RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY NEEDS TO PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING EXPERIMENTAL LIFE STYLES

By

CRAIG WAYNE BIRDSONG

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1973

RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY NEEDS TO PERCEPTIONS
CONCERNING EXPERIMENTAL LIFE STYLES

Thesis Approved:

Nick Stinnett
Thesis Adviser

James Walters

Milton Paschall

D Durham
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express special thanks to Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose friendship throughout this program of study, whose willingness to guide, support, and provide insight into man's differentness will remain for a lifetime.

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. James Walters and Mr. Milton Paschall for their critical reading and helpful suggestions in the preparation of this study.

All three of these men have, in their individual ways, given freely of their time, their wisdom and knowledge, and more importantly, their friendship, without which this study and the entire concept of education would be questionable.

A very special thanks is extended to the writer's parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Birdsong, whose faith and support have imparted more strength than words adequately express.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of Problem	1
	Purpose	3
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
	Extra-Marital Relationships	5
	Homosexual Marriages	9
	Cohabitation	17
	Trial Marriages	18
	Group Marriages	20
	Communal Living	22
III.	PROCEDURE	31
	Selection of Subjects	31
	Description of Instrument	31
	Analysis of Data	34
IV.	RESULTS	36
	Description of Subjects	36
	Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results	39
V.	SUMMARY	53
	Conclusions and Discussion	55
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY		59
APPENDIX - CURRENT ISSUE QUESTIONNAIRE		66

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Characteristics of the Subjects	37
II.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Achievement	40
III.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Deference	40
IV.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Order	42
V.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Exhibition	42
VI.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Autonomy	43
VII.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Affiliation	44
VIII.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Intraception	45
IX.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Succorance	46
X.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Dominance	47
XI.	F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Abasement	48

Table | Page

XII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Nurturance 48

XIII. F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Change 49

XIV. F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Endurance 50

XV. F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Sex 51

XVI. F Score Reflecting Differences in Total PELS Scale Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Aggression 52

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

With the rapid expansion of industrialization, technology, and population, the dynamics of social change has accelerated within our society (Edwards, 1972). One of the most revolutionary changes is the emergence of experimental life styles (Hedgepeth, 1971). Toffler (1970, p. 306) defines life style as: "the way in which the individual expresses his identification with this or that subcult."

Toffler (1970) has suggested that the increase of subcults within society has resulted in an increased number of possible life styles and that the number of alternatives will continue to increase. Mass media have publicized the emergence of these experimental life styles and large numbers of youth are aware of and may be seriously considering the possibilities of participating in these nonconventional life styles (Edwards, 1972). Some undoubtedly experiment with these life styles because they feel it is fashionable or exciting. Much of the available information is of a promotional or sensational nature and there exists a limited amount of sound research concerning the experimental life styles as well as information concerning youths' perceptions of these life styles.

There is a tendency to assume that most youth are accepting of and

favor the various experimental life styles. However, research shows this is not true. For example, Edwards (1972), in a National survey of college students, found that their perceptions toward experimental life styles were far more conservative and that their perceptions coincided more with the traditional Judeo-Christian concept of marriage and family living than is generally assumed. Edwards found that less than 25 percent of the students' perceptions reflected acceptance of the experimental life styles considered in the study. It was also found that the majority (70 percent) believed traditional monogamous marriage is the most fulfilling type of man-woman relationship.

While experimental life styles remain in the minority, there is no doubt that in recent years there has been a significant increase in both the incidence in and acceptance of these life styles. According to Reich (1971), what is phenomenal is the increasing tolerance which our society seems to be expressing toward experimental life styles.

As Edwards (1972) has suggested, social scientists are increasingly becoming aware of the important implications which the recent emergence of experimental life styles has for our society. It is becoming increasingly apparent that there is a need to identify etiological factors which are associated with some youths' rejection of traditional family life patterns and acceptance of various experimental life styles.

Sussman and Cogswell (1972, p. 381), as well as others, believe that alternate life styles "are influencing the structure, interaction patterns, and activities of today's nuclear family and will continue to have such effects in the future."

Currently sufficient evidence does not exist concerning what some of the more important immediate long range effects of alternate life

styles may be either upon the growth and development of individuals or upon social relationships. Because of the increased interest in and incidence of alternate life styles, social science researchers must begin to explore the potential effects of experimental life styles on human growth and development. One of the most important stages of such research is to examine what the perceptions of youth are concerning various experimental life styles and to identify those factors which are closely associated with acceptance of experimental life styles.

Purpose

The general purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceptions of experimental life styles and selected personality needs represented in the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (1959). Such perceptions were measured by the Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale (Edwards, 1972). Specifically, the purpose of the study was to determine if any significant differences existed in the total Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores according to the respondents' perceptions of the level to which they possess each of the following personality needs:

1. Achievement--Characterized by ambition, to succeed, to do one's best, to accomplish something of great significance.

2. Deference--Characterized by dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional.

3. Order--Characterized by neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and to plan in advance; orderly schedule.

4. Exhibition--Characterized by attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.

5. Autonomy--Characterized by independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations.

6. Affiliation--Characterized by need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments.

7. Intraception--Characterized by need to know, to understand--what and why, to analyze and empathize.

8. Succorance--Characterized by receiving help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others.

9. Dominance--Characterized by the need to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence.

10. Abasement--Characterized by conscience, the need to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority.

11. Nurturance--Characterized by the need to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous.

12. Change--Characterized by variety, novelty, the need to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine.

13. Endurance--Characterized by perseverence, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful.

14. Sex--Characterized by the need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do something involving sex.

15. Aggression--Characterized by the need to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one things of others.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Very little literature is available concerning attitudes toward and perceptions of experimental life styles. The following is a selected review of the research and thoughts which have been reported concerning experimental life styles, with emphasis in the areas of extra-marital relationships, homosexual marriages, cohabitation, trial marriages, group marriages, and communal living.

Extra-Marital Relationships

When mutual consent to sexual freedom within marriage occurs, it is often referred to as co-marital sexual relations or consensual adultery (Smith and Smith, 1970). Bernard (1969, p. 52) states: "married couples have become increasingly willing to accept a new kind of marriage that preserves permanence at the expense of exclusivity." Merton and Nesbit (1966, p. 326) have stated:

> there is a cost to linking marriage too exclusively with sexual expression. . . . If the marital bond is given primacy and is guaranteed to be secure, then confining sex expression to it is a strait jacket which many people seem unable to endure.

Neubeck and Schletzer (1962) found that marriage partners try to deal with dissatisfaction by fantasy rather than real involvement; and, that no significant difference was found between those highly satisfied with their marriage and those in the low satisfactory group in regard to

becoming sexually involved or emotionally involved.

Johnson (1970a) in a study of 100 upper-middle class, middle-aged couples, residing in a Midwestern community, found 16 (32 percent) of the postparental families and 12 (24 percent) of the launching families had been affected by at least one extra-marital sexual affair.

In another study, Johnson (1970b) found that husbands who had experienced extra-marital involvement had a lower degree of sexual satisfaction and marital adjustment in their marriage than did those husbands who had not become extra-maritally involved. In addition, there appeared to be a basic sex difference between husbands and wives in the following areas: (1) opportunity for involvement, (2) perceived desire of others for involvement, (3) potential involvement, (4) justification for involvement, and (5) marital adjustment and involvement.

Morton Hunt in The Affair (1969) suggests that some people, despite strong consciences and puritan-romantic values, find the first infidelity rather easy due to special circumstances that temporarily lower their defenses and override their conflicts. For conscience-controlled people, particularly puritan-romantics who once had (or wanted to have) a totally committed and involved marriage, it is rare for the extra-marital affair to remain casual or emotionally limited. Instead, it tends to be a dynamic and disruptive process that either grows by invading and claiming parts of the marriage, or is counter-attacked by it and driven off. For other persons, their affairs have no significant effects upon their marital relationship. For some, an affair makes a person a happier and more easy-going person than he would otherwise have been. Hunt (1969), in his research, found about half the men and half the women indicated that their affairs made their marriage

more tolerable. Hunt also found that over 25 percent of those persons who knew about their spouse's affair expressed reactions which could be characterized as tolerant, understanding, or even happy; however, 75 percent reacted in a more traditional fashion, with behaviors running the gamut from total passivity to violent action. Approximately one-third of those who learn of their mate's infidelities threaten divorce if they do not refrain.

In a research study for Psychology Today, Athanasiou, Shaver, and Travis (1970) report that while nearly 80 percent of the respondents condoned extra-marital relations in varying circumstances, only 40 percent of the married men and 36 percent of the married women were or had engaged in extra-marital relations. Husbands reported a greater number of partners, and an earlier involvement after marriage than did wives--73 percent of the men within the first five years of marriage as compared to 57 percent of the women. However, once started, the women reported about the same frequency of extra-marital intercourse as the men.

What seems to be a recently new phenomenon in extra-marital relations is "swinging" or mate-swapping. It has been defined by Symonds (1968) as the willingness of a husband and wife to exchange sexual partners with a couple with whom they are not acquainted, or the willingness of a husband and wife to have sexual intercourse with strangers.

Bartell (1970, p. 114) suggests that "Evidently, the interest in swinging . . . came about as the result of an article in Mr. magazine in 1956." The estimated numbers of swingers range from one to ten million people involved.

Mace (Bell, 1971) offers the following merits of swinging: (1) complete openness and honesty about sex, (2) equality rights in all

sexual exchanges between husbands and wives; and, the following demerits: (1) fear of the children finding out, (2) social criticism or blackmail, (3) threat to the marriage should an emotional involvement develop, (4) risk of venereal disease, (5) superficiality of worth based on physical beauty, and (6) suppression of humaneness during sexual intercourse.

However, in a study utilizing an experimental group composed of mate-sharing couples and a control group of married couples who had never experienced co-marital sexual behavior, Schupp (1970) noted several similarities and differences. Both groups were found to be similar in background attitudes toward nudity and sex, self concept, and happiness and satisfaction of their marriages. The groups were different in that: the experimental group had background of more numerous premarital sexual relations with partners other than their spouse; the experimental group believed that sex and love were two distinct human needs whereas the control group disagreed; the experimental group indicated they were more honest with their spouse than the control group; and the experimental group did not view adultery as cause for separation or divorce whereas the control group did. In general, the swingers appeared to be representative of middle-class America, except in the area of sexual orientation.

Athenasiou, Shaver, and Travis (1970) reported that while only five percent of the married couples in their study had participated in swinging either a few times or frequently, over 30 percent reported they might be interested in such sexual activity.

In the sexual activities themselves, same-sex activity among women is usually encouraged, whereas same-sex activity among men is not

condoned, if at all tolerated (Bartell, 1970; Denfeld and Gordon, 1970; O'Neill and O'Neill, 1970; and, Smith and Smith, 1970).

The four most common methods of acquiring partners according to Bartell (1970) are advertisement in magazines, swinging bars, personal reference, and personal recruitment.

Smith and Smith (1970) in a study of swinging couples found that 34 percent of the females and 27 percent of the males reported feelings of jealousy; and, that some of the controls on jealousy are that the marriage command paramount loyalty, that physical but not emotional interest develop, that singles be avoided, and there be no concealment of sexual activities.

Denfeld and Gordon (1970) and Brecher (1969) suggest that swinging couples can work to reassure one another, through verbal and non-verbal statements, that their marriage is of foremost importance.

Brecher (1969) indicates that people freed of sexual inhibitions do not behave in a fixed manner whether in swinging or in other patterns of behavior, but rather show a wide variation.

It is apparent that "when swinging works for a couple, it appears to be when the couple are able to separate sex with other partners from their relationship to one another" (Bell, 1971, p. 70).

Homosexual Marriages

Long term relationships between members of the same sex are not a phenomenon of recent years. History of various cultures points to the existence of homosexual relationships of an enduring nature far back in time. An editorial in Time (October 31, 1969, p. 65) states:

For varying reasons, homosexual relations have been condoned

> and even encouraged among certain males. . . . However, few scholars have been able to determine that homosexuality had any effect on the functioning of those cultures.

In his Symposium, Plato tells of homosexual relationships in which "the pair are lost in an amazement of love and friendship and intimacy, and will not be out of the other's sight, as I may say, even for a moment: these are the people who pass their lives together" (Jowett, 1937, p. 318).

A special report in Newsweek (August 23, 1971, p. 46) points to the fact that:

> Homosexuals have effectively established the beginnings of a distinctively gay public life style. In a dozen cities around the country, homosexual clergymen have set up their own churches, where they perform all normal religious rites, including marriage. Since 1969, more than 100 homosexual couples have been 'married' in this fashion . . . although the legality of their unions is doubtful.

However, if one is to accept the definition of marriage as that which "makes two people married to each other is that they perceive themselves to be married, bonded, committed" (Constantine and Constantine, 1971a, p. 159), then it is not the legality of the union, but rather the relationship between the two people and their common relationship to society which constitutes marriage.

Presently, only four states, Idaho, Illinois, Colorado, and Connecticut recognize the rights of the homosexual to pursue his own life style (Newsweek, 1971, p. 47).

An editorial in Christian Century (March 3, 1971) suggests that the acceptance of homosexuals as normal human beings not only threatens the accepted norm in sexual expression but also threatens the complete concept of sex mores.

Epstein (1970, p. 50) also indicates the precarious position of those who would prefer to live openly in this life style:

> If heterosexual life has come to seem impossibly difficult, homosexual life still seems more nearly impossible. For to be a homosexual is to be hostage to a passion that automatically brings terrible pressures to bear on any man that lives with it. . . . However openly it is now carried on, however wide the public tolerance for it, it is no more accepted privately than it ever was. . . . I think there is no resolution for this pain in our lifetime.

In a study of attitudes toward sex roles and feelings of adequacy, Dickey (1961) found that homosexual males tend to idealize with the role of the typical heterosexual rather than the typical homosexual; and, that homosexual males tend to feel more adequate if they are homosexually married. Such marriages are being encouraged, and they are visibly increasing. The Reverend Troy Perry, founder of the Metropolitan Community Church of Los Angeles, suggests homosexual marriages may serve to "deepen personal relationships and cut down on sexual promiscuity with its attendant psychological and venereal disease problems" (Cleath, 1970, p. 49). Perry requires that the couple give evidence of having known each other for a minimum of six months, and attend two counseling sessions. Perry has performed more than 40 such marriages of which only two had not survived. In the legally unrecognized ceremony, the words "friends" and "spouse" are substituted for the more traditional "man" and "wife" (Cleath, 1970). However, Perry does not encourage wedding ceremonies per se, stating:

> It's important to some couples and not to others, I don't feel that saying some magical words over some person's head is going to make a relationship any better or worse. You have to work at a relationship. (Tobin and Wicker, 1972, p. 26)

Wright (1971, p. 285) has outlined the Roman Catholic position as being in distinct opposition to homosexual marriages: "No confessional

family or denomination has moved a single centimeter toward sanctioning marriage of members of the same sex, and probably none will in the near future."

In suggesting that there are as many different types of homosexual behavior as heterosexual behavior, Thompson (Green, 1964, p. 11) has stated: "the interpersonal relations of homosexuals present the same problems as are found in heterosexual situations."

Kinsey, Pomeroy, and Martin (1948), Hooker (1965), and Hoffman (1968) agree that male homosexual marriages of any duration are relatively rare. However, Hooker (1956) does suggest the desire for such permanent relationships; and, that for some homosexuals, the most important group memberships are those centered around informal social groups composed of friends and/or the homosexual marriage itself.

Lowen (Redbook, November, 1971, p. 94) has suggested the future will bring about more homosexual relationships of an enduring nature.

Reuben (1969), Kaye (1971), and Lowen (Redbook, 1971), as well as other writers in the field of human sexual behavior, have revealed the belief that longstanding relationships are considerably more common among female homosexuals than among male homosexuals.

There appear to be differences between male and female homosexual marriages from their beginning. Hoffman (1968) found female homosexuals usually engaging in courtship rituals similar to those of heterosexuals to a much greater extent than male homosexuals. Females typically become socially acquainted with each other first, then date, and tend to leave the sexual involvement until later in the relationship.

Wilbur (Marmor, 1965) found that in some apparently stable female relationships, either or both partners secretly indulge in sexual

relations with other female homosexuals. Discovery of such infidelity often resulted in a dissolvement of the marriage.

Klemesrud (1971) reports that many female homosexuals indeed do form marriages or permanent households, and that some have or adopt children.

After having studied some 30 male homosexual marriages, Hooker (1965, p. 102) concludes that such marriages contain:

> Complex problems of role management and practical problems of domestic establishment must be solved, as they are subject to the strains of a hostile heterosexual society as well as to those of the homosexual world. That many do survive these pressures is well established by my data. . . . Contrary to widespread belief these roles (of sex and gender) are not clearly dichotomized between masculine and feminine . . . . Instead, the variety and the form of sexual acts between pair members, the distribution of tasks performed, and the character of their performance do not permit us to make such a differentiation. New solutions appear for which the old terms are inapplicable. In part, we may attribute the emergence of the new solutions to the changing culture of the homosexual world.

Thompson (Green, 1964), Hooker (1965), Hoffman (1969) and Poole (1970) have indicated the following as some of the difficulties interfering with the establishment and maintenance of homosexual marriages:

1. Promiscuity;
2. Lack of institutionalization by church and state;
3. Lack of partner participation in the heterosexual world;
4. Inability to live together in avoidance of suspicion of sexual orientation;
5. The family relations of individual members may become strained if knowledge of their marriage is revealed;
6. Social prohibition against male intimacy;
7. The individual incorporating into his own conscience the

prohibition against such forms of male closeness;

8. Guilt as a result of sustained homosexual relationships; and
9. The marriage itself is a constant reminder that one is crossing societal rules.

Hoffman (1968, p. 177) has noted with irony the social forces which act to prevent most males from becoming homosexuals are those same social forces which "reach into the lives of those who do become homosexuals and prevent them from developing closeness in a sexual relationship with another man."

Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard (1953, p. 682) point out that promiscuity is characteristic of males, and that "they are more likely to desire a variety of sexual partners. Females have a greater capacity for being faithful to a single partner."

Hoffman (1968) suggests a distinction between promiscuity and an inability or severe difficulty in forming lasting paired relationships and attributes a tendency toward promiscuity in males to psychological differences between males and females with respect to erotic response.

In his study of male homosexuals, Sonenschein (1968, p. 81) has distinguished two types of permanent, close relationships. One he terms "marriage" and the other "co-habitation." Marriage is characterized by the following complex of traits: (1) some sort of ritual, usually in imitation of the heterosexual marriage ceremony, (2) a material demarcation of the union as in the exchange of wedding rings, (3) a value system of the participants, based on a romantic conception of ideally unending love, and (4) a tendency to dichotomize social roles. Whereas, cohabitation is:

less formalized, often the only event being a personal

> exchange of rings and/or the setting up of a household. It too was based on a conception of love but the relationship was less predominantly sexual as was the previous variety; there was a more conscious attempt by the individuals involved to aim at congruence of values and interests.

Sonenschein has found cohabitation to be more stable than marriage, because marriage with its inherent characteristics, mentioned above, tends to integrate the couple into the homosexual community whereas cohabitation does not integrate the couple to the same degree.

In his study of homosexuals, Weinberg (1970) noted the following:

1. Homosexuals improve in psychological adjustment as they age;
2. Young homosexuals and older homosexuals (under 26 and over 45 respectively) scored lower in homosexual association and higher in heterosexual association;
3. No age difference appeared for unhappiness or depression;
4. Younger homosexuals worry more about their homosexuality becoming known than do older homosexuals;
5. Younger homosexuals were lower in self acceptance, stability of self concept, highest in negative feeling states on a psychological adjustment scale, and highest in psychosomatic system and feelings of interpersonal awkwardness.

Athanasiou et al (1970) in reporting the findings of Psychology Today's sex survey received more than 850 respondents acknowledging their homosexuality. The results of which follow:

1. Male homosexuals were more active than female homosexuals;
2. Female homosexuals generally orgasm more often than heterosexual females, and they are twice as likely to be multi-orgasmic on each sexual occasion;

3. Homosexual respondents appear to be as satisfied with their sex lives as heterosexuals;
4. Homosexuals are generally not guilt-ridden;
5. Homosexuals expressed fear of social disapproval--49 percent of the men and 36 percent of the women;
6. The strain of living in both the homosexual and heterosexual worlds is noted as a major contributor to breakups between lovers;
7. Relationships are more likely to last in large cities where homosexuals get support and approval from friends.

Bass-Hass (1968) found in her study of white and non-white female homosexuals that whites tend to initiate homosexual relations earlier than non-whites; that white female homosexuals are less likely to be satisfied in permanent relationships than non-whites; and, that whites are less likely to have heterosexual contacts prior to entering into a female homosexual relationship.

Freedman (1967) found that women, in general, regardless of choice of sexual outlets, are more oriented to the interpersonal aspects than to sexual aspects of relationships.

Of current interest to many people is the recent "Gay Movement" which, according to Young (1971), is attempting to abolish male supremacy and sex-determined roles in society. The Gay Movement is seeking a sexual freedom for all men and women based on pleasure through equality. Some homosexuals, having already broken with gender programming, feel they have a better chance than many heterosexuals to build relationships based on equality due to less enforcement of roles.

Cohabitation

According to Webster (1966), cohabitation is defined as living together as husband and wife though not legally married and implying sexual intercourse. Van Horne (1969, p. 69) has stated:

> Living together without the benediction of marriage is the new vogue on University campuses and among young people who dwell in those giddy habitations restricted to 'singles.' The affair is without commitment or any assumption of permanence.

Some cohabitation does indeed go beyond the self-directed stage, but precluding marriage for one reason or another. Bernard (1969, p. 52) suggests:

> Growing numbers of young men and women approve semi-permanent liaisons with a loved one that may or may not lead to marriage. For as long as these relations last, young people are more apt to insist more strictly than their elders upon 'fidelity based authentic emotion.'

In Bloch's report (1969) some of the reasons for students establishing unmarried households are: preparation for marriage, rebellion against institutionalism, and temporary convenience. Those who commented they were not planning to marry gave various reasons: fear of marriage, desire to continue the extension-of-dating relationship, importance of other goals (often educational or professional), or fear the marriage might destroy the present relationship. Others felt "too immature, too unsettled emotionally, to be ready for a permanent commitment. Living together, they felt, was giving them time to come to grips with their own ambivalent feelings" (Bloch, 1969, p. 142).

Hunt (1969) suggests that cohabitation is essentially monogamous. As a rule there is not the engagement in mate-swapping or open infidelity.

Through cohabitation, many young people attempt to find meaning in their lives, their society, and their interpersonal relationships, rather than the guilt surrounding sex which plagued the previous generation.

Trial Marriages

One of the first persons in the United States who sought to make marriage laws conform to the nature of human behavior was the Denver, Colorado, juvenile court jurist, Judge Ben B. Lindsey. In the early part of 1926, Lindsey began writing numerous articles on trial marriages, and the following year his book, The Companionate Marriage appeared. Lindsey has stated:

> It is my contention that we must finally learn to face things as they really are, and that we must sooner or later provide that persons who are unready or unfitted for permanent marriage . . . be given a form of marriage which would not involve children, and which would permit a legally supervised living together with legally permitted nullification by mutual consent--such union to be capable of becoming permanent by means of a special contract that could be entered into only by persons who are obviously competent and who obviously know their own minds. (Redbook, 1966, p. 4)

Bertrand Russell (1957) agreed with Lindsey's idea, but felt it did not go far enough. Russell thought trial marriages would attempt to introduce some stability into the sexual relations of the young, in place of the present promiscuity.

Lindsey and Russell were societal outcasts after their declaration of another form of marriage and the idea of trial marriages was nearly forgotten until Margaret Mead (1966) revived the idea, built on Lindsey's The Companionate Marriage, and suggested a marriage theory in two steps: the first offered the individual marriage with simple

ceremony, limited economic responsibilities, easy divorce if desired, and no children; and the second step proposed a parental marriage undertaken when the couple desire children and wish to assume life-time responsibility for their children. The parental marriage would be more difficult to enter into and leave, and would include mutual continuing responsibility for any children.

Responses to Mead's proposal ranged from disapproval for suggesting a two-step marriage to complaints from students for setting up too much structure. Mead, after receiving numerous responses, reported:

> It now seems clear to me that neither elders nor young people want to make a change to two forms of marriage. They want to reserve the word 'marriage' for a commitment that they can feel is permanent and final, no matter how often the actual marriages fail. . . . I believe we have to say at present: If you want the experience of full-time companionship with someone you love . . . you had better get legally married, use contraceptives responsibly and risk divorce later. You are risking more if you don't. (Redbook, 1968, p. 50)

Also in 1966, Cadwallader proposed a flexible contract with periodic options to renew, suggesting and reminding that adults are not the only ones to suffer in unhappy marriages, but that children often receive the anxiety and tensions of their parent's relationship (Cadawaller, 1966).

Following Mead and Cadawaller, a three-step marriage plan was proposed by Scriven (1967) consisting of a preliminary marriage (cohabitation), a personal marriage (contract, but no provision for child support), and a parental marriage (the husband would be expected to support any offspring).

Satir (1967) suggested an "apprentice period" for people contemplating marriage, and a five-year renewable contract, and specially trained, government financed, substitute parents for children of

dissolved marriages. Her reasoning was that marriage as we know it in the Western Christian world has no time length, no opportunity for review, and no socially acceptable means of termination.

In The Sexual Wilderness, Vance Packard (1968) recommended a two-year confirmation period, after which marriage would become final or would be dissolved.

Rimmer (1969) in The Harrad Letters favors a structured, socially approved form of pre-marital experimentation that would give the male and female opportunity to realize themselves fully, without guilt, and to adjust to their new marital roles without legal entanglement, recognizing marriage as the commitment a couple makes to society when they decide to have children.

The 1969 National Council on Family Relations Workshop held opposing views of trial marriage; some participants feeling it should be morally sanctioned by society as an alternative, and others felt it was not the same as a real marriage and therefore not a valid preparation for marriage (Berger, 1971).

In summarizing trial marriages, Berger (1971) suggests further study; and, as a marriage counselor and emotional health consultant, she recommends a type of service to young people, legal and otherwise, such that they might learn from the experiences of trial marriages; however, she also suggests there is some question as to motivation for trial marriages and its effects upon the participants.

Group Marriages

Constantine and Constantine (1971a, p. 165) defines group marriage as "any marriage of two or more men and two or more women." The

evidence suggests that group marriage is a new phenomenon dating from the mid-sixties, and the popularization of such novels as Rimmer's Harrad Experiment and Yale Marratt, and Heinlein's Stranger in a Strange Land and The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress. Kilgo (1972) indicates that, in many cases, group marriage evolves out of a group experience with swinging. Constantine and Constantine (1971b) also support this, finding that half of the respondents reported having had swinging or mate-swapping experiences.

Kilgo (1972) noted that group marriage, to its participants, offers greater security (materially and psychologically), wider sexual variety, greater potential for personal growth and individualism, the benefit to children of having more than two parents to love and care for them, and a broader economic base from which to operate a household.

Herbert Smith differs with many others in his view of individual development and interpersonal growth through the group marriage since:

> In those societies where polygyny is practiced or where the extended family is well developed, individualism is achieved only at great cost to both the actor and the family. It may well be that one of the real costs of the security of group marriage is a denial of one's individualism and the opportunities for growth and development to say nothing of privacy (Kilgo, 1972, p. 11).

In a study of group marriage by Constantine and Constantine (1971b) the following were noted as characteristic of those entering group marriages: (1) the median age was 31, (2) the majority were married at the time of entry and entered as couples, and (3) the median total group income was $15,000 per annum.

Rimmer has noted three common elements in group marriage: (1) high education level of couples involved, (2) the couples have been married several years and communicate reasonably well in their monogamous lives,

and (3) they avoid any publicity of their group marital life (Kilgo, 1972).

Constantine and Constantine (1971b, p. 225) found jealousy to be a function of age, and that groups do learn with time to cope with jealousy or even overcome it altogether; that sexual problems diminish as a function of group experience; that there is less sex role differentiation and more freedom in choice of roles and tasks; and that group sexual involvement becomes more likely as the group endures; and, in general "we find groups learning to cope , . . through maturation and a variety of adaptive mechanisms, such as special frameworks for decision making."

Athenasiou et al (1970) found that only nine percent of their respondents were in favor of group marriage, while another 16 percent thought they might be interested.

Group marriage follows:

> A more typical marital pattern is being formed in a single process, continuing in the same form for some time, and if dissolving, dissolving in a single process. Turnover of members of the conjugal unit is rare. (Constantine and Constantine, 1971a, p. 162)

Communal Living

Communes are not a mid-twentieth century phenomenon born of the discontent of our times, but rather have existed with varying degrees of success for many generations. Good News for Modern Man, an English translation of the New Testament gives the following account in Acts 2: 44-45:

> All believers continued together in close fellowship and shared their belongings with one another. They would sell their property and possessions and distribute the money among them according to what they need.

Mead (1970, p. 51) states:

> The belief that a small group of determined, like-minded idealists could set out to construct a little closed society whose members, sharing everything, would be a living demonstration that the good life . . . was within reach of dedicated human beings has recurred in almost every period of social turmoil and change.

In the early 1800's the first of what was to become a long series of experiments of group living emerged in the form of religious families whose retreat from the world took the form of communal living. Hutterites, Zoarites, Fourierites, Shakers, Moravians, Perfectionalists, Spiritualists, Separatists, and the Onedia Community organized around leaders who felt "called" to lead these pioneers in group living (Kephart, 1966). Mead (1970, p. 52) states:

> In the years before the Civil War and even later, more than 100 different Utopian communes sprang up and briefly prospered here. Only a few, such as the Hutterites, have survived, or like the Mormons, have merged with the larger community.

Kovach (1970) notes that the more successful groups were precise and exacting in the form of commitment required to enter a commune. And, while the form of commitment has a relationship to family stability, the significance of marriage varies with the controlling agency, whether church, kinship group, state, or a private matter based on personal ideology (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

In the early 1930's, communal living came to be called the "Bohemian" way of life. Although it centered in New York City, groups existed in various parts of the country. Not necessarily dropouts or misfits, these people were artistic, political liberals,

> . . . many of whom went on to produce notable works of their maturity after World War II. They were transient, cosmopolitan people, and the really remarkable thing . . . is that they stayed together as long as they did. (Evans, 1964, p. 15)

The decades between the 1940's and 1960's saw few developments in communal living. However, the 1960's saw once again the emergence of communal living. The first born of the new communes came into being in the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco in 1964. Within three years this epicenter of dissent creativity had been made shambles by the communal movement's two greatest enemies: drugs and mass media had robbed the dwellers of their spontaneity and facilities (Hedgepeth, 1971). Newsweek (August 18, 1969, p. 90) reported:

> By October, 1967, the once gentle Haight-Ashbury scene had turned into an overcrowded Miami Beach for the younger generation. When things really became unbearable, word went out from the hippie elite . . . 'The Haight is not where it's at --it's in your head and hands. Gather into tribes; take it anywhere. Disperse.'

Robinson (1970, p. 91) suggests the communal movement seems to have been taken over by a more stable, serious-minded people:

> This, then, is no hodge-podge of long-haired freakouts, although they are in a real sense a part of the dropout generation. They are, more significantly, a group of young Americans who find something basically wrong,--for them,--undesirable about how people in this country live and think, and therefore chose to remove themselves from the mainstream.

By mid-1969, it was estimated that roughly 10,000 hippies had settled in more than 500 communes across the country (Newsweek, August 18, 1969). By 1971, the estimates were close to 3,000 communes with no estimate of the total number of residents (Otto, 1971). Haughey (1971, p. 255) has stated: "both in quality and range of group styles the present commune phenomenon seems unprecedented."

Mead (1970, p. 51) presents a description of communes as understood by most people:

> Contemporary communes present a spectacle of young men and women living in casual promiscuity, often warm, loving and

> generous in their concern for one another but also unconcerned with longer-term responsibility. Many take drugs to excess. Most are resistant to any rules of cleanliness and hygiene and many are ignorant of the simplest skills necessary for survival. Affectionate and permissive toward children, many nevertheless are deeply neglectful of their children's urgent needs. Wretchedly housed, ragged and unkempt, most live as parasites on the working community from which they have cut themselves adrift.

A report in Life (July 18, 1969) describes communal members seeking in the land, and in one another, meaningful work, mutual love and spiritual rebirth. The use of drugs and marijuana is permitted in some communes, but many have banned them. Some take broad views of sexual morality, but many couples practice traditional monogamy. Often, children are reared by all the adults and by the older children, collectively referred to as the "family."

Haughey (1971, p. 255) notes two general classifications of communes--irresponsible and sincere. In speaking of marriage and interpersonal relationships in communal living, he states:

> The very convenience of joining an urban commune doesn't make for very good marriages or for stable voluntary families. The minimal commitment exacted leaves them accessible to the irresponsible who happen along, take what they can get, and go their way.

Otto (1971) has noted the following characteristics which appear to be common to most communes:

1. Interest in ecology,
2. Anti-establishment sentiment,
3. The belief that living can be a continuous source of joy,
4. Strong, inner search for meaning in life,
5. Strong trend toward ownership of land and homes,
6. Preference toward vegetarianism and organic foods,
7. Considerable sexual permissiveness, high degree of pairing,

casual acceptance of nudity, and a preference for natural childbirth,

8. Interest in spiritual development.

Some of the major problems which appear to face most communes and contribute to their relatively short life span are:

1. Problems involving authority and structure, those with transcendental or spiritual values seem to have highest survival rate;
2. Problems of economics;
3. Narcotics, especially in communes where drug use is extensive;
4. Overcrowding and lack of privacy;
5. Hostility of surrounding communities; and
6. Interpersonal conflicts, often fueled by the exchange of sexual partners and resulting jealousy (Otto, 1971 and 1972; Hedgepeth, 1971).

Smith and Sternfield (1970) noted patterns of responsibility, social integration and monetary conflicts as major communal problems; and, education of the young on the commune, organizational parental schooling, stressing music, folk arts and crafts, and practicing outdoor and domestic skills as indicators of successful communes.

Hedgepeth (1971, p. 232) notes as a uniqueness of communal life the concept of relating while living in close proximity; and, states:

> Their whole life-style is a statement; a commitment to recover those human relationships that make existence make sense--and to reclaim, as well, the lost realms within themselves.

After having lived in The Community, a white, middle-class, well-educated commune in the Pacific Northwest, French (1971) suggests communal life to be as alienating as the more traditional life. He states, in regard to communal interpersonal relationships, that building interpersonal relationships over time depends upon a person "stretching" himself in uncomfortable directions, and most people are unwilling to make such an effort. French (1971, p. 35) further states:

> If the counter culture has rejected grades, authority, the nuclear family, it has carried over from the straight world, the fragmentation of lives, immersion in abstraction, and an atomistic version of individual growth.

Types of communes vary greatly, and it is not clear at this time which hold the most promise for enduring. Hippie communes seem to have been the most prominent contemporary developments, with other types in various degrees of refinement following. Davidson (1970, p. 91) comments on hippie life:

> Being a hippie means dropping out completely, and finding another way to live, to support one's self physically and spiritually. . . . It means saying no to competition, no to the work ethic, no to technology's products, no to political systems and games. . . . The hippie alternative is to turn inward and reach backward for roots, simplicity, and the tribal experience.

Houriet (1969, p. 91) describes life in one hippie commune:

> Work in the usual sense--8 hours a day, 40 hours a week--for money--was shunned. . . . There was a substantial amount of purposeful activity . . . but it was a sometime thing. . . . We came into the family with ego hangups of one sort (sic). Our life together wears down these hangups until a sort of group spirit takes over. . . . In some hippie communes, group sex is standard procedure. At a few in the Southwest, newcomers are given to understand from the outset that property and bodies are to be shared freely, on demand. . . . There was a fairly widespread feeling . . . that birth control methods were unnatural.

Religious communes are perhaps the second largest in number. The

Tulsa World (July 8, 1971, p. 7c) reports on an 800 member Society of Brothers commune located in the Allegheny Mountains in Southwestern Pennsylvania in three settlements. One of the oldest of religious communes, started in Germany in 1920, these settlements are economically self-sufficient, educate their children through the 8th grade, and own all property in common. Marriage and community living are regarded as lifetime commitments, and big families are condoned.

Christianity Today (April 23, 1971) reports on several religious communes; a 300 member non-denominational group which moved from Southern California to Indiana to get away from the hustle and bustle, smog and problems in public schools; a group of 500 which left Southern California in 1968 for locations in Missouri, Tennessee and Georgia; a 250 member group which moved in March, 1971, to Tennessee to start an agricultural commune; and, a 200 member "Christ's Household of Faith" commune in Mora, Minnesota.

While all communes seem to include ecological values, a few have been established with this as a central purpose for being. These may be called "Agricultural Subsistence Communes," or "Nature Communes," with emphasis on supporting the ecological system, farming organically with the intent of making the commune self-supporting, and enjoying nature (Otto, 1971, p. 17). Hoffman (1970, p. 222) found that most "commune members are obsessed with ecology--and on all fronts, from population control to chemical fertilizers."

Political and social change is the goal of at least one family in a commune reported by Poppy (1971, p. 81). The husband emphasized, "Politics is a lens we use to look at everything, including marriage." As socialists, they say their goal is "no ownership . . . that's where

we're going, not where we are." In some political communes, classes are conducted, strategy formulated and carried out, and minority causes organized. They often identify themselves by the single word "revolutionary" (Otto, 1971, p. 19).

Other types are the Craft communes, where the enjoyment of one or more crafts serves as a focal point for the group; Service communes, with emphasis on organizing communities, helping people plan and carry out community projects, and sharing of professional services; Art communes, painters, sculptors, or poets working together but usually selling their works individually; Teaching communes, which promote particular systems of techniques and methods; Homosexual communes, currently found in large urban areas; Growth-centered communes, focused on helping members to become self-actualized; Mobile or Gypsy communes, travelling in cars, buses, or trucks; and, Street or Neighborhood communes, for those who wish to live communally (Otto, 1971).

Skinner (Todd, 1970) author of Walden Two has expressed hope that communal life will aid in a move toward a society in which the family is replaced by a larger social group.

Morrone (1971) cites a poll taken by Glamor of 350 single college women concerning their attitudes toward sex, contraceptives, and communal living. The poll indicated the respondents were aware of the pro's and con's of communal living but favored love and marriage in the traditional monogamous setting.

There is considerable mobility in communes, which appears to be symptomatic of an epidemic wanderlust and search for a better life. Twin Oaks in the Virginia Hills came close to a seventy percent turnover last year. The ones who leave are often the most competent who still

expected special recognition for their talents. However, it is noted that once exposed to communal living, the majority of people will maintain a communal life style (Otto, 1971).

Davidson (1970) evidenced at Freedom Farm, one of the oldest communes to start on open land, that the second generation of communally reared is leaving the commune.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were undergraduate college students enrolled in undergraduate family relations courses at seven universities, representing five regions of the country. The data were collected from the following seven universities: (a) University of Arizona, and Oklahoma State University, representing the Southwest region; (b) Oregon State University, representing the Northwest region; (c) Michigan State University, representing the Midwest region; (d) University of Alabama, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, representing the Southeast region; (e) New York State University, representing the Northeastern region.

The data were collected between December, 1971, and January, 1972. A total sample of 768 students was obtained. The students were primarily single and between the ages of 19 and 22.

Description of Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study was developed and reported by Edwards (1972) for the purpose of investigating college students' perceptions of experimental life styles. The questionnaire included fixed alternative type questions. Items were included in the instrument to

obtain the following information:

a. Background characteristics of subjects, such as sex, age, and religious preference;

b. Perception of selected experimental life styles;

c. Perception of certain personality characteristics of the subjects.

In order to determine college students' perceptions of experimental life styles, the PELS Scale was developed by Edwards (1972).

In order to determine the student's self-perceived level of certain basic personality needs, a modified version of the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (Edwards, 1959) was used.

Perception of Experimental Life Styles

In order to measure the college students' favorableness of perceptions toward experimental life styles, the Perception of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale was developed by Edwards (1972). The PELS Scale is a 35 item Lickert-type scale, which seeks to determine perceptions of each of the following experimental life styles: (a) extra-marital sex relations with consent of spouse, (b) extra-marital sex relations without knowledge of spouse, (c) homosexual marriages, (d) cohabitation, (e) trial marriages, (f) group marriage, and (g) communal living.

Each of these seven experimental life styles was represented by five items. Each of the 35 items in the scale is characterized by five degrees of response: (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, and (e) strongly disagree. The answers were scored so that the most favorable response was given the highest score, and the least

favorable response was given the lowest score. A response which was given the highest score was assumed to reflect the most favorable perception of the experimental life style. As an indication of the validity of the items in the PELS Scale, the items were presented to a panel of seven family life specialists, all of whom held advanced degrees in family life education or child development, who were asked to judge each of the items in terms of clarity, specificity, and relevancy (i.e., in this way the investigator was assisted in determining if each of the items dealing with a particular life style was actually appropriate in eliciting a perception of that particular life style).

As a further indication of validity of the PELS Scale, an item analysis utilizing the Chi-square test was undertaken to determine those items which significantly differentiated upper and lower quartile groups. It was found that all of the 35 items in the PELS Scale were significantly discriminating at the .001 level. In assessing the reliability of the items in the PELS Scale (Edwards, 1972), a split-half reliability coefficient of .95 was obtained.

Edwards Personal Preference Scale

In order to measure the college students' personality needs, the Edwards Personal Preference Scale was used. The EPPS is a 15 item scale designed to measure the following personality needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance (1) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

Each of the 15 items in the scale is characterized by ten numerical degrees of response ranging from one to ten. The answers were scored so that the highest level of need was given the highest score, and the lowest level of need was given the lowest score. For purpose of analysis, the ten degrees of responses were collapsed into five responses: Very High, High, Moderate, Low, and Very Low.

As an indication of validity, the EPPS was compared with projective tests and other personality inventories, such as the Thematic Apperception Test (TAT), and various modifications of it, as well as the Adjective Check List. The studies of self-ratings generally find moderate relationships between the EPPS and self-ratings. As an example, in Q-type analysis, the means of the EPPS scores and corresponding self-ratings correlated .56 (Korman, 1962).

In the test-retest reliability estimates, based on a one-week interval, the median is .79; the split-half reliability co efficients, the median is .78 (Edwards, 1959).

The Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) as used in this study is a modification of the original EPPS as used by Constantine and Constantine (1971b).

Analysis of Data

A percentage and frequency count was used in order to describe background characteristics of the subjects. An analysis of variance was used to examine the hypotheses: that there is no significant difference in total PELS Scale scores according to the respondent's self-perceived level of need of each of the following personality needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (e) exhibition,

(f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 768 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. Of the respondents, twenty-nine percent were male, and seventy-one percent were female. The ages of the respondents ranged from 17-18 years to over 30, with the largest number (45.57%) coming in the 19-20 year category, and the smallest number (1.19%) in the over 30 category.

The majority (62.91%) were Protestants. Most of the subjects (70.31%) indicated their degree of religious orientation as religious. The largest percentage (44.53%) of the respondents indicated that the religious orientation of the family in which they were reared was conservative, while the largest proportion (34.33%) noted their present religious orientation is liberal.

The greatest number of respondents reported a middle-of-road (39.08%) or liberal (34.52%) political orientation. Most of the students were single, and most noted an approximate grade average of B. The great majority of students' parents were living together (83.66%).

Family life education courses appeared to have been present in only 47.85% of the respondents previous educational experience. The largest percentage of the students (40.37%) were reared in the Southern

TABLE I

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Sex	Male	225	29.34
	Female	542	70.66
Age	17-18	22	2.91
	19-20	345	45.57
	21-22	329	43.46
	23-24	25	3.30
	25-30		3.57
	Over 30		1.19
Religious Preference	Catholic	133	17.43
	Protestant	480	62.91
	Jewish	20	2.62
	Morman	4	.52
	None	85	11.14
	Other	41	5.37
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very Religious	56	7.29
	Religious	540	70.31
	Non-Religious	158	20.57
	Anti-Religious	14	1.82
Type of Religious Orientation in Family Background	Orthodox/Fundamentalist	36	4.69
	Conservative	342	44.53
	Middle-of-Road	293	38.15
	Liberal	81	10.55
	None	16	2.08
Present Type Religious Orientation	Orthodox/Fundamentalist	21	2.74
	Conservative	155	20.23
	Middle-of-Road	242	31.59
	Liberal	263	34.33
	None	85	11.10
Political Orientation	Very Conservative	8	1.05
	Conservative	166	21.70
	Middle-of-Road	299	39.08
	Liberal	264	34.51
	Radical	18	2.35
	Revolutionary	10	1.31
Marital Status	Single	661	86.07
	Married	101	13.15
	Divorced	4	.52
	Widowed	2	.26

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Approximate Grade Average	A	86	11.21
	B	485	63.23
	C	194	25.29
	D	2	.26
Marital Status of Parents	Living Together	640	83.66
	Divorced (with no remarriage)	20	2.61
	One of parents deceased (with no remarriage)	47	6.14
	Divorced (with remarriage)	39	5.10
	One of parents deceased (with remarriage)	19	2.48
Previous Experience in Family Life Course	Yes	367	47.85
	No	400	52.15
Geographic Region Lived in Most of Life	Middle Atlantic States	90	11.87
	Midwestern States	156	20.58
	New England	4	.53
	Pacific Coast States	67	8.84
	Rocky Mountain States	6	.79
	Southern States	306	40.37
	Southwestern States	129	17.02
Size Community Lived in Most of Life	On farm or in country	103	13.43
	Small town under 25,000	190	24.77
	City of 25,000 - 50,000	140	18.25
	City of 50,000 - 100,000	127	16.56
	City of over 100,000	207	26.99
College Represented	University of Alabama	267	34.77
	University of Arizona	61	7.94
	Michigan State University	148	19.27
	New York State University	71	9.24
	Oklahoma State University	107	13.94
	Oregon State University	56	7.29
	Virginia Polytechnic Institute	58	7.55

region of the United States and came from cities of over 100,000 population. Students enrolled in universities in five geographic regions composed the sample: 34.77% at the University of Alabama; 7.94% at the University of Arizona; 19.27% at Michigan State University; 9.24% at New York State University; 13.94% at Oklahoma State University; 7.27% at Oregon State University; and 7.55% at Virginia Polytechnic Institute.

Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results

Hypothesis A. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for achievement.

As Table II indicates, there was a significant difference in total PELS Scale scores which were classified according to the respondents' personality need for achievement. An F score of 3.47 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level. Those who indicated a low level of need for achievement received the highest mean PELS Scale scores, representing the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. Those respondents who indicated a very high level of need for achievement received the lowest mean PELS Scale scores, representing the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles.

Hypothesis B. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for deference.

As Table III indicates, when this hypothesis was examined, a

TABLE II

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Achievement				
Very High	283	84.84		
High	318	87.08		
Moderate	135	86.90	3.47	.01
Low	21	101.67		
Very Low	9	92.33		

TABLE III

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR DEFERENCE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Deference				
Very High	14	82.00		
High	96	78.95		
Moderate	211	83.52	8.33	.001
Low	261	88.72		
Very Low	184	91.81		

significant difference was found to exist in total PELS Scale scores which were classified according to the respondents' personality need for deference. An F score of 8.33 was obtained, which indicated a significant difference at the .001 level. Those students who indicated a very low level of need for deference expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. Those who indicated a high level of need for deference expressed the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles.

Hypothesis C. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for order.

As Table IV indicates, there was a significant difference in total PELS Scale scores. An F score of 8.72 revealed a significant difference at the .001 level. The respondents who indicated a very low level of need for order expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles; those who indicated a very high level of need for order expressed the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. A closer examination of Table IV reveals an inverse relationship between the need for order and the acceptance of experimental life styles.

Hypothesis D. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for exhibition.

As Table V demonstrates, no significant difference was found when the one-way analysis of variance was applied to this hypothesis. An F

TABLE IV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR ORDER

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Order				
Very High	212	82.05		
High	254	85.32		
Moderate	176	88.77	8.72	.001
Low	90	92.29		
Very Low	34	100.09		

TABLE V

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR EXHIBITION

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Exhibition				
Very High	21	93.90		
High	130	87.54		
Moderate	238	87.40	1.17	NS
Low	240	86.15		
Very Low	137	84.47		

score of 1.17 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the need for exhibition and perceptions of experimental life styles.

Hypothesis E. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for autonomy.

Examination of this hypothesis revealed an F score of 12.78, which was significant at the .001 level. Students who expressed a very low level of need for autonomy indicated the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles, while those who expressed a very high level of need for autonomy indicated the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles. Table VI demonstrates a direct positive relationship between the need for autonomy and the acceptance of experimental life styles.

TABLE VI

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR AUTONOMY

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Autonomy				
Very High	162	92.57		
High	272	90.04		
Moderate	190	81.74	12.73	.001
Low	108	81.53		
Very Low	31	74.19		

Hypothesis F. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for affiliation.

As Table VII indicates, the examination of this hypothesis yielded an F score of 3.12, which was significant at the .05 level. Those respondents who reported a very low level of need for affiliation indicated the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles; those expressing a very high level of need for affiliation indicated the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles.

TABLE VII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR AFFILIATION

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Affiliation				
Very High	307	84.84		
High	270	86.03		
Moderate	120	90.69	3.12	.05
Low	52	87.96		
Very Low	17	98.18		

Hypothesis G. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for intraception.

As Table VIII indicates, no significant difference was found when the one-way analysis of variance was applied to this hypothesis. An F score of .92 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the need for intraception and perceptions of experimental life styles.

TABLE VIII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR INTRACEPTION

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Intraception				
Very High	274	87.59		
High	295	86.29		
Moderate	141	86.50	.92	NS
Low	41	87.54		
Very Low	15	77.33		

Hypothesis H. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for succorance.

As Table IX indicates, an F score of 4.98 revealed a significant difference at the .001 level. The students who reported a low level of need for succorance indicated the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles, while those who expressed a very high level of need

for succorance indicated the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles.

TABLE IX

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR SUCCORANCE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Succorance				
Very High	150	81.52		
High	264	86.44		
Moderate	194	86.73	4.98	.001
Low	122	92.56		
Very Low	36	89.81		

Hypothesis I. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for dominance.

As Table X indicates, no significant difference was found when the one-way analysis of variance was applied to this hypothesis. An F score of .49 was obtained, which revealed that no significant relationship existed between perceptions toward experimental life styles and the need for dominance.

TABLE X

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR DOMINANCE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Dominance				
Very High	93	84.23		
High	231	87.47		
Moderate	242	87.36	.49	NS
Low	129	85.98		
Very Low	71	86.23		

Hypothesis J. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for abasement.

Examination of this hypothesis, as demonstrated in Table XI, yielded no significant difference when the one-way analysis of variance was applied. The obtained F score of 1.72 indicated that no significant relationship existed between the need for abasement and perceptions of experimental life styles.

Hypothesis K. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for nurturance.

As Table XII indicates, examination of this hypothesis yielded an F score of 5.53, which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who indicated a moderate level of need for nurturance expressed

TABLE XI

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR ABASEMENT

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Abasement				
Very High	45	88.69		
High	133	83.50		
Moderate	208	86.15	1.72	NS
Low	206	86.42		
Very Low	174	89.54		

TABLE XII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR NURTURANCE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Nuturance				
Very High	272	82.60		
High	323	87.46		
Moderate	125	92.65	5.53	.001
Low	36	88.81		
Very Low	10	90.70		

the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. Those respondents who reported the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles indicated a very high level of need for nuturance.

Hypothesis L. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for change.

As Table XIII demonstrates, an F score of 6.31 was obtained, indicating a significant difference at the .001 level. Students who reported a very low level of need for change expressed the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles; those who reported a very high level of need for change expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles.

TABLE XIII

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR CHANGE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Change				
Very High	218	90.27		
High	309	86.91		
Moderate	166	82.11	6.31	.001
Low	57	89.53		
Very Low	16	70.81		

Hypothesis M. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for endurance.

As Table XIV indicates, a significant difference was found when the one-way analysis of variance was applied to this hypothesis. An F score of 3.88 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level. Those students who indicated a very low level of need for endurance were the most accepting in their perceptions toward experimental life styles; those students who indicated a very high level of need for endurance reported the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. A closer examination of Table XIV indicates the presence of an inverse relationship between the need for endurance and the acceptance of experimental life styles.

TABLE XIV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR ENDURANCE

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Endurance				
Very High	197	82.79		
High	271	86.59		
Moderate	179	87.96	3.88	.01
Low	91	90.03		
Very Low	28	95.96		

Hypothesis N. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for sex.

As Table XV demonstrates, an F score of 4.29 was obtained when the analysis of variance was applied to this hypothesis, indicating a significant difference at the .01 level. The students who indicated the most accepting perceptions of experimental life style expressed a very high level of need for sex, while those who indicated the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles expressed a low level of need for sex.

TABLE XV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR SEX

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Sex				
Very High	291	87.13		
High	302	88.71		
Moderate	130	82.63	4.29	.01
Low	31	86.77		
Very Low	12	68.50		

Hypothesis O. There is no significant difference in total Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles (PELS) Scale scores according to the respondents' personality need for aggression.

Examination of this hypothesis, as demonstrated in Table XVI, revealed an F score of 5.33, which was significant at the .001 level. The students who indicated a very low level of need for aggression held the least accepting perceptions of experimental life styles. Those students who indicated a very high level of need for aggression reported the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles. Closer examination of Table XVI reveals that the perceptions toward experimental life styles become progressively more accepting as the need for aggression increases.

TABLE XVI

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN TOTAL PELS SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR AGGRESSION

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Signifiance
Aggression				
Very High	65	95.09		
High	185	89.16		
Moderate	227	85.81	5.33	.001
Low	171	85.45		
Very Low	118	81.65		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between perceptions of experimental life styles and selected personality needs represented in the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (1959). These perceptions were measured by the Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale (Edwards, 1972).

The sample was composed of 768 college students from seven colleges and universities representing five regions of the United States. The students were primarily Protestant, predominantly between the ages of 19 and 22, and all were enrolled in a family life course. The data were obtained during the months of December, 1971, and January, 1972.

The questionnaire included the following sections which were utilized in this study: (a) an information sheet for securing certain background information, (b) the Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale, and (c) a modified version of the Edwards Personal Preference Scale.

The one-way analysis of variance was used to determine if a significant difference in total PELS Scale scores existed according to the respondents' self perceived level of the following personality needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o)

aggression.

The results and conclusions of this study were as follows:

1. Acceptance of experimental life styles was significantly related to a high level of the following personality needs:

(a) autonomy--i.e., need for independence (p. = .001)

(b) change--i.e., need for variety (p. = .001)

(c) sex--i.e., need for opposite sex activity (p. = .01)

(d) aggression--i.e., need to attack contrary views (p. = .001)

2. Rejection of experimental life styles was significantly related to a high level of the following personality needs:

(a) achievement--i.e., need to succeed (p. = .01)

(b) deference--i.e., need to conform (p. = .001)

(c) order--i.e., need to be systematic (p. = .001)

(d) affiliation--i.e., need for people (p. = .05)

(e) succorance--i.e., need to receive help (p. = .001)

(f) nurturance--i.e., need to give help (p. = .001)

(g) endurance--i.e., need for perseverence (0. = .01)

3. The following personality needs were not related to acceptance or rejection of experimental life styles:

(a) exhibition--i.e., need for attention

(b) intraception--i.e., need to know, to understand what and why

(c) dominance--i.e., need to persuade and influence

(d) abasement--i.e., need to feel guilty and accept blame

Conclusions and Discussion

From the analysis of this study, the general conclusion which could be drawn is that those individuals who accept experimental life styles have evolved different personality needs from those who reject experimental life styles. The level of needs tend to lie at extreme opposites: those who were accepting of experimental life styles perceived themselves to be very high in need for autonomy, change, sex, and aggression; while those who were nonaccepting considered themselves to be very low in these identical needs. The students who felt high or very high in need for deference, achievement, order, affiliation, succorance, nurturance, and endurance were least accepting of experimental life styles; whereas, those same personality needs ranged from moderate to very low in those students who were most accepting.

The findings that those who have the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles tended to be low in their level of need concerning the personality needs for affiliation, succorance, and nurturance indicates that these respondents have a low level of need for people and a low level of need to both receive and give help. These findings, in addition to the findings of a high level of need for aggression and autonomy among those who are most accepting toward experimental life styles, may offer a partial explanation for the high degree of instability which characterizes the experimental life styles which were considered in this study (for example, the high turn-over rate and the high degree of interpersonal conflict which has characterized communes, group marriages, and homosexual marriages). As Albert Ellis (1970) has suggested in his discussion of group marriage, the individual

who seeks out group marriage tends to be highly individualistic, freedom loving, and autonomous. However, Ellis also notes that group marriage is in many respects not suited to this type of person, as it involves restrictions and the type of self discipline which he tends to have difficulty in achieving. Perhaps many of the experimental life styles today tend to attract people who have personality characteristics which are not conducive to promoting success in these experimental life style ventures.

The findings of a low level of need for affiliation, succorance, nurturance, and endurance as well as a high level of need for autonomy and aggression among those who were most accepting of experimental life styles are in contradiction to the often stated goal and ideal of achieving intimate, close, fulfilling interpersonal relationships, which many of the participants of experimental life styles profess. These findings would offer a partial explanation of why this professed goal is so often unachieved in experimental life styles. As French (1971) has suggested, building close interpersonal relationships, over time, depends upon perserverence, a person being responsive to the needs of others, and upon a person "stretching" himself in what may be often uncomfortable directions. The present findings indicate that the personality needs of those who are most accepting of experimental life styles (a low level of need for affiliation--i.e., need for people; succorance --i.e., need to receive help; nurturance--i.e., need to give help; endurance--i.e., need for perseverence) are not compatible with many of the components involved in achieving close, fulfilling interpersonal relationships.

The finding that those who indicated a low level of need for

achievement expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental styles would seem to be related to the results of other research studies in the area of parent-child relationships which indicate that a high level of achievement in children is associated with positive, warm, supportive, accepting, and autonomy-granting parent-child relations (Peppin, 1963; Norris, 1968; Cross and Allen, 1969; Walters and Stinnett, 1971). The presence of such positive parent-child relationships would tend to promote identification with the parents (Winch, 1962), and would probably decrease the likelihood that the child would identify with and develop favorable perceptions toward experimental life styles which the parents did not accept. It is logical that an individual with a high level of need for achievement in the traditional sense would tend to identify with the traditional values and life styles of the "establishment" and would tend not to identify with, or hold favorable perceptions toward experimental life styles which the "establishment" did not accept.

The need for deference reflects a need to conform and win approval. Perhaps it is logical that those who have positive, accepting perceptions toward life styles which are generally not accepted by the mainstream of American society would tend to have a low level of need for deference.

A high level of need for order reflects a desire for structure and predictability. Those who expressed a high level of need for order also expressed the least favorable perceptions of experimental life styles and undoubtedly perceived the experimental life styles as offering little structure and predictability. This finding coincides with the reports that many individuals living in communes as well as other

experimental life styles voice the strong desire for individual freedom and lack of structure (Otto, 1971). This finding also would appear to be related to the frequent problems in communes involving authority and structure (Otto, 1971; Hedgepeth, 1971).

The finding that those who expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles also tended to express a high level of need for sex may reflect a greater emphasis by these respondents concerning sex and may also reflect the stereotype that sexual activities are the central focus of experimental life styles. This finding may also simply reflect more freedom and willingness to admit a need for sex among those who expressed more accepting, positive perceptions toward experimental life styles.

The personality need for change reflects a need for variety, novelty, and the need to experiment. It is logical that those respondents who indicated a high level of need for change expressed the most positive and accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles (which represents to many a radical change in and alteration of the traditional, accepted life styles). It is also understandable that those who have a low level of need for change would tend to express less accepting and less positive perceptions toward experimental life styles.

This research project represents one of a very few studies investigating the relationship between personality and perceptions toward experimental life styles. It is suggested that further research be conducted examining the relationship between parent-child relationships and various personality and psychological variables to participation in, and perceptions of, experimental life styles.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Athenasiou, Robert, Phillip Shaver, and Carol Tavris. "Sex." Psychology Today. Vol. 4 (July, 1970), 39-52.

Bartell, Gilbert D. "Group Sex Among Mid-Americans." The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 6 (May, 1970), 113-130.

Bass-Hass, Rita. "The Lesbian Dyad." The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 4 (May, 1968), 108-126.

Bell, Robert R. "Swinging: The Sexual Exchange of Marital Partners." Sexual Behavior. Vol. 1 (May, 1971), 70-79.

Berger, Miriam E. "Trial Marriage: Harnessing the Trend Constructively." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 20 (January, 1971), 38-43.

Bernard, Jessie. Paper read at the American Psychiatric Society, Bal Harbour, Florida. Time. Vol. 53 (May 16, 1969), 52.

Bloch, Donald. "Unwed Couples: Do They Live Happily Ever After?" Redbook. Vol. 132 (April, 1969), 90-91.

Brecher, E. M. The Sex Researchers. Boston: Brown, 1969.

Cadwallader, Mervyn. "Marriage As a Wretched Institution." The Atlantic. Vol. 218 (November, 1966), 62-66.

Christian Century. Vol. LXXVIII (March 3, 1971), 275.

Christianity Today. Vol. XV (April 23, 1971), 35.

Cleath, Robert. "The Homosexual Church." Christianity Today. Vol. XIV (September 11, 1970), 48-50.

Constantine, Larry L., and Joan M. Constantine. "Group and Multilateral Marriage: definitional notes, glossary, and annotated bibliography." Family Process. Vol. 10 (June, 1971), 157-176.

Constantine, Larry L., and Joan M. Constantine. "Sexual Aspects of Multilateral Relations." The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 7 (August, 1971), 204-225.

Cross, Herbert J., and Jon G. Allen. "Relationship Between Memories of Parental Behavior and Academic Achievement in College." Proceedings of the 77th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. 4:285-286.

Davidson, Sara. "Open Land." Harper's. Vol. 240 (June, 1970), 91-100.

Denfeld, Duane, and Michael Gordon. "The Sociology of Mate Swapping." The Journal of Sex Research. Vol. 6 (May, 1970), 85-100.

Dickey, Brenda A. "Attitudes Toward Sex Roles and Feelings of Adequacy in Homosexual Males." Journal of Consulting Psychology. Vol. 25 (1961), 116-128.

Duvall, Evelyn M. Family Development. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1962.

Edwards, Allen L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Manual). New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.

Edwards, Maxine Payne. "College Students' Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles." Unpublished Master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1972.

Ellis, Albert. "Group Marriage: A Possible Alternative?" The Family in Search of a Future. ed. Herbert A. Otto. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, 85-97.

Epstein, Joseph. "The Struggle for Sexual Identity." Harper's. Vol. 241 (September, 1970), 50-51.

Evans, Oliver. "The Pad in Brooklyn Heights." The Nation. Vol. 199 (July 13, 1964), 15-16.

Freedman, Mark. "Homosexuality Among Women and Psychological Adjustment." Unpublished dissertation, Case Western University, 1967.

French, David. "After the Fall." New York Times Magazine. October 3, 1971, 21.

Gardner, John W. "Individuality and Its Limits." Individualism. eds. Gross and Osterman. New York: Dell, 1971, 15-23.

Good News for Modern Man. New York: American Bible Society, 1966.

Green, Maurice R., ed., Interpersonal Psychoanalysis, the Selected Papers of Clara M. Thompson. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Haughey, John C. "The Commune-Child of the 1970's." America. Vol. 124 (March 31, 1971), 254-256.

Hedgepeth, William B. "Individualism and the Communes." Individualism. eds. Gross and Osterman. New York: Dell, 1971, 202-232.

Hobart, Charles. "Commitment, Value Conflict, and the Future of the Family." The Individual, Marriage, and the Family: Current Perspectives. ed. Lloyd Saxton. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1970, 3-14.

Hoffman, Martin. The Gay World. New York: Basic Books, 1968.

Hoffman, Martin. "Homosexual." Psychology Today. Vol. 3 (July, 1969), 43.

Hoffman, Rita. "On the Edge of Disaster." Mademoiselle. Vol. 70 (April, 1970), 222-223.

Hooker, Evelyn. "A Preliminary Analysis of Group Behavior of Homosexuals." The Journal of Psychiatry, Vol. 42 (1956), 217-225.

Hooker, Evelyn. "Male Homosexuals and Their Worlds." Sexual Inversion. ed. Judd Marmor. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

Houriet, Robert. "Life and Death of a Commune Called Oz." New York Times Magazine, February 16, 1969, 30-31.

Hunt, Morton. The Affair. New York: World, 1969.

Johnson, Ralph E. "Extramarital Sexual Intercourse: a Methodological Note." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 32 (May, 1970), 279-282.

Johnson, Ralph E. "Some Correlates of Extramarital Coitus." Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 32 (August, 1970), 449-456.

Jowett, B., tr., The Dialogues of Plato. New York: Random House, 1937.

Kaye, Harvey E. "Lesbian Relationships." Sexual Behavior, Vol. 1 (1) (April, 1971), 80-87.

Kephart, William M. The Family, Society, and the Individual, 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.

Kilgo, Reese Danley. "Can Group Marriage Work?" Sexual Behavior, Vol. 2 (March, 1972), 8-14.

Kinsey, Alfred, Wardell Pomeroy, and Clyde Martin. Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948, 633.

Kinsey, Alfred, Wardell Pomeroy, Clyde Martin, and Paul Gebhard. Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953.

Kirkpatrick, Clifford. The Family As Process and Institution, 2nd ed. New York: Ronald, 1963.

Klemesrud, Judy. "The Disciples of Sappho, Updated." New York Times Magazine, March 28, 1971, 38.

Korman, Maurice, and Frances Coltharp. "Transparency in the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule." Journal Consulting Psychology, Vol. 26 (August, 1962), 379-382.

Life. "The Commune Comes to America." Vol. 67 (July 18, 1969), 16B-23.

Lindsey, Ben B. As quoted in "Between the Lines," Redbook, Vol. 127, No. 3 (July, 1966), 4.

Lowen, Alexander. "When Women Love Other Women." Redbook, Vol. 138 (November, 1971), 85.

Mead, Margaret. "Marriage in Two Steps." Redbook, Vol. 127 (July, 1966), 49.

Mead, Margaret. "A Continuing Dialogue on Marriage--Why Just Living Together Won't Work." Redbook, Vol. 130 (April, 1968), 50.

Mead, Margaret. "Communes: A Challenge to All of Us." Redbook, Vol. 135 (August, 1970), 51-52.

Merton, Robert K., and Robert A. Nesbit, eds., Sexual Behavior. New York: Harcourt, Bruce, and World, 1966.

Morrone, Wenda Wardell. "Facts and Fictions Singles Have About Love and Marriage." Glamour, February, 1971, 126-127.

Neubeck, Gerhard, and Vera M. Schletzer. "A Study of Extra Marital Relationships." Journal of Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24 (August, 1962), 279-281.

Newsweek. Vol. 74 (August 18, 1969), 89-90.

Newsweek. "The Militant Homosexual." Vol. 78 (August 23, 1971), 45.

Norris, Nancy P. "Parental Understanding, Parental Satisfaction, and Desirable Personality Characteristics in Preadolescent Boys." Dissertation Abstracts 28:4709-4710.

O'Neill, George C., and Nena O'Neill. "Patterns in Group Sexual Activity." The Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 6 (May, 1970), 101-112.

Otto, Herbert A. "Has Monogamy Failed?" Saturday Review, Vol. 53 (April 25, 1970), 23-25.

Otto, Herbert A. "Communes: The Alternative Life-Style." Saturday Review, Vol. 65 (April 24, 1971), 16-21.

Packard, Vance. The Sexual Wilderness. New York: David McKay, 1968.

Parsons, Talcott, and Robert F. Bales. Family, Socialization, and Interaction Process. Glencoe, Illinois: 1955.

Peppin, Bruce Hilands. "Parental Understanding, Parental Acceptance and the Self Concept of Children As a Function of Academic Over-and-Under-Achievement." Dissertation Abstracts 23:4422-4423.

Poole, Kenneth A. "A Sociological Approach to the Ectiology of Female Homosexuals and the Lesbian Social Scene." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1970.

Poppy, John. "The Radical Family." Look, Vol. 35, No. 2 (January 26, 1971), 81-84.

Reich, Charles A. The Greening of America. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Reuben, David. Everything You Always Wanted to Know About Sex. New York: David McKay, 1969.

Rimmer, Robert. The Harrad Letters. New York: Signet, 1969.

Rimmer, Bob. "Comment on 'Can Group Marriage Work?'" Sexual Behavior, Vol. 2 (March, 1972), 10.

Robinson, Louie. "Life Inside a Hippie Commune." Ebony, Vol. 26 (November, 1970), 88-91.

Rogers, Carl A. "Interpersonal Relationships: U. S. A. 2000." The Individual, Marriage, and the Family: Current Perspectives. Ed. Lloyd Saxton. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1970, 37-48.

Russell, Bertrand. Marriage and Morals. New York: Liveright, 1957.

Satir, Virginia. "I John, Take Thee, Mary--for the Next Five Years." Christian Century, Vol. 84 (September 20, 1967), 1182.

Schupp, Cherie Evelyn. "An Analysis of Some Social Psychological Factors Which Operate in the Functioning Relationships of Married Couples Who Exchange Mates for the Purpose of Sexual Experience." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1970.

Scriven, Michael. "Let's Be Sexumenical." National Review, Vol. 19 (December 26, 1967), 1430 (Speech given at the conference on "The Changing Women: The Impact of Family Planning").

Smith, David E., and James Sternfield. "The Hippie Communal Movement: Effects on Child Birth and Development." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 40 (April, 1970), 527-530.

Smith, Herbert. "Comment on 'Can Group Marriage Work?'" Sexual Behavior, Vol. 2 (March, 1972), p. 11.

Smith, James R., and Lynn G. Smith. "Co-Marital Sex and the Sexual Freedom Movement." The Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 6 (May, 1970), 131-142.

Sonenschein, David. "The Ethnography of Male Homosexual Relationships." The Journal of Sex Research, Vol. 4 (May, 1968), 69-83.

Sussman, Marvin B., and Betty E. Cogswell. "The Meaning of Variant and Experimental Marriage Style and Family Forms in the 1970's," The Family Coordinator, Vol. 21 (October, 1972), 375-381.

Symonds, Carolyn. "Pilot Study of the Peripheral Behavior of Sexual Mate Swappers." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of California, 1967.

Time. "The Homosexual: Newly Visible, Newly Understood." October 31, 1969, 56-67.

Todd, Richard. "Walden Two: Three? Many More?" New York Times Magazine, March 15, 1970.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam, 1971.

Tulsa World. (Thursday, July 8, 1971), 7c.

Van Horne, Harriet. "Are We the Last Married Generation?" McCalls, Vol. 96 (May, 1969), 69.

Walters, James, and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research," Journal of Marriage and the Family. February, 1971, 70-111.

Webster's New World Dictionary. New York: World, 1966.

Weinberg, Martin S. "The Male Homosexual: Age Related Variations in Social and Psychological Characteristics." Social Problems, Vol. 17 (4), 1970, 527-537.

Wilbur, Cornelia B. "Clinical Aspects of Female Homosexuals." Sexual Inversion, ed. Judd Marmor. New York: Basic Books 1965.

Winch, Robert F. Identification and Its Familial Determinants. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1962.

Wright, Elliott. "The Church and Gay Liberation." The Christian Century, Vol. 88 (March 3, 1971), 281-285.

Young, Allen. "Out of the Closet: A Gay Manifesto." Ramparts (November, 1971), 50-59.

APPENDIX

CURRENT ISSUE QUESTIONNAIRE

CURRENT ISSUE QUESTIONNAIRE

Your willingness to be of assistance in this research project is greatly appreciated. Your contribution and cooperation help by adding to our knowledge concerning attitudes toward current issues, and by furthering understanding of interpersonal relationships. Please check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question.

Most of this questionnaire was designed to measure your attitudes about some current issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Since your name is not required, please be as honest in your answers as possible. This is not a test.

The blanks at the extreme left of the page are for purposes of coding. (Do not fill in.)

___ 1.-3. (Omit)

___ 4. Sex: ___ 1. Male ___ 2. Female

___ 5. Age: _____

___ 6. Religious preference:
___ 1. Catholic ___ 4. Mormom
___ 2. Protestant ___ 5. None
___ 3. Jewish ___ 6. Other

___ 7. Indicate below your degree of religious orientation:
___ 1. Very religious ___ 3. Non-religious
___ 2. Religious ___ 4. Anti-religious

___ 8. Indicate below the type of religious orientation in which you were reared:
___ 1. Orthodox/fundamentalist ___ 4. Liberal
___ 2. Conservative ___ 5. None
___ 3. Middle-of-road

___ 9. Indicate below your present type of religious orientation.
___ 1. Orthodox/fundamentalist ___ 4. Liberal
___ 2. Conservative ___ 5. None
___ 3. Middle-of-road

___10. Indicate below your political orientation:
___ 1. Very conservative ___ 4. Liberal
___ 2. Conservative ___ 5. Radical
___ 3. Middle-of-road ___ 6. Revolutionary

___11. Marital status: ___ 1. Single ___ 3. Divorced
___ 2. Married ___ 4. Widowed

___12. Your approximate grade average: ___ A ___ B ___ C ___ D

___13. Marital status of parents:
___ 1. Living together ___ 4. Divorced (with remarriage)
___ 2. Divorced (with no remarriage)
___ 3. One of parents deceased (with no remarriage) ___ 5. One of parents deceased (with remarriage)

___14. Have you previously taken a course in family relations, marriage, or child development? ___ 1. Yes ___ 2. No

___15. In what state have you lived for the major part of your life?

_____

___16. For the major part of your life, have you lived
___ 1. On farm or in country
___ 2. Small town under 25,000 population
___ 3. City of 25,000 to 50,000 population
___ 4. City of 50,000 to 100,000 population
___ 5. City of over 100,000 population

Below please circle the responses that you feel best reflect your own degree of satisfaction in interpersonal relationships. Responses for each of the questions below are: VS = Very Satisfying; S = Satisfying; A = Average; U = Unsatisfying; VU = Very Unsatisfying.

___17. VS S A U VU How would you rate your interpersonal relationships with the opposite sex?

___18. VS S A U VU How would you rate your interpersonal relationships with your own sex?

___19.-20. (Omit)

___21. When you were a child, how often did your parents find time to do things with you?
___ 1. Very rarely
___ 2. Rarely
___ 3. Moderate
___ 4. Often
___ 5. Very often

___22. Which of the following best describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your <u>father</u> during your childhood?
___ 1. Much below average
___ 2. Below average
___ 3. Average
___ 4. Above average
___ 5. Much above average

___23. Which of the following best describes the degree of closeness of your relationship with your <u>mother</u> during your childhood?
___ 1. Much below average
___ 2. Below average
___ 3. Average
___ 4. Above average
___ 5. Much above average

___24.-25. (Omit)

___26. I would rate the happiness of my parents' relationship with each other as
___ 1. Very happy
___ 2. Happy
___ 3. Undecided
___ 4. Unhappy
___ 5. Very unhappy

___27. Do you believe that traditional monogamous marriage is the most fulfilling type of man-woman relationship?
___ 1. Yes ___ 2. Undecided ___ 3. No

The following items are designed to obtain your attitudes concerning various current issues. There are no right or wrong answers. Please circle the responses below that best describe your degree of agreement or disagreement to the statements. The response code is as follows: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree:

Extramarital sexual relations with the mutual consent of husband and wife:

___28. SA A U D SD Is one major factor contributing to divorce.

___29. SA A U D SD Improves the quality of the marriage relationship.

___30. SA A U D SD Has a harmful effect on the children of the parents involved.

___31. SA A U D SD Helps fulfill more of an individual's emotional needs than is possible in exclusively monogamous marriage relationships.

___32. SA A U D SD Would not be an acceptable life style for me.

___33.-34. (Omit)

Extramarital sexual relations without the knowledge of one mate:

___35. SA A U D SD Is one major factor contributing to divorce.

___36. SA A U D SD Improves the quality of the marriage relationship.

___37. SA A U D SD Has a harmful effect on the children of the parents involved.

___38. SA A U D SD Helps fulfill more of an individual's emotional needs than is possible in exclusively monogamous marriage relationships.

___39. SA A U D SD Would not be an acceptable life style for me.

___40.-41. (Omit)

Marriage between homosexual persons:

___42. SA A U D SD Contributes to the emotional health of homosexual persons.

___43. SA A U D SD Threatens the stability of our existing family system.

___44. SA A U D SD Helps homosexual persons establish more fulfilling relationships with each other.

___45. SA A U D SD Causes children reared by homosexual couples to have more emotional problems than children reared by heterosexual couples.

___46. SA A U D SD Is not a life style I would want to be closely associated with (such as living next to a homosexual couple).

___47.-48. (Omit)

Cohabitation (living together without being married):

___49. SA A U D SD Is a good way for two people to test their compatibility before entering into marriage.

___50. SA A U D SD Results in the couple being less committed to each other than they would be if they were legally married.

___51. SA A U D SD Offers more advantages than disadvantages to a couple.

___52. SA A U D SD Results in children born to such couples having more problems than children of legally married couples.

___53. SA A U D SD Would be an acceptable life style for me.

___54.-55. (Omit)

Marriage in two stages, the first a trial marriage and the second a more permanent contract would:

___56. SA A U D SD Result in fewer divorces.

___57. SA A U D SD Result in decreased commitment with the marriage relationships.

___58. SA A U D SD Result in more satisfying marriage relationships.

___59. SA A U D SD Provide a more positive emotional climate for rearing children than does traditional marriage.

___60. SA A U D SD Be an acceptable life style for me.

___61.-62. (Omit)

Group marriage (marriage involving more than two partners):

___63. SA A U D SD Involves too much conflict to be satisfying.

___64. SA A U D SD Improves our family system.

___65. SA A U D SD Contributes to an increased ability to establish loving intimate relationships.

___66. SA A U D SD Helps to decrease the divorce rate.

___67. SA A U D SD Is not an acceptable life style for me.

___68.-69. (Omit)

Communal living:

___70. SA A U D SD Offers great possibilities for personal growth and development.

___71. SA A U D SD Contributes to the instability of siciety.

___72. SA A U D SD Contributes positively to children's emotional health.

___73. SA A U D SD Promotes fulfilling, close human relationships.

___74.-76. (Omit)

___77.-78. (Omit)

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

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

Score yourself on each of the needs. For scoring, use the 1 to 10 point scale to the right of each need. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of that need. Keep in mind that 1 represents the lowest level of the need, while 10 represents the highest level of the need.

	DESCRIPTION OF NEEDS	YOUR LEVEL OF NEED
NEED FOR -		
___ 1.	ACHIEVEMENT--ambition to succeed, to do one's best, to accomplish something of great significance.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 2.	DEFERENCE--dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 3.	ORDER--neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 4.	EXHIBITION--attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 5.	AUTONOMY--independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 6.	AFFILIATION--need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 7.	INTRACEPTION--need to know, to understand--what and why, to analyze and empathize.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 8.	SUCCORANCE--to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___ 9.	DOMINANCE--to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___10.	ABASEMENT--conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___11.	NURTURANCE--to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

___12.	CHANGE--variety, novelty; to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___13.	ENDURANCE--perseverence, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___14.	SEX--need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
___15.	AGGRESSION--to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

VITA

Craig Wayne Birdsong

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONALITY NEEDS TO PERCEPTIONS CONCERNING EXPERIMENTAL LIFE STYLES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Ponca City, Oklahoma, September 2, 1949, the son of Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Birdsong.

Education: Graduated from Newkirk High School, May, 1967; graduated from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Housing and Interior Design, May, 1971; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1973.

Professional Experience: Graduate Research Assistant, 1971-72.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu.