PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND

PERCEPTIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL

LIFE STYLES

By

SHERRY GARLAND TAYLOR

Bachelor of Arts

State College of Arkansas

Conway, Arkansas

1970

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

PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND

PERCEPTIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL

LIFE STYLES

Thesis Approved:

_____
Thesis Adviser

_____

_____

_____
Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

American Society is in a state of transition. The advancement of

scientific discoveries, new technologies, the women's liberation move-

ment, youth movements, minority group movements, and a new

emphasis upon individualism have brought about societal changes in

roles, attitudes and values (Hilton, 1972). There is evidence that the

changes which are taking place now are just the beginning. "The

acceleration of change in our time is, itself, an element force. This

accelerative thrust has personal and psychological, as well as sociolog-

ical, consequences" (Toffler, 1970, p. 3).

Among the social frameworks largely influenced by this

accelerative transition are the institutions of marriage and the family

(Otto, 1970). With the acceleration of change an emergence of diverse

and experimental life styles has taken place (Hedgepeth, 1971).

The emergence of those experimental life styles has been

publicized by the mass media and an increasing number of youth are

aware of and may be seriously considering participation in these

experimental life styles. Some undoubtedly will adopt these life styles

largely because they believe it is the fashionable or exciting thing to do.

Much of the available information concerning these life styles is of a

promotional or sensational nature. There is a limited amount of sound
research concerning experimental life styles as well as information
about youths' perceptions of these life styles (Edwards, 1972;
Birdsong, 1973).

These life styles seem to be alternatives or re-interpretations of
the traditional nuclear or extended family systems. Whether or not
the nuclear family meets the changing needs of society is one of the
pivotal topics of discussion by various social scientists, the news
media, women's liberation groups and the youth culture (Cuber, 1970;
Otto, 1971).

Although it has recently been fashionable to express dissatisfac-
tion with the traditional forms of marriage there is evidence that as an
institution conventional marriage is still very much a part of our
society and is likely to remain the dominant form of man-woman
relationships. Only three to four percent of our population never
marry. For the third consecutive year in 1970 there were over two
million marriages in the United States. The rate of marriage has
increased to 10.7 marriages per 1000 individuals, the highest rate
since 1950 (Olson, 1972).

With the increase and popularity of traditional marriages
experimental life styles remain in the minority although there has been
a significant increase in the incidence and acceptance of these life
styles (Birdsong, 1973). Experimental life styles are associated with
youth and there is a tendency to believe that most youth accept and
promote the various experimental life styles. There is little research
to support this view.

In a national survey of college students, it was found that less than 25 percent of the students' perceptions reflected acceptance of experimental life styles. Traditional monogamous marriage was considered to be the most fulfilling type of man-woman relationship by 70 percent of the students (Edwards, 1972).

The role experimental life styles will play in the future of the traditional marriage and family life style is not clearly evident. However, some social scientists such as Sussman and Cogswell (1972, p. 381) 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."

Toffler (1970, p. 271) has suggested that:

How we choose a life style, and what it means to us, looms as one of the central issues of the psychology of tomorrow. For the selection of a life style, whether consciously done or not, powerfully shapes the individual's future. It does this by imposing order, a set of principles or criteria on the choices he makes in his daily life.

The factors which are closely associated with acceptance and adoption of experimental life styles by youth and their potential effects on the traditional nuclear family need to be identified and examined by social science researchers. In particular, knowledge needs to be obtained concerning the types of parent-child relationships which are associated with acceptance of experimental life styles as well as the types of parent-child relationships which are associated with non-acceptance of experimental life styles. Since such research is extremely limited, it is the objective of this study to gain such information.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the perceptions of experimental life styles as reflected by the Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores and each of the following perceptions concerning parent-child relationships:

1. Frequency with which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood,

2. Degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood,

3. Degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood.

A secondary purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the Perception of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores and perceived happiness of the parents' marriage.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In a review of the literature concerning experimental life styles
there is found to be very little empirical research concerning the
etiological factors of experimental life styles. Most of the current
literature reports on and describes the typology of these life styles.

The following is a selected review of the research which reports
on different types of experimental life styles including cohabitation,
trial marriages, extra-marital relationships, group marriages,
communal families, and homosexual marriages. Some selected
literature concerning parent-child relationships will also be reviewed
with the emphasis upon the type of parent-child relationships of youths
who engage in these types of experimental life styles.

Cohabitation

An increasingly common aspect of courtship is a "living together
arrangement" which is found most often on college campuses. There
are several forms of cohabitation. These forms vary from simply
sharing a room with one or more individuals to sharing a bed and a
room as a couple, either alone or with other individuals (Olson, 1972).

Macklin (1972, p. 463) defines cohabitation as: "To share a
bedroom for at least four nights per week for at least three consecutive
months with someone of the opposite sex." Macklin's definition may

be more rigid than that shared by most people, social scientists and students, alike. Webster (1966) defines cohabitation as living together as husband and wife though not legally married, and implying sexual intercourse.

From the results of her study of cohabitation at Cornell University, Macklin (1972, p. 464) concluded that, "Cohabitation is a common experience for students on this particular campus and is accepted by many as a 'to-be-expected' occurrence. However, it should be noted that her sample included only 44 students who were involved in cohabitation.

Reasons for living together are broad and extend from the environmental atmospheres of colleges and universities to the personal motivations of the specific students. Bloch (1969) and Macklin (1972) report some of the reasons for students establishing unmarried house-holds are: The changes in dormitory regulations concerning curfews, co-ed dormitories, and off-campus living regulations which permit greater flexibility in the students' living patterns; rejection of the 'dating game' and the widespread questioning of the institution of marriage; preparation for marriage or "to test out the relationship;" plus the added convenience, financially and emotionally, of "living with someone who cares about you."

Bloch (1969) also found that those cohabitating couples who were not planning to marry gave various reasons such as the fear of marriage, the desire to continue the extension-of-dating relationship, the importance of educational or professional goals, or the fear that marriage might destroy the present relationship. Some other reasons for not desiring a more permanent relationship were immaturity,

unpreparedness for a permanent commitment and a need for time to enable them to settle their own ambivalent feelings.

Living together was not seen as a trial marriage or even an engagement period by most students.

> In most cases, living together seems to be a natural component of a strong, affectionate "dating" relationship which may grow in time to be something more, but which in the meantime is to be enjoyed and experienced because it is pleasurable in and of itself (Macklin, 1972, p. 470).

In Macklin's study (1972) it was found that one third of the relationships lasted an average of only four and one half months. Macklin also found that almost half of the respondents in her study experienced the problem of over involvement which included loss of identity and lack of opportunities to participate in other activities or with other friends.

Trial Marriages

The idea of the marriage contract as a periodically renewable legal bond has gained wide attention as of late due to the ever increasing incidence of divorce in the United States. In 1970 there were 715,000 divorces and annulments, almost double the number in 1950. Almost 50 percent of the marriages involving young people under the age of 18 end in divorce (Olson, 1972).

The idea of trial marriage is not new. As early as 1926 Judge B. Lindsey of the Denver Juvenile Court advocated what he termed as "companionate" marriage. The major features of his system would include legalized education in birth control, divorce by mutual consent,

education for marriage, and the reform of laws regulating alimony

(Ditzion, 1969). 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 permitted nullification by mutual con-
> sent, 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 (1966) held the view that people may come

together for many different reasons. They may come together for sex,

for companionship, or for the purpose of having children. With this

view in mind he advocates many different types of marriages or trial

marriages.

In 1966 Margaret Mead revived the idea of trial marriage. She

proposed two types of marriage: "individual" where two people would

be committed to each other as long as they wished to remain together,

but not as future parents; and "parental" marriage which would involve

parenthood. The parental marriage would be more difficult to enter

into and leave. The couple would agree to be mutually responsible for

any children (Mead, 1966).

There have been various types of trial marriages proposed since

1966. Some of these proposals include: (a) renewable contracts, at

three to five year intervals; (b) three step marriages consisting of

preliminary marriage, personal marriage and parental marriage;

(c) a recognized pre-marriage of two years or less and (d) probationary

marriages of three to eighteen months (Cadawallader, 1966, Satir,

1967; Scriven, 1967; Packard, 1968; and Toffler, 1970).

Berger, (1971) reported the differing views on trial marriage which were expressed at the 1969 National Council on Family Relations Workshop. Some participants felt that trial marriages should be institutionalized as morally sanctioned alternatives to conventional marriages, while others felt trial marriages did not have the same commitment value as a real marriage therefore they were not a valid preparation for marriage.

Extra-Marital Relationships

> Each contact between a married person and anyone other than his or her spouse is by definition an extra-marital one. Although on the whole, the term "extra-marital" is associated with a sexual relationship of some kind (Sprey, 1972, p. 38).

Few people marry with the intention of establishing extra-marital relationships, yet many do so. Some social scientists advocate extra-marital sexual relationships and view the current rise in extra-marital relations as evidence of the deterioration and demise of conventional marriage. For example, Sprey (1972) sees extra-marital relationships as an indication of an attempt to come to terms with marriage rather than a rejection of the institution of marriage itself. Russell (1966, p. 95) says, "there can be no doubt that to close one's mind on marriage against all the approaches of love from elsewhere is to diminish receptivity and sympathy and the opportunities of valuable human contact."

Ellis (1972, p. 49) believes that, "When adultry ensues, some marriages gain and some lose; some mates are happy and some are miserable." Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard, (1953) as well as Otto (1972) reported that sometimes there seems to be an

improvement in a marriage relationship following an extra-marital experience. It seems that the key word used was sometimes. There is evidence of many negative psychological and social consequences of extra-marital sexual relationships. These negative consequences make their impact upon the marriage relationship and upon the individuals involved in the affair (Hunt, 1969; Beltz, 1969).

While Hunt (1969) in his research, found about half the men and half the women indicated that their affairs made their marriages more tolerable, he also found that over a third of the respondents were eventually divorced as a direct result of their extra-marital sexual experience. Also, only a small minority of Hunt's respondents claimed that they had improved marriage relationships as a result of extra-marital affairs. Only one out of 10 reported that their affairs had brought them emotionally closer to their spouse.

Athanasiou, Shaver, and Travis (1970) in their research study concerning extra-marital behavior report that 40 percent of the married men and 36 percent of the married women were or had engaged in extra-marital relations. Nearly 80 percent of the respondents condoned extra-marital relations in varying circumstances.

Hunt (1969) reported that a large majority of the respondents in his study always or usually disapproved of adultry. While those who had experienced affairs themselves were more tolerant, it is interesting that even the majority of this group were disapproving of extra-marital relationships. His results coincide with a 1966 poll conducted by McCalls' magazine.

In a recent study involving a national survey of college students it was found that approximately 80 percent of the students indicated

that extra-marital relationships with or without the mutual consent of their spouse would not be an acceptable life style for them personally (Edwards, 1972).

When mutual consent to sexual freedom occurs, it is often referred to as consensual adultery (Smith and Smith, 1970). The idea that a good marriage based on openness and communication should be a life long commitment, but not that it will exclude other sex relations has been expressed more often recently (Russell, 1966; Hobbs, 1970).

O'Neill and O'Neill, (1972), p. 26) believe that "marriage in some form or another, still provides the only framework in which people can find the stability in which to experience the full intimacy of a one-to-one relationship." They advocate the "open-marriage" as opposed to the traditional "closed-marriage" concept. They see the difference between closed marriage and open marriage as the difference between coercion and choice. They define open marriage as a non-manipulative relationship between man and woman; a relationship of peers. Each has the opportunity for growth and new experience outside the marriage.

> Through their growth as separate persons and their
> supportive love for each other, they vitalize and
> increase their couple-power. Open marriage thus
> draws on the idea of synergy; that one plus one equals
> more than two, that the sum of the parts working
> together is greater than the sum of the parts working
> separately. (O'Neill and O'Neill, 1972, p. 41).

Denfeld (1970) cites three factors which have contributed to the recent emergence of an institutionalized form of extra-marital sex known as "swinging". They are: (a) The shifts in attitudes toward female sexuality, (b) more permissive attitudes toward premarital

sex, and (c) the revolution in contraceptive techniques which permit sex to be indulged in with less apprehension and more pleasure.

Swinging is defined as the sexual exchange of partners among two or more married couples. They define their behavior as consensual adultery. One of the main criteria is that the couples do not know each other before hand and do not become emotionally involved (Symonds, 1968; Denfeld, 1970; Bell, 1971; Ramey, 1972).

Denfeld (1970) suggests, "for the couple committed to the marital relationship and for whom it still performs important functions, mate swapping may relieve sexual monotony without undermining the marriage" (p. 93). The couples give no indication of finding traditional marriage an unsatisfactory or inconvenient institution. Actually, they argue, one of their primary motives for swinging is to help their marriage.

Symonds (1967) reports that there are two types of swingers. "Utopian swingers" are concerned with building a better world. The acceptance of free sexual behavior is an intrinsic part of their philosophy. They tend to favor communal living. The "recreational swinger" uses swinging as a form of recreation. He does not want to change the social order or to fight the establishment.

The majority of swingers are "recreational swingers". They tend to be politically, domestically , and occupationally middle class; with incomes of $10,000 or more, some college education, home owners, with conservative backgrounds toward nudity and sex, although they engaged in more premarital sex. They felt sex and love were two distinct needs, and that they were more honest with their spouse and

viewed their marriages as happy and satisfactory (Denfeld, 1970;

Schupp, 1970).

> What may be the most important value among many
> swingers is that sex with others should be kept as
> physical and impersonal as possible. Many swingers
> realize that if any interpersonal commitment develops
> it may constitute a severe threat to the marriage.
> Many swingers feel that sex between two people
> doesn't threaten their respective marriages, but a
> developing emotional commitment between them could
> (Bell, 1971, p. 75).

Group Marriages

Group marriage has emerged as a much publicized life style

since the mid-sixties and is probably the most complex form of

marriage. It combines commitment to the group with multiple pair

bonding among members of the group (Ramey, 1972). The Constantine's

(1971, p. 204) define group marriage as: "One in which three or more

people consider themselves married or committed in an essentially

equivalent manner to at least two other members of the group."

Group marriage may involve two couples, one couple and a

single, three couples, or two or three couples and a single. Most

often group marriage consists of triads or two couples. No known

group marriage contains more than six people. The median age of

members is 31-33 years. The majority were married at time of

entry and entered as couples, who had been married an average of

seven years. The average duration of a group marriage is 16 to 19

months although some have lasted as long as five years (Ramey, 1972;

Constantine and Constantine, 1971).

> As a group, participants in these marriages are
> normally healthy individuals who attempt to form
> an expanded family unit for which there is little
> precedent, historical or otherwise. Thus they
> work without cultural support or guidelines. Most
> of the dynamics which in a conventional marriage
> are structured through rituals, roles and expecta-
> tions suddenly must be created and resolved
> idiomatically, ad hoc, through group processes
> (Constantine and Constantine, 1972, p. 458).

Some of the advantages of group marriage which have been listed
by group marriage participants include greater security (materially
and psychologically), wider sexual variety, greater potential for
personal growth and individualism, their children have more adult
models, and they have a broader economic base from which to operate
a household (Kilgo, 1972). While sexual interest is acknowledged at
the private level as a motivation it could hardly be said to be
emphasized by participants (Constantine and Constantine, 1971).

Problems of living in a group marriage situation and reasons for
dissolution of the marriage are as varied as the people who enter into
these marriages. Basically, multilateral or group marriages dissolve
because the partners are incompatible in their basic personality traits
and life styles. These are problems of interpersonal conflict, jealousy,
and deciding who will be responsible for performing certain functions
(Constantine and Constantine, 1972).

Age of the participants seems to play a role in the relative
success of a group marriage, with the more successful being 30 or
over. Other common problems are money and the division of labor,
degree of visibility to the community and child rearing practices
(Ramey, 1972).

Smith (1972, p. 11) believes that,

> We need to know more about the personalities of those
> entering group marriage arrangements, and more about
> the factors in the breakup of such units. It could well be
> that, for some at least, their very make up in terms of
> experiences and temperment mediate against achieving
> the goals they seek upon entering group marriage.

Communal Families

Ramey (1972, p. 447) defines a communal family as:

> When individuals agree to make life commitments as
> members of one particular group, rather than through
> many different groups, they may constitute a commune.
> The number of common commitments will vary from
> commune to commune, the critical number having been
> reached at the point at which the group sees itself as a
> commune rather than at some absolute number.

Historically, the idea of communal living is not new. Plato in

The Republic describes a utopian commune and many of his major

concepts are echoed in the communes of today (Gordon, 1972). There

were many attempts, and some of them successful, at creating

communities during the 19th Century in America. Nine of these

communes lasted over 33 years. Intimacy was a daily fact of life in

these communes. Exclusive couples and biological families were

discouraged through celibacy, free love or group marriage. Successful

19th century communities tended to separate biological families and

place children in dwelling units apart from their parents. They also

celebrated their togetherness in group rituals such as singing,

religious services, and festive occasions (Kanter, 1972).

One of the most successful and long lasting communities of the

19th century was the Oneida Community. It was founded in 1848 by

John Humphrey Noyes, who was a graduate of Yale Theological

Seminary. Noyes' theology revolved around spiritual equality, which he interpreted to include the economic and sexual spheres.

The group, which finally settled at Oneida, New York consisted of several hundred members who dwelt together in a large Community Mansion House. For many decades the Oneida Community flourished until around 1880 when Father Noyes resigned and the community fell apart, torn by internal dissension. It was then that Oneida Ltd., a business enterprise was set up and the stock apportioned among the members. Some of the remarkable characteristics of this community were that they practiced economic communism, group marriage, scientific breeding, and sexual equality with successful outcomes (Kephart, 1972).

The 1960's saw the emergence of communal living growing out of the hippy movement of the Haight-Ashbury section of San Francisco. It is estimated that there are 40,000 people living in communes in the bay area of San Francisco, perhaps five percent of the 18 to 30 year olds in that area. And there may be 100,000 or more people scattered over the Western states alone (Platt, 1972).

There are various types of communes. Their goals may be social, religious, political, even recreational. Some of the more common types are:

1. Rural These are the farming communes which combine work and living. These are the back to the land, organic food, vegetarian, hand-labor groups who seek to become typically self-sustaining without recourse to the rest of society. Many are utopian in outlook such as the Twin Oaks Community which is based on the ideas of B. F. Skinner

in his utopian novel, <u>Walden Two</u> (Berger, Hackett, and Millar, 1972;
Schulterbandt and Nichols, 1972; Ramey, 1972; and Kinkade, 1973).

2. <u>Urban</u> These communes are varied in form and purpose.
Many see their movement as a means of becoming more involved in
society rather than withdrawing from it. They tend to have a high rate
of people turnover and are not as permanent as the rural commune
(Schulterbrandt and Nichols, 1972; Berger, Hackett and Millar, 1972;
Fonzi, 1972).

3. <u>Religious or Creedal</u> Creedal communes are those
organized around a formal doctrine or creed. They are highly
structured, have authoritarian leadership, adhere to the work ethic,
are usually self-sustaining and withdrawn from society and are family
orientated (Ramey, 1972; Berger, Hackett, and Millar, 1972).

4. <u>Evolutionary</u> These communes are apparently recent. They
are most often found in metropolitan areas where groups of academic,
professional, and managerial people desire to live with a group of
committed people with whom they feel they can cope with present-day
society in a more successful manner than they can manage as couples
or individuals. They are characterized as high achievers, highly
mobile, have straight jobs, are upper middle class, opinion leaders,
and are over age 30. The basic reason for becoming a part of an
evolutionary commune seems to be the desire for more intimate inter-
personal relationships in a more complex situation (Ramey, 1972).

Gordon (1972, p. 22) says, "For most communal life represents
an attempt to involve the individual in the larger community, to destroy
the notion that the world outside the family is hostile and cold." This
attempt is not without problems. Some of the more common problems

which are characteristic of communal living and which contributes to
their relatively short life span are: a high rate of turnover among
members, problems involving authority and structure, economic
problems, the use of illegal drugs, lack of privacy and overcrowding,
interpersonal conflicts and the hostility of surrounding communities
(Otto, 1971 and 1972; Hedgepeth, 1971).

Whitehurst (1972) compared conventional and communal families
in eight activity areas ranging from childrearing and economics to
religious and lesiure time use. He suggested that the communal family
shows good potential for meeting needs in the areas of child-rearing,
labor, economics, lesiure time, sex, placement of the aged, and
possibly religion.

The future of communal living is uncertain but there probably will
be more experimentation in such informal group living arrangements.
There may be more acceptance of these life styles as society itself
becomes more diverse (Downing, 1970).

Homosexual Marriages

As Kinsey's research has indicated, many men and women are
neither exclusively heterosexual nor exclusively homosexual. Kinsey's
data indicate that only 61 to 72 percent of the unmarried female
population are exclusively heterosexual, while only one to three percent
are exclusively homosexual. Among white males, 53 to 73 percent
are totally heterosexual, and only four percent are exclusively homo-
sexual (Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin, and Gebhard, 1948, 1953).

The rejection by society in general of the homosexual has kept
the homosexual world concealed until recently. The sexual revolution,

as well as the Gay Liberation Movement and recognition of homosexual

marriage by some clergy have helped to increase knowledge and under-

standing of homosexuality (Bensman, 1970; Oberholtzer, 1971).

> 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 union is
> doubtful (Newsweek, 1971, p. 46).

The Reverend Troy Perry, founder of the Metropolitan Community

Church of Los Angeles, believes that homosexual marriages may

"deepen personal relationships and cut down on sexual promiscuity"

(Cleath, 1970, p. 49). Perry has performed more than 40 such

marriages of which only two have not survived. He requires that the

couple give evidence of having known each other for a minimum of six

months, and attend two counseling sessions (Cleath, 1970).

There seem to be differences between male and female homo-

sexual marriages. The female homosexual marriage appears to be

more stable; they more often form permanent households and some

adopt children. Male homosexual marriages of any duration are

extremely rare (Hoffman, 1968; Klemesrud, 1971)

There are two types of permanent, close relationships among

homosexuals. One is "marriage" and the other is "cohabitation".

The characteristics of a marriage are: (a) some sort of ritual, (b) a

material demarcation of the union as in the exchange of wedding rings,

(c) a value system of the participants, based on romantic love, and

(d) a tendency to dichotomize social roles. Cohabitation is described

as:

> 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 relation-
> ship 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, 1968, p. 81).

Sonenschein (1968) has found cohabitation to be more stable than marriage, because the marriage tends to integrate the couple into the homosexual community whereas cohabitation does not to the same degree.

There are many difficulties involved in establishing and maintaining a homosexual marriage. Hooker (1965), Hoffman, (1969), and Poole (1970) report some of these:

1. Promiscuity; promiscuity is more characteristic of males than of female homosexuals;

2. Lack of institutionalization by church and state;

3. Lack of partner participation in the heterosexual world;

4. Jealousy;

5. The family relations may become strained if knowledge of their marriage is revealed;

6. Social taboos against homosexuality;

7. Guilt;

8. The marriage itself is a constant reminder that one is crossing societal rules.

In a study of attitudes toward sex roles and feelings of adequacy Dickey (1961) found that homosexual males tend to idealize the typical heterosexual role. Her results indicate that homosexual males feel more adequate if they are homosexually married.

Parent-Child Relationships

Bell (1966) indicated that most parents probably assume that their offspring accept traditional sexual values. The involvement of youth in the "sexual revolution" raises many questions concerning the family of orientation. Do these young people come from broken homes, sexually permissive or restrictive homes, what are their parents' attitudes toward sex education, courtship and marriage?

Wyman (1970) found that the sexual attitudes of adolescents were related to their perceptions of their parents' attitudes. Walsh (1970) reports that student permissiveness varies directly with the perceived permissiveness of the adolescent's main reference group. Those who chose the church as a main reference group were lowest in permissiveness; next were those who chose their parents; and the most permissive were the ones who chose their peers as a main reference group.

Joyce (1972) examined the effects of parents and peers on the non-conventional attitudes and behavior of adolescents. Her general conclusion was that adolescent differences in non-conventional attitudes and behaviors are, mainly, a function of differential parental socialization.

In a study of the attitudes of college students toward marriage Wallin (1954) shows that when the perception of the parents' marriage is highly positive the students' attitude toward marriage is most favorable.

Macklin (1972) in her efforts to determine the causes for cohabitation among students found that while two thirds considered their parents' marriage to have been "very successful" many do not

plan to marry because of their negative feelings toward marriage in general. Knox (1970) found that highschool seniors who have parents that are living together tend to have a more realistic attitude toward love than those seniors who have parents who are divorced or who have one parent deceased.

The child's perception of family attitudes and behaviors although possibly distorted and highly personalized are known to have significant effects in the later development of identity and life-style choice as indicated by Paulson, Tien-teh, and Hanssen (1972, p. 602):

> For the alienated, anti-establishment youth there is a
> greater recall of perceived maternal inadequacy.
> They recalled their mothers as less effective in ful-
> filling the feminine role, there was a recognition of
> greater disharmony within the home milieu, and a
> perception of a generalized pattern of parental irrita-
> bility and family insensitivities.

Keniston (1965) defines individual alienation as "the explicit rejection of traditional American Culture. It is different from other types of alienation in that it is freely chosen" (p. 465). He suggests some common factors in the family background of these alienated youth: (a) Actual or symbolic absence of the father; (b) Unusual or intense attachment of the mother and son; and (c) relative absence of sibling rivalry.

Walters and Stinnett (1971) in reporting a summary of research findings concerning parent-child relationships report the following as some characteristics of school age boys who showed signs of anti-social behavior: (a) little warmth from either parent; (b) feelings of dependency; (c) disruption; (d) limited identification with values and standards of parents; (e) inconsistency of discipline; (f) concrete

rewards and verbal methods of abuse by parents in order to control

behavior; and (g) limited cohesiveness of the family group.

Rode (1971) characterizes the alienated, anti-establishment

youth by their pervasive distrust of peers and adults, their hostility

toward authority and their fear of influence and domination. He

reports:

> Individually alienated adolescents of both sexes per-
> ceive their parents, and particularly their mothers,
> as hostile, non-accepting, and as exercising control
> through psychological means such as instilling
> persistent anxiety. In adolescence they tend to reject
> their parents, especially their mothers (p. 38).

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were 768 undergraduate college
students enrolled in undergraduate family relations courses. The
students were primarily single and ranged in age from 19 to 22 years.

The subjects represent a total of seven universities from 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 Northeast region.

The data were collected between December, 1971 and January,
1972.

Description of Instrument

A questionnaire developed and reported by Edwards (1972) for
the purpose of investigating college students' perceptions of experi-
mental life styles was used in this study.

The questionnaire consisted of fixed alternative type items. The
following information was obtained from these items in the

questionnaire: (a) background characteristics of the subjects, such as age, sex, and religious preference, (b) perceptions concerning certain aspects of the parent-child relationships of the subjects, and (c) perceptions of selected experimental life styles. In order to determine college students' perceptions of experimental life styles, the PELS Scale (Edwards, 1972) was used.

Perception of Experimental Life Styles

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

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. Each of the seven experimental life styles was represented by five items.

In scoring the responses the most accepting response was given the highest score, and the least accepting response was given the lowest score. A response which was given the highest score was assumed to reflect the most accepting perception of the experimental life style.

To ascertain 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. They were asked to judge each of the items in terms of clarity, specivity, 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).

To further ascertain the validity of the PELS Scale, an item analysis utilizing the Chi-square test was used to determine those items which significantly differentiated upper and lower quartile groups. All of the 35 items in the PELS Scale were significantly discriminating at the .001 level. A split-half reliability coefficient of .95 was obtained in an assessment of the reliability of the PELS Scale (Edwards, 1972).

<center>Analysis of Data</center>

A percentage and frequency count was used to describe the background information of the subjects. An analysis of variance was used to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is a significant difference in the PELS Scale scores according to each of the following perceptions concerning parent-child relationships of the respondent: (a) frequency with which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood, (b) degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood, (c) degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood.

2. There is a significant difference in <u>PELS</u> <u>Scale</u> scores according to perceived happiness of the parents' marriage.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

Table I gives a detailed description of the 768 subjects who
participated in this study. The respondents ranged in age from 17 - 18
years to over 30. The largest number were in the 19 - 20 year
category (45.57%), and the smallest number in the over 30 category
(1.19%). Twenty-nine percent of the respondents were male, and
seventy-one percent were female.

The majority of the subjects (70.31%) rated their degree of
religious orientation as religious with most being Protestants. The
respondents indicated that the religious orientation of the family in
which they were reared was conservative (44.53%), while their present
religious orientation was liberal (34.33%) or middle-of-road (31.59%).

A middle-of-road (39.08%) or liberal (34.52%) political orienta-
tion was reported by most of the respondents. The majority of the
students were single (86.07%), and an approximate grade average of
B was noted most often. Most of the student's parents were living
together (83.66%).

Previous experience in family life education courses was
reported by only 44.85% of the respondents. The Southern region of
the United States was most represented with 40.37% of the respondents

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
	Mormon	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	29.08
	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 1000,000	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

having lived most of their life in that area. Most came from cities of

over 100,000 population. Students from Universities in five

geographic regions composed the sample: the University of Alabama, 34.77%; the University of Arizona, 7.94%; Michigan State University, 19.27%; New York State University, 9.24%; Oklahoma State University, 13.94%; Oregon State University, 7.27% and Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 7.55%.

<div align="center">Examination of Hypotheses and
Discussion of Results</div>

Hypothesis I (a). <u>There is a significant difference in Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores according to frequency with which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood.</u>

A significant difference was found to exist in <u>PELS Scale</u> scores according to frequency with which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood. As Table II indicates, an F score of 7.27 was obtained indicating a significant difference at the .001 level.

Those respondents who indicated that their parents <u>very rarely</u> found time to do things with them during childhood received the highest mean <u>PELS Scale</u> scores, reflecting the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles. Those respondents who indicated that their parents <u>very often</u> found time to do things with them during childhood received the lowest mean <u>PELS Scale</u> scores reflecting the least accepting perceptions of experimental life styles.

TABLE II

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN PELS SCALE
SCORES ACCORDING TO FREQUENCY WITH
WHICH PARENTS FOUND TIME TO DO
THINGS WITH RESPONDENT
DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	$\overline{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Frequency with which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood				
Very Rarely	10	98.10		
Rarely	50	95.54		
Moderate	214	88.92	7.27	.001
Often	307	86.84		
Very Often	187	81.00		

Hypothesis I (b).   There is a significant difference in Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores according to the degree of closeness of relationship with the father during childhood.

A significant difference was found to exist in PELS Scale scores according to the degree of closeness of relationship with the father during childhood.   An F score of 4.49 was obtained, as shown in Table III, indicating a significant difference at the .01 level.

Those respondents who perceived the closeness of relationship with the father as much below average expressed the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles.   Those respondents who perceived the closeness of relationship with the father as much above

average expressed the least accepting perceptions of experimental life styles.

TABLE III

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN PELS SCALE
SCORES ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF
CLOSENESS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH
FATHER DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	$\overline{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Degree of closeness of relation- ship with father during childhood				
Much Below Average	42	96.09		
Below Average	118	90.79		
Average	270	85.26	4.49	.01
Above Average	236	86.22		
Much Above Average	100	82.88		

Hypothesis I (c). There is a significant difference in Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores according to the degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood.

As Table IV indicates, there was a significant difference in PELS Scale scores according to the degree of closeness of relationship with the mother during childhood. An F score of 5.49 was obtained indicating a significant difference at the .001 level.

TABLE IV

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN PELS SCALE
SCORES ACCORDING TO THE DEGREE OF
CLOSENESS OF RELATIONSHIP WITH
MOTHER DURING CHILDHOOD

Description	No.	$\bar{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Degree of closeness of relation-ship with mother during childhood				
Much Below Average	5	78.80		
Below Average	53	94.75		
Average	271	89.18	5.49	.001
Above Average	320	85.82		
Much Above Average	119	81.80		

Those who indicated the degree of closeness of relationship with the mother as below average received the highest mean PELS Scale score, representing the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. Those who indicated the closeness of relationship with the mother as much below average received the lowest mean PELS Scale scores, representing the least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles. The next least accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles were expressed by those who indicated the closeness of relationship with the mother as much above average. With the exception of the category much below average, the pattern was that the greater the closeness of relationship with the mothers the less accepting were the perceptions toward experimental life styles.

Hypothesis II. There is a significant difference in Perceptions of Experimental Life Styles Scale (PELS) scores according to perceived happiness of the parent's marriage.

Examination of this hypothesis, as presented in Table V, revealed an F score of 12.18, which is significant at the .001 level. The students who indicated that they perceived their parents' marriage as unhappy received the highest PELS Scale score, representing the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles. Those students who perceived their parents' marriage as very happy received the lowest mean PELS Scale score, representing the least accepting perceptions of experimental life styles.

TABLE V

F SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN PELS SCALE
SCORES ACCORDING TO PERCEIVED HAPPINESS
OF THE PARENTS' MARRIAGE

Description	No.	$\overline{X}$	F	Level of Significance
Perceived happiness of the parents' marriage				
Very Happy	297	81.39		
Happy	288	87.43		
Undecided	84	93.93	12.18	.001
Unhappy	55	97.49		
Very Unhappy	41	91.05		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship
between perceptions of experimental life styles and the respondents'
perceptions of certain aspects of their parent-child relationship. The
perceptions of experimental life styles was measured by the Perception
of Experimental Life Styles Scale (Edwards, 1972).

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

An analysis of variance was used to determine if a significant
difference existed in PELS Scale scores according to the following
perceptions concerning parent-child relationships: (a) frequency with
which parents found time to do things with respondent during childhood,
(b) degree of closeness of relationship with father during childhood,
(c) degree of closeness of relationship with mother during childhood,
and (d) the perceived happiness of the parents' marriage.

The findings of this research indicated that a significant difference
exists in PELS Scale scores according to each of the following percep-
tions concerning parent-child relationships. The subjects who
expressed the most accepting perceptions of experimental life styles

perceived that: (a) their parents <u>very rarely</u> found time to do things with them during childhood, (b) the closeness to their father as <u>much below average,</u> (c) the closeness to their mother as <u>below average,</u> and (d) their parents' marriage was <u>unhappy.</u>

Those subjects who expressed the least accepting perceptions of experimental life styles perceived that; (a) their parents <u>very often</u> found time to do things with them during childhood, (b) the degree of closeness to their father was <u>much above average,</u> (c) the degree of closeness to their mother was <u>much below average,</u> although the next least accepting of experimental life styles perceived the degree of closeness to their mothers as <u>much above average,</u> and (d) their parents' marriage was <u>very happy.</u>

Conclusions and Discussion

The findings of this study indicate that youth who perceive relationships with their parents as positive and close tend to be significantly less accepting of experimental life styles than youth who have negative perceptions of their parent-child relationships. These findings suggest that if an individual has negative perceptions of his family of orientation he will have more positive perceptions toward non-conventional life styles and may be more likely to experiment with such life styles. Conversely, if an individual has positive perceptions of his family of orientation it seems logical that there would be less incentive to experiment with non-conventional life styles.

The present results coincide with the results of Rode (1971) and Paulson (1972) that alienated, anti-establishment youth tend to have negative perceptions of their parent-child relationships, perceiving

their parents as hostile, non-accepting, and as exercising control through psychological means (such as instilling persistent anxiety), and they also perceive more disharmony within their families than do non-alienated youth. Perhaps the findings of this study are also related to the results of various studies which indicate the following characteristics of children who express anti-social behavior: (a) little warmth from either parent, (b) limited identification with values and standards of parents, and (c) limited cohesiveness of the family (Walters and Stinnett, 1971).

The findings of this study would also seem to be related to other research which indicates that those who report a happy relationship with their parents express more favorable perceptions toward tradition- al marriage than do those who do not report happy parent-child relationships (Walters, Parker, and Stinnett, 1972).

The finding that those who perceive their parents' marriage as unhappy expressed the most accepting perceptions toward experimental life styles further suggests that those who have had negative experiences with the traditional life style in their family of orientation will be more likely to express more positive perceptions toward, and to experiment with, non-conventional life styles.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

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

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

Bell, Robert R. "Parent-Child Conflict in Sexual Values." Journal of
    Social Issues. Vol. 22 (1966), 34-45.

Beltz, Stephen E. Extramarital Relations. ed. Gerhard Neubeck. New
    Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1970.

Bensman, Joseph. "The Sexual Revolution and Cultural Styles."
    Psychoanalytic Review. Vol. 57 (1970), 405-431.

Berger, Bennett, Bruce Hackett, and R. Mervyn Millar. "The
    Communal Family." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21 (October,
    1972), 419-427.

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

Birdsong, Craig W. 'Relationship of Personality Needs to Perceptions
    Concerning Experimental Life Styles." Unpublished Master's
    Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1973.

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

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

Cleath, Robert. "The Homosexual Church." Christianity Today.
    Vol. 14 (September 11, 1970), 48-50.

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

Constantine, Larry L., and Joan M. Constantine. "Dissolution of
    Marriage in a Nonconventional Context." The Family Coordinator.
    Vol. 21 (October, 1972), 457-462.

Cuber, John F. "Alternate Models From the Perspective of Sociology,"
The Family in Search of a Future. ed. Herbert A. Otto. New
York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, 11-23.

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.

Ditzion, Sidney. Marriage Morals and Sex in America, New York:
Octagon, 1969.

Downing, Joseph J. "The Tribal Family and the Society of Awakening."
The Family in Search of a Future. ed. Herbert A. Otto. New
York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, 119-135.

Edwards, Maxine Payne. "College Students' Perceptions of Experi-
mental Life Styles." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma
State University, 1972.

Ellis, Albert. "It All Hinges on the Guilt Factor," Sexual Behavior.
Vol. 2 (September, 1972), 49.

Fonzi, Gaeton. "The New Arrangement." The Nuclear Family in
Crisis: The Search for An Alternative. ed. Michael Gordon.
New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Gordon, Michael. The Nuclear Family in Crisis: The Search for an
Alternative. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

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

Hilton, Helen LeBaron. Families of the Future: A Search For
Meaning. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1972
(Conference held at Iowa State University, October 4-7, 1971).

Hobbs, Edward C. "An Alternate Model From a Theological Perspec-
tive." The Family in Search of a Future, ed. Herbert A. Otto.
New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, 25-41.

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

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

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

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

Joyce, Carol. "The Socialization of Adolescent Non-conventionality: A Parent, Peer Moderator Approach." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of California, 1972.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Communes," The Nuclear Family in Crisis: The Search for an Alternative. ed. Michael Gordon. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Keniston, Kenneth. The Uncommitted. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1965.

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

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

Kephart, William H. "Experimental Family Organization: An Historical Cultural Report on the Oneida Community." The Nuclear Family in Crisis: The Search for an Alternative. ed. Michael Gordon. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

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

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

Kinkade, Kathleen. "Commune: A Walden Two Experiment." Psychology Today. Vol. 6 (February, 1973), 71-82.

Knox, David H., Jr. "Attitudes Toward Love of Highschool Seniors." Adolescence. Vol. 5 (1970), 89-100.

Lindsey, Ben B. As quoted in "Between the Lines." Redbook. Vol. 127 (July, 1966), 4.

Macklin, Eleanor D. "Heterosexual Cohabitation Among Unmarried College Students." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21 (October, 1972), 463-472.

Mead, Margaret. "Marriage in Two Steps," Redbook. Vol. 127 (July, 1969), 49.

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

Oberholtzer, W, Dwight. Is Gay Good? Ethics, Theology, and Homosexuality. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1971.

—

Olson, David H. "Marriage of the Future: Revolutionary or Evolutionary Change?" The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21 (October, 1972), 383-393.

O'Neill, Nena and George O'Neill. Open Marriage: A New Life Style For Couples. New York: M. Evans and Company, Inc., 1972.

Otto, Herbert A. The Family in Search of a Future. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970, 183-200.

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

Otto, Herbert A. "New Light on Human Potential." Families of the Future: A Search For Meaning. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1972., 14-25 (Conference held at Iowa State University October 4-7, 1971).

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

Paulson, Morris J., Lin Tien-teh, and Carl Hanssen. "Family Harmony An Etiological Factor in Alienation." Child Development. Vol. 43 (1972), 591-603.

Platt, John. "A Fearful and Wonderful World for Living." Families of the Future: A Search for Meaning. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1972, 3-13 (Conference held at Iowa State University, October 4-7, 1971).

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

Ramey, James W. "Emerging Patterns of Innovative Behavior in Marriage." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 24 (October, 1972), 435-456.

Rode, Alex. "Perceptions of Parental Behavior Among Alienated Adolescents." Adolescence. Vol. 6 (Spring, 1971), 19-38.

Russell, Bertrand. Marriage and Morals. New York: Bantam, 1966.

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

Schulterbrandt, Joy G., and Edwin J. Nichols. "Ethical and Ideological Problems for Communal Living: A Caveat." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21 (October, 1972), 429-433.

Scriven, Michael. "Let's Be Sexumenical." National Review, Vol. 19 (December 26, 1967), 14-30 (Speech given at the conference on "The Changing Women: The Impact of Family Planning").

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

Sprey, Jetse. "Extramarital Relationships." Sexual Behavior. Vol. 2 (August, 1972), 34-45.

Sussman, Marvin B., and Betty E. Cogswell. "The Meaning of Variant and Experimental Marriage Styles and Family Forms in the 1970s." 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.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam, 1970.

Wallin, Paul. "Marital Happiness of Parents and Their Children's Attitudes Toward Marriage." American Sociology Review. Vol. 19 (1954), 20-23.

Walsh, Robert H. "A Survey of Parents and Their Own Children's Sexual Attitudes." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Iowa, 1970.

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

Walters, James, Carol Parker, and Nick Stinnett. "Collete Students' Perceptions Concerning Marriage." Family Perspective, Vol. 7 (Fall, 1972), 43-49.

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

Whitehurst, Robert N. "Some Comparisons of Conventional and
    Counter-culture Families." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 21
    (October, 1972), 395-401.

Wyman, Rachael. "Adolescents Attitudes Toward Sex as Related to
    Their Perceptions of Their Parents." Unpublished Ph. D.
    dissertation, New York University, 1970.

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. Mormon

_____ 2. Protestant _____ 5. None

_____ 3. Jewish _____ 6. Other

_____ 7. Indicate below your degree of religious orientation:

_____ 1. Very religious

_____ 2. Religious

_____ 3. Non-religious

_____ 4. Anti-religious

_____ 8. Indicate below the type of religious orientation in which you were reared:

_____ 1. Orthodox/fundamentalist

_____ 2. Conservative

_____ 3. Middle-of-road

_____ 4. Liberal

_____ 5. None

_____ 9. Indicate below your present type of religious orientation.

_____ 1. Orthodox/fundamentalist

_____ 2. Conservative

_____ 3. Middle-of-road

_____ 4. Liberal

_____ 5. None

_____ 10. Indicate below your political orientation:

        _____ 1. Very conservative

        _____ 2. Conservative

        _____ 3. Middle-of-road

        _____ 4. Liberal

        _____ 5. Radical

        _____ 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
        _____ 2. Divorced (with no remarriage)
        _____ 3. One of parents deceased (with no remarriage)
        _____ 4. Divorced (with 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 inter- personal relationships with the opposite sex?

_____ 18. VS   S   A   U   VU   How would you rate your inter- personal 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   _____ 4. Often

     _____ 2. Rarely   _____ 5. Very Often

     _____ 3. Moderate

_____ 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   _____ 4. Above average

     _____ 2. Below Average   _____ 5. Much above average

     _____ 3. 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   _____ 4. Above average

     _____ 2. Below average   _____ 5. Much above average

     _____ 3. Average

_____ 24.-25. (Omit)

_____ 26. I would rate the happiness of my parents' relationship with each other as

     _____ 1. Very happy   _____ 4. Unhappy

     _____ 2. Happy   _____ 5. Very unhappy

     _____ 3. Undecided

_____ 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 <u>circle</u> 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 <u>mutual consent</u> 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 <u>without</u> <u>the knowledge</u> 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 within 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 society.

_____ 72. SA A U D SD Contributes positively to children's emotional health.

_____ 73. SA A U D SD Promotes fulfilling, close human rela-
tionships.

_____ 74. SA A U D SD Would not be an acceptable life style for
me.

_____ 75.-76. (Omit)

_____ 77.-78. (Omit)

On the next page are fifteen basic, normal personality needs that every-
one 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, gen-
eral 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 accu-
rately 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 high-
est level of the need.

DESCRIPTION OF NEEDS　　　　YOUR LEVEL OF NEED

NEED FOR -

_____ 1. ACHIEVEMENT--ambition, to   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
succeed, to do one's best, to
accomplish something of great
significance.

_____ 2. DEFERENCE--dependence, to   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
follow orders (and others), to
conform, to be conventional.

_____ 3. ORDER--neatness, to have   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
organization, be systematic,
and plan in advance; orderly
schedule.

_____ 4. EXHIBITION--attention, to be the   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
center of things, to be noticed, to
talk about oneself.

_____ 5. AUTONOMY--independence, to be   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
free in decisions and actions; to
be nonconforming without obliga-
tions.

_____ 6. AFFILIATION--need for people,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
friends, groups, to form strong
attachments.

_____ 7. INTRACEPTION--need to know,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
to understand--what and why, to
analyze and empathize.

_____ 8. SUCCORANCE--to receive help,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
encouragement, sympathy, kind-
ness from others.

_____ 9. DOMINANCE--to be a leader, to   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
lead, direct and supervise, to
persuade and influence others.

_____ 10. ABASEMENT--conscience, to   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
feel guilty and accept blame, to
confess wrongs, admit inferiority.

_____ 11. NURTURANCE--to give help,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
sympathy, kindness to others,
to be generous.

_____ 12. CHANGE--variety, novelty; to   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
experiment, try out new things,
experience change in routine.

_____ 13. ENDURANCE--perseverance,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
tenacity; to finish what is started,
to stick to something even if
unsuccessful.

_____ 14. SEX--need for opposite sex,   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
for sexual activities; to do
things involving sex.

_____ 15. AGGRESSION--to attach contrary 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
views, to criticize, to tell what
one thinks of others.

VITA

Sherry Garland Taylor

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PARENT-CHILD RELATIONSHIPS AND PERCEPTIONS OF EXPERIMENTAL LIFE STYLES

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, October 11, 1945, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. H. Garland. Married 1965 to Stan B. Taylor. One child; Andrea Lynn Taylor, born May 10, 1968.

Education: Graduated from Putnam City Highschool, May, 1963, Attended Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, 1963-66; Chapman College, Orange, California, 1967-68; graduated from State College of Arkansas, Conway, Arkansas, 1970, with a Bachelor of Arts in English and a minor in Psychology. Completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1973.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu