate friends.	66	52.38	5	3.97	55	43.65
12. My parents have a much less important place in my life now than they did before I was married.	75	59.52	7	5.56	44	34.92
13. My spouse and I share similiar values (such as religious or political beliefs).	111	88.10	7	5.56	8	6.35
14. My family often works together on household chores.	97	76.98	8	6.35	21	16.67
15. My family often goes on family outings (picnics, movies, trips, etc.)	102	80.95	10	7.94	14	11.11
16. When an important decision is to be made, my family and I usually discuss it together.	113	89.68	4	3.18	9	7.14
17. I am usually willing to share my weaknesses and failings with my spouse.	100	79.37	13	10.32	13	10.32
18. I am usually willing to accept criticism from my spouse.	98	69.84	15	11.91	23	18.25
19. Members of my family are very independent.	66	52.38	28	22.22	32	25.40

TABLE XVIII (CONTINUED)

Item	Agree N	Agree %	Uncertain N	Uncertain %	Disagree N	Disagree %
20. The decisions I make and the things I do are strongly influenced by my family.	113	89.68	10	7.94	3	2.38
21. I believe that there is a great religious meaning in marriage.	71	65.85	24	19.51	18	14.63
22. The happiness of my family is more important to me than my own happiness.	83	67.48	24	19.51	16	13.01
23. I often experience a really overpowering feeling of love for my mate.	99	80.49	11	8.94	13	10.57
24. We have many family traditions.	65	52.03	24	19.51	35	28.46

105

TABLE XIX

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION
OF RESPONSES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES
TO THE FFS ITEMS

Items	Great N	Great %	Somewhat N	Somewhat %	Little N	Little %
1. Someone with whom to share secrets and personal problems	101	80.8	16	12.8	8	6.4
2. Continuing financial support	91	80.8	10	8.	14	11.2
3. Help in a financial crisis	102	81.6	13	10.4	10	8.
4. Companionship	111	88.8	9	7.2	5	4.
5. Recreation	95	76.	20	16.	10	8.
6. Affection	105	84.	13	10.4	20	5.6
7. Meals	106	84.8	12	9.6	7	5.6
8. Care when ill	115	92.	8	6.4	1	.8
9. Teaching children the limits of acceptable behavior.	116	92.8	8	6.4	1	.8
10. Care for children	113	90.4	9	7.2	3	2.4
11. A sense of security when I grow old	97	77.6	19	15.2	9	7.2
12. A sense of purpose in life.	105	84.0	16	12.8	4	3.2
13. Sexual fulfillment	101	80.8	13	10.4	11	8.8
14. Religious education and worship	62	49.6	42	33.6	21	16.8
15. Teaching children right from wrong	118	94.4	7	5.6	0	0

TABLE XIX (CONTINUED)

Items	Great N	%	Somewhat N	%	Little N	%
16. Teaching children what they will need to know when they grow up	116	92.8	7	5.6	2	1.6
17. Help in times of emotional stress.	103	82.4	15	12.	7	5.6
18. Provide models of manliness and womenliness for the children to imitate	111	88.8	13	10.4	1	.8

VITA

Paul William Stevenson

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: COMMITMENT, FUNCTIONALITY, AND MARITAL NEED SATISFACTION

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Joplin, Missouri, February 18, 1949, the son of Dr. and Mrs. Robert F. Stevenson. Married May 31, 1972 to Nancy English Cline. Father of two boys, Mark and Glenn.

Education: Graduated from Wichita High School, North Wichita, Kansas, in May, 1967. Graduated from The University of Tulsa, in May, 1971, with a Bachelor of Arts degree in English and a Bachelor of Educational Science degree with a major in Secondary Education. Graduated from The University of Tulsa in August, 1972, with a Master of Arts degree in English. Completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in July, 1975.

Professional Experience: Substitute teacher for the Tulsa Public School System, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1972-1973. Director of Children's World Learning Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1973-1974. Teacher, Crosstown Day Care Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1974.

Professional Organizations: Oklahoma Kindergarten Teachers Association, Friends of Day Care.