

FIRO-B PERSONALITY PATTERNS AND COMMITMENT
AMONG STRONG FAMILIES

By

CHARLES ARTHUR LELAND

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1972

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
July, 1977

Thesis
1977D
L537f
cop. 2



FIRO-B PERSONALITY PATTERNS AND COMMITMENT
AMONG STRONG FAMILIES

Thesis Approved:

Rich Stinnett

Thesis Adviser

Althea Wright

Elaine Jorgenson

Kenneth McVay

Norman N. Durbin

Dean of the Graduate College

997294

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to all those who have contributed to the completion of this study. Truly special thanks are extended to my personal friend and major adviser, Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose understanding, guidance, encouragement, and strength have provided a positive and healthy environment in which to work. He maintains a commitment toward academic excellence and intellectual rigor while providing psychological comfortableness and humane empathy.

Special thanks also goes to those who served on my research committee: Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, head, department of home economics education; Dr. Kenneth St. Clair, professor of educational administration and higher education; and Dr. Althea Wright, assistant professor of family relations and child development. To my friends, Ken Dye, Bill Davis, and Jan Scott, who have encouraged and guided me in so many special and needed ways during the course of study, I extend my thanks. To my wife, Debbie, I give my love. Her devotion will always be remembered and appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Need for Research	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Hypotheses	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Family Strengths	10
Marital Success	16
Personality Characteristics as Related to Marriage Success	23
Summary	26
III. PROCEDURE	29
Selection of Subjects	29
Instruments	30
Analysis of Data	32
IV. RESULTS	37
Description of the Subjects	37
The Item Analysis of the <u>Family Commitment Scale</u>	40
Responses of Strong Family Members to the <u>Family Commitment Scale</u>	40
Mean FIRO-B Scores of Husbands and Wives Among Strong Families	40
Examination of Hypotheses	45
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	65
Results	66
Conclusions and Discussion	70
Recommendations	73
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE	80

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX B - FIRO-B	93
APPENDIX C - <u>FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE</u>	96

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	38
II. Item Analysis of the <u>Family</u> <u>Commitment Scale</u>	41
III. Responses of Strong Family Members to the <u>Family Commitment Scale</u>	42
IV. Mean FIRO-B Scores of Husbands and Wives Among Strong Families	44
V. Z Score Reflecting Differences in Expressed Affection Scores According to Sex	49
VI. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between <u>Family</u> <u>Commitment Scale</u> Scores and Each of the FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	55
VII. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Affection Dimension of the FIRO-B	57
VIII. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Control Dimension of the FIRO-B	59
IX. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Inclusion Dimension of the FIRO-B	60
X. Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Affection and Inclusion Dimension of the FIRO-B	62

Table

Page

XI.	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Affection and Control Dimension of the FIRO-B	63
XII.	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficients Reflecting Associations Between Perceptions of Husbands and Wives Among Husband-Wife Pairs Concerning the Control and Inclusion Dimension of the FIRO-B	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Otto (1975) defined family strengths as forces and factors in the relationship which encourage the development of personal resources and potentials of family members which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to its members. One of the most important needs in our society today is strengthening family life. The family serves a variety of needs and functions most of which are unspecified (Zimmerman, 1972). The concept, family strengths, implies that the family is more desirable for the stability of society (Grams, 1967), and it has been noted that societies with strong family systems tended to recuperate rapidly from conditions of adversity whereas the opposite types recovered only with great difficulty (Zimmerman, 1972, p. 365). It is, therefore, important not only for the individual members within the family unit but also for society as a whole to have healthy families.

A study of strong families offers an opportunity to understand better the unique assets and potentials of family life. Such research is especially desirable since the divorce ratio in the United States has increased from one out of twelve in 1900 to approximately one out of three today.

There is evidence that most people consider a strong satisfying

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

Bowman (1974) helps to define marriage success by reporting that a successful marriage is one in which both partners receive a high level of personal satisfaction from the relationship. Success occurs when both partners obtain at least the satisfaction that they expected from the marriage (Kirkpatrick, 1963). As satisfaction with the marriage increases above this minimum amount, the relationship is considered even more successful (Bowman, 1974). There are many factors, both premarital and postmarital, that are associated with marriage success, but it is necessary that an attempt be made to further identify factors characteristic of successful marriages and thus provide models for strengthening families.

Need for Research

A marriage is comprised of individuals who have distinct personalities and life philosophies. Personality characteristics have been positively associated with marriage success; however, there is a need to identify additional personality characteristics which are related to marriage success and family strength (Lantz and Snyder, 1969). Grams (1967) has summarized the present situation: "Family strengths implies that strength is a value to be sought, that strong families are preferred to weak ones. This is the kind of concept that most . . . can

accept, but few can pin down." (p. 4).

Information and skills regarding the specific characteristics of family strength would be useful to the following: (a) family counselors, therapists, and social workers who are assisting families to develop more satisfying relationships; (b) to instructors in family life education or counseling programs in public and private schools, higher education, and family agencies; (c) to those who design and conduct marriage and family enrichment programs. The ability to develop strong, satisfying relationships should be incorporated into the socialization process itself (Mace and Mace, 1975). The identification of the characteristics of such relationships is the first step toward that end.

The characteristics of families who meet each other's emotional needs are seen as especially important. A recurrent theme in describing American families, marriages, and parent-child relationships during the past thirty years has been the shift from the primacy of fulfilling societal functions to that of fulfilling the emotional needs of individuals (Burgess and Locke, 1945; Mace and Mace, 1975). An emphasis on clearly defined instrumental or task-oriented roles is seen as gradually giving way to fluid relationships based on interpersonal competence rather than ascription (Foote and Cottrell, 1955). A major problem in the transition has been that while partners enter marriage with the expectation that they will meet their mate's emotional needs, and that the mate, in turn, will reciprocate, the requisite skills necessary to achieve this end are often not included in either partner's prior socialization (Scanzoni, 1972).

The ability to satisfy the universal human need for intimacy within the family is seen as especially important within American society where

alienation and isolation have become the unfortunate by-products of urban-industrial capitalism (Fromm, 1956). The present research was designed to identify and describe the personality patterns, as measured by the Fundamental Interpersonal Relation Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B), of husbands and wives who have been successful in establishing intimacy in their relationship and in developing strengths within their families.

The definition of family strengths as used in this study is based upon Otto's definition and refers to relationship patterns, social and psychological characteristics which create a sense of positive family identity, promote satisfying interaction among family members, and encourage the development of individual potential of family members (Stinnett and Sauer, 1975, p. 2).

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the personality patterns of husbands and wives among strong families and to relate personality patterns to selected background and relational factors.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. To determine the mean scores of husbands and wives among strong families concerning (a) the expressed Inclusion, Control, and Affection dimensions of the FIRO-B, and (b) the wanted Inclusion, Control and Affection dimensions of the FIRO-B.
2. To relate the expressed Inclusion, Control, and Affection dimensions of the FIRO-B scores to: (a) sex, (b) length of marriage, (c) closeness of the relationship with the child, (d) degree of marital happiness, (e) Family Commitment scores.
3. To relate the wanted Inclusion, Control, and Affection dimensions of the FIRO-B scores to the same variables as in Purpose number 2.
4. To determine the relationship between perceptions of husbands

and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:

- (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.
- (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores.
- (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores.
- (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.

- (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
- (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
- (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
- (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

- (a) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
- (b) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
- (c) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
- (d) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

5. To determine the relationship between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:

- (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
- (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
- (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
- (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives'

wanted Inclusion scores.

- (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
-
- (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses of this study were:

1. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the following: (a) sex, (b) length of the marriage, (c) closeness of the relationship with the child, (d) degree of marital happiness.
2. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in hypothesis number 1.
3. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the

variables listed in hypothesis number 1.

4. There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in hypothesis number 1.
5. There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in hypotheses number 1.
6. There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in hypothesis number 1.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to examine the following hypotheses:

7. There is no significant correlation between Family Commitment Scale scores and each of the following: (a) expressed Affection scores, (b) expressed Control scores, (c) expressed Inclusion scores, (d) wanted Affection scores, (e) wanted Control scores, (f) wanted Inclusion scores.
8. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.
9. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the

following: (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

10. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
11. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
12. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (c) husbands' wanted

Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

13. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Rationale for Hypotheses

The rationale for relating the specific variables mentioned in the above hypothesis to the Family Commitment Scale scores and the FIRO-B scores is that the literature indicates the personality patterns and those particular demographic and background variables included in the hypotheses do exert an important influence upon the quality of marriage and family relationships. Also, the research is extremely limited concerning the relationship of personality patterns and commitment to family strengths.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature and research concerning the family strengths is limited. The review of available literature reported here is concerned with family strengths, marital success, and personality characteristics as related to marriage success.

Family Strengths

Little research has been conducted concerning what makes a strong family. In an early study by Otto (1962, 1966) twenty-seven families were asked to list what they perceived as their family strengths. The results revealed that the affective, or the feeling domain of family life, especially the giving and receiving of love and empathy between spouses and between parents and children, proved to be the greatest sources of family strength. Other variables considered important within a strong family were joining in activities together as a family and sharing religious and moral convictions.

In a later study Otto (1967) revealed that families have latent strengths or capacities which they are not using. People within families tend to concentrate on their problems instead of concentrating on their strengths and some positive alternatives. Otto (1963, 1975) indicates that family strength is the end product of a series of ever changing related components. He identifies these twelve components which result

in family strength as follows:

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

Otto (1962) believed that family strengths are a composite of constantly changing elements within a family's subsystem which are constantly interacting and interrelated. Each element may be identified as a separate strength but when viewed in their totality result in family strength. Family strengths as defined by Otto (1975):

are those forces, and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourage the development of the personal resources and potentials of members of the family and which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to family members (p. 16).

Variations in the strengths of a family would naturally be expected throughout the family life cycle. A recent study of family strengths in Oklahoma found that five major factors characterized the sample of strong families: (a) the expression of appreciation to each other, (b) they spend much time together and participate in many activities together, (c) good communication patterns, (d) a high degree of religious orientation, and (e) a high degree of commitment to each other and to the entire family unit.

Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) in their study of successful families found that:

1. Successful families have more intimate family friends and have more in common with their friends than do unsuccessful families.
2. The basic "social" family principle is that of common values. This unique, purposeful, common value principle begins with mating and extends through the life history of the family and outward in family friends.
3. In every city, in every degree of intimacy and in every measure of friendship similarity, the co-working of intimacy and similarity has been associated strikingly with success. The more friends are like each other, the more successful they are in avoiding divorce, desertion, juvenile arrest records, and other phases of the breaking up of homes and domestic relations.
4. Having a child continue in high school is a positive function of child protection and of family success.
5. Parents with an ideal for their children, such as school

continuance, can most thoroughly implement that ideal in the minds of the children by surrounding their household from the beginning with friends who also possess the same ideals.

6. The totality of all the impressions of life other than parental had been received by the children from members of friend families.
7. Friendship between similar minded adults living in proximity over a period of years results in its most basic or primary type. The friendship of this type is between equals, is voluntaristic, involves common experiences, and is not primarily for the appetitive pleasure or political, economic, or social gain.

Therefore, the families who were successful in their study allowed only those families who were like themselves into their homes and circle of friends. In terms of families' friends, Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) found that only a few reported no friends at all (one percent) while from seventy to eighty percent claimed having approximately five or more intimate family-group friends. Depending upon the city, relatives made from three-tenths to almost one-half of the family group friends. The family-group friends were not restricted to the one stage of family life cycle which enabled the family as a whole to be exposed to a wide diversity of family types.

In a study by Reeder (1973), a model of family characteristics was developed which would aid problem solving behavior in families with a mentally disturbed child. He stated that a successful family:

- (a) is integrated into society;
- (b) maintains an internal focus of authority, decision-making, and emotional

investment; (c) has ties of affection and support among all members; (d) has open channels of communication; (e) has a centralized authority structure to coordinate problem solving efforts; (f) has the ability to communicate and evaluate conflicting ideas according to their intrinsic merit rather than the status of their source; (g) is able to reach a consensus on family goals and related role allocations and expectations; (h) prefers specific value orientations (p. 1758B).

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

Blackburn (1967) indicates that the strong family is the family that has a high degree of satisfaction with husband-wife and parent-child relationships. Strong husband-wife relationships exist where they have high feelings of mutual respect, affection, and love for each other (Cutright, 1971). The individuals comprising strong families usually come from similar economic classes and backgrounds with similar goals and expectations. They are also compatible sexually (Barton, Kawash, and Cattell, 1972).

Successful parent-child relationships also tend to strengthen and bind the family as a unit. Children affect the marital dyad in many ways. One way children may strengthen the family is through the commitment the couple has to the children (Blackburn, 1967, and Figley, 1973).

Walters and Stinnett (1971) report that couples without children tend to be either extremely unhappy or extremely happy while those with children approached average in happiness. One element central to the stability and strength of a strong family is commitment (Stevenson and Stinnett, 1976). Commitment is the process where individuals give their energy and loyalty to a central theme. Committed family members

strongly believe in what the family stands for as they continue to demonstrate this commitment. Kanter (1968) believes that many of the social problems in our society are seen as stemming from a lack of commitment.

Strong families have positive, open lines of communication and spend much time talking with each other (Ball, 1976). Most strong families are considered equalitarian in that all family members contribute to making decisions. According to Figley (1973) the strong family is not afraid to ask for help when it is needed, while a weak family waits until it is too late to seek help. The strong family has the ability to cope and to handle stressful situations that arise.

Religion, Figley further reports, plays an important part in the lives of strong families. It functions to support and to make the family stronger. One strength of the American family is that it continues to meet the basic needs of people (Barton, Kawash, Cattell, 1972). One such need is the need for companionship. The family has the potential of providing a place where members can grow and be accepted, be loved and cared for. It also offers the potential for fulfilling the emotional and physical needs of its members. Three main sources exist that support the family according to Grams (1967). One source is the church. It supports the family structure internally and externally by strengthening the family structure (Crockett, Babchuk, and Ballweg, 1969, and Grams, 1967).

Education is also a source of family strength. Through education, individuals become more aware of how to successfully live in families (Grams, 1967). The ability to establish priorities is another source of family strength. Those families who decide upon priorities of needs and wants and orient their behavior in accordance with those priorities tend

to experience a greater degree of satisfaction (Grams, 1967).

Marital Success

The achievement of a successful marriage is valued greatly by our society. Success is the evaluation of perceptions perceived by those involved in the relationship. A successful marriage occurs when both partners gain at least the satisfaction that they had anticipated from the marriage (Kirkpatrick, 1963). Spanier (1972) indicates that a successful marriage is being relatively free of conflict, the husband and wife being in relative agreement on major issues, enjoying the same leisure interests and participating in them together, and showing affection for one another. There may be merit in realizing that in order for a marriage to be successful the marital needs of individuals comprising the relationship must be met. If these needs are not met, the relationship is often dissolved and family strength is not allowed to develop.

There are many premarital and postmarital factors associated with marriage success. One such premarital factor to consider is the success or failure of the parents' marriage. If the parents were happily married, then the couple has a greater chance of being happily married than if the parents were unhappy or divorced. Children tend to follow examples set for them, and it is important that the examples are positive (Bowman, 1974).

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

positive way, he will more likely relate to others positively, particularly a marriage partner (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

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

Age at marriage has been reported to be another factor related to marital success. Those marrying at age nineteen or younger have the highest divorce rate and the most problems. A few reasons for the high rate of divorce in this group is because of such factors as small income, limited education, continued need for parental support, and lack of emotional maturity (Kirkpatrick, 1973, and Burchinal, 1965).

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

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

greater (Kirkpatrick, 1963).

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

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

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

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

Children can greatly affect the success of a marriage, even before they are conceived (Meyerowitz, 1970, and Figley, 1973). In his 1973 article, Figley stated that the timing of the birth of the first child affects marriage success. For instance, if the bride was premaritally pregnant, or if the couple became pregnant before adjusting to being married, the marriage may tend to not be successful. Premarital and early postmarital conception have been found by Hurley and Palonen (1967) to be associated with a high divorce rate. They also found a

significant negative relationship between marital adjustment and child density. The more children the lower the marital adjustment.

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

A study was conducted by Hill (1970) of a family over three generations, and he found that children are not financial assets nor can they be expected early to earn their keep. Hill reports that children are now liabilities with mouths to feed, bodies to clothe, and minds to educate.

Of 4,452 families surveyed in a study by Renee (1970), those couples currently raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied with their marriage than couples with no children or whose children were adults and had left home. Parents who have no problems in rearing their children tend to be more satisfied with their marriage than those having behavior problems with the children. In an investigation conducted by Rollins and Feldman (1970), they consistently found among wives a decline in marital satisfaction over the first ten years of marriage, or until the children were of school age. This same decline in marital satisfaction continues during the child's teen years until the child is launched. The marital relationship reaches a low point in the period just prior to the departure of the children from home (Hurley and Palonen, 1967).

A research project conducted by Luckey and Bain (1970) found that having children tends to be positively associated with marriage

stability, and that children are the primary, if not the only, satisfaction in the marriages of couples who admit to a low degree of marital bliss. Couples with a low degree of satisfaction may be staying married because of the children.

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

Gurin (1960) reports that marriage success has been associated with marriage happiness. This happiness develops from a healthy interpersonal relationship between husband and wife. Healthy interpersonal relationships include such elements as mutual respect, expression of appreciation and affection, which are necessary in contributing to marital happiness which affects marital success.

Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery (1970) have identified four basic needs considered important in the marital relationships of all age groups:

1. Love
2. Personality fulfillment
3. Respect
4. Communication

The meeting of these needs by each spouse is positively associated with marital success.

Lines of communication tend to be kept open in successful marriages. To develop effective lines of communication, attitudinal and behavioral patterns must be learned and positively reinforced. A few

of these effective patterns as reported by Navran (1967) are:

1. Talking to each other.
2. Understanding what is being said to them.
3. Having a wider range of subjects available to them.
4. Preserving communication channels and keeping them open.
5. Sensitive to each other's feelings.
6. Personalizing their language symbols.
7. Using nonverbal techniques of communication effectively.

(p. 182).

Levinger (1964) found that both spouses place a higher value on the affective aspect of task performance or behavior than on instrumental aspects. In a study of married undergraduates, Chilman and Meyer (1966) discovered that, "Love and companionship in marriage received a far higher rating . . . than sex satisfaction, living conditions, and academic pursuits" (p. 75).

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

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

Luckey (1960a, 1960b) and Stuckert (1963) found that marital satisfaction is related to the agreement of the husband's self concept and that held of him by his spouse. The corresponding relationship for the wife, that the husband accurately perceive his wife's self concept, was found to not be important for marital success. Hurvitz (1965) indicated that there was a significant relationship between marital satisfaction and the degree to which wives conform to the husbands' expectations. Hurvitz also observed that men do not conform as much as do women within the marital relationship.

The occupation of both the husband and wife have an important influence upon marriage success. Marriage satisfaction and stability tend to be higher among the more stable and higher paid occupations according to Bernard (1972). Marriage satisfaction tends to also be associated with job satisfaction which is associated with a feeling of self worth (Ridley, 1973).

Employment of the wife outside the home may have an adverse effect on the marriage, particularly if the wife is working when she does not want to or because of financial necessity. Also, if she does not enjoy her work or her husband does not approve of her employment, then this may have an adverse effect on the marriage. These conditions can cause strain and pressure on the marital relationship (Orden and Bardburn, 1969).

Burr (1971) found that there are discrepancies between role expectation and role behavior which influence marital satisfaction. Burr's findings revealed a high negative relationship between role discrepancies and marital satisfaction among 116 middle class married couples in a major midwestern city.

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

Personality Characteristics as Related to Marriage Success

Lantz and Snyder (1969) report that personality characteristics of marriage partners are significantly related to marriage failure or success. No one type of personality guarantees success in marriage; however, clinical evidence suggest that the person with a generally healthy personality will have a greater probability for marital success than will the person on the other end of the personality continuum (Stroup, 1963).

A few personality characteristics as associated with marriage failure or success have been identified by Lantz and Snyder (1969).

These include the following:

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

Spanier (1972) reports that spouses of successful marriages are mature, stable, conventional, and conforming people who come from

untroubled family backgrounds.

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

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

Stroup (1963) indicates that a high degree of marital dissatisfaction is associated with large differences in personality traits; however, it is not known whether the personality characteristics are the cause of the unhappy marriage or whether the marital problems produce these personality characteristics. Cattell and Nesselroade (1967) report that marriage satisfaction and stability are associated with similarity in emotional stability, enthusiasm, social boldness and conscience.

Stinnett and Walters (1977) observed that happily married persons have personality attributes that contribute to the successful development of any interpersonal relationship. Landis and Landis (1973) noted that those who have kind attitudes toward others, are considerate, cooperative, emotionally stable, and optimistic tend to have satisfying friendships as well as marriages.

Those persons dissatisfied with their marriages tend to view their spouses as being impatient, either dictatorial or passive, unkind, blunt, aggressive, gloomy, complaining, slow to forgive, and distrustful (Allen, 1962), while those persons who are inconsiderate, selfish, uncooperative, aggressive, and moody tend to have unsatisfying marriages and fewer friendships (Landis and Landis, 1973). Matthews and Michanovich (1963) found that unhappily married individuals felt they:

1. were neglected by their mates;
2. received little appreciation, affection, companionship, or understanding from their mates;
3. were belittled and that their self-respect was attacked by their mates;
4. were often falsely accused by their marriage partners.

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

Using the 16 PF and Marriage Role Questionnaire, Barton, Kawash, and Cattell (1972) related individual personality factors to various marital dimensions. They found that partners with high ego strength (emotional stability) and low guilt proneness reported high sexual satisfaction. Subjects with high superego (conscientiousness) tended to be highly devoted to the home, and low anxiety respondents reported high social-intellectual equality in their marriages. On the other hand, marriage instability scores were highest among individuals who used cognition rather than feelings in problem solving.

In a study relating family strength to personality characteristics (as measured by Edwards Personal Preference Scale), Ammons (1976) found

that couples of strong families who had a high degree of marital satisfaction expressed significant complementary need relationships along the following dimensions:

1. Nurturance-Exhibition. The wife's need to give help, sympathy, and kindness was associated with the husband's need to be the center of things and to be noticed.
2. Succorance-Affiliation. The wife's need to receive help, encouragement, and kindness from others was associated with the husband's need for people and his desire to form strong attachments.
3. Intracception-Succorance. The wife's need to understand and to empathize was associated with the husband's need to receive help, encouragement, and kindness from others.
4. Affiliation-Dominance. The wife's need for people and to form strong attachments was associated with the husband's need to persuade and influence others.
5. Endurance-Nurturance. The wife's need to persevere or finish what is started was associated with the husband's need to give help and sympathy.
6. Affiliation-Sex. Among both husbands and wives the need for strong attachments was associated with the need for sex on the part of their mate.

Summary

The related literature seems to indicate the following observations:

1. Certain characteristics such as (a) the expression of

appreciation to each other, (b) spending much time together and participating in many activities together, (c) good communication patterns, (d) a high degree of religious orientation, and (e) a high degree of commitment to each other and to the entire family unit are associated with strong families.

2. Successful families have more intimate family friends and have more in common with their friends than do unsuccessful families.
3. Depending upon the city, relatives made from three-tenths to almost one-half of the family group friends.
4. One element central to the stability and strength of a strong family is commitment to each other.
5. Three main sources that support the family are the church, the educational system, and the ability of families to decide upon priorities.
6. Premarital factors associated with marriage success are as follows: (a) success or failure of the parents' marriage, (b) individuals' personal happiness in childhood, (c) length of relationship before marriage, (d) age at marriage, (e) parental approval of one's mate, and (f) primary reason for getting married.
7. Three keys to marital success are: (a) personal readiness for marriage, (b) compatible mate selection, and (c) early adjustment to marriage.
8. Postmarital factors associated with marriage success are as follows: (a) an equalitarian, democratic

attitude, (b) similar cultural backgrounds, (c) timing of the birth of the first child, (d) healthy interpersonal relationships such as mutual respect, expression of appreciation, affection, and communication.

9. Higher levels of income and income stability are positively related to marital success.
10. Marital satisfaction is related to the agreement of husbands' self-concept and that held of him by his spouse.
11. Persons who are considerate, cooperative, generous, emphathetic, conventional, responsible, kind toward others, and view their spouses as being considerate are associated with successful marriages.
12. Strong families who had a high degree of marital satisfaction expressed significant complementary need relationships.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The 85 subjects of this study represent 55 strong families. These subjects were obtained through recommendations of the extension home economist in each of the 77 counties in Oklahoma. Cover letters, (see Appendix) explaining the research study and assuring anonymity, were sent to approximately 180 families. Questionnaires were included for both the husband and wife. They were requested to complete the questionnaires separately and not to compare answers. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with each questionnaire. The data were obtained in 1975 during the months of March, April, and May.

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

The extension home economists in each of the 77 counties in Oklahoma were sent letters requesting that they recommend two or more families in their county whom they felt were strong families. They were provided with general guidelines for consideration in selecting these families. The general guidelines were:

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

Instruments

An additional criterion was that the respondents must rate his or her marital happiness and satisfaction in the parent-child relationship as satisfactory or very satisfactory on the questionnaire. Further modifications were made as a result of suggestions made by the families who participated in this pre-test. The final questionnaire consisted of 70 items (see Appendix). The sections of the questionnaire that were used in the study consisted of the following:

- (a) background information, age, sex, and religious preference,
- (b) the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B),
- (c) the degree of family commitment scale.

The FIRO-B and degree of family commitment scale are described below.

FIRO-B

The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior (FIRO-B), developed by William Schutz (1958), is a 54-item questionnaire which measures three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal relationships: Inclusion, Control, and Affection.

Inclusion assesses the degree of which a person associates with others. Karen Horney's concept of "moving toward people" or "moving away from people" and the Jungian concepts of "introversion" and "extroversion" are similar to inclusion. Control measures the extent to which a person assumes responsibility, makes decisions, or dominates people. The Affection score reflects the degree of which a person becomes emotionally involved with others (Ryan, 1971).

Ryan (1971) indicates the test assumes that these three dimensions are fundamental in understanding and predicting interpersonal behavior. Although other factors certainly influence a person's actions, if these three dimensions concerning a person are known, meaningful inferences can be made about that person's behavior.

For each variable, two scores, represented by the letters "e" and "w," are obtained. The "e" scores represent the person's expressed or observable behavior in the areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection. The "w" scores represent the person's wanted behavior or what one wants from others, in the areas of Inclusion, Control, and Affection. The position of the scores are within the 0-9 range. The intensity of the score modifies the strength and applicability of Inclusion, Control, and Affection behavior. For example:

0-1 are extremely low scores; the behavior mentioned will have a compulsive quality.

2-3 are low scores; the behavior mentioned for low scores will be noticeably characteristic of the person.

4-5 are borderline scores; the person may reveal a tendency toward the behavior described for high or low scores.

6-7 are high scores; the behavior will be noticeably characteristic

of the person.

8-9 are extremely high scores; the behavior will have a compulsive quality to it.

Ryan (1971) believes what one seeks in one's interpersonal relationships is less directly observable, but it is valuable information in understanding and predicting one's behavior.

The subscales of the FIRO-B have been found to reflect a relatively high degree of internal consistency. The test-retest correlations are all over .70 (Buros, 1972).

Degree of Family Commitment Scale

The Degree of Family Commitment Scale is composed of a series of eight items in which the respondent rates the degree of commitment present in the family on a five point continuum ranging from very high to very low. The items reflect the respondents' perceptions concerning the degree of commitment in general among family members, perceptions concerning degree to which husband and wife support each other during times of trouble, and perceptions concerning the degree to which the husband and wife are concerned with promoting each other's welfare and happiness.

Analysis of Data

Frequencies and percentages were used to analyze background information such as age, sex, place of residence, race, socio-economic status, religion, number of years married, and number of children. An item analysis, using the Chi Square test was used to determine if items in the Family Commitment Scale significantly discriminated between the high

and low quartiles of the sample. A split-half reliability was used to obtain an index of the reliability of the Family Commitment Scale.

The ordinal level of the data and the relatively small sample size indicated that a non-parametric statistical test would be most appropriate to examine the various hypotheses. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) and the Mann-Whitney "U" test (when comparing two groups) were used to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the following: (a) sex, (b) length of the marriage, (c) closeness of the relationship with the child, (d) degree of marital happiness.
2. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in hypothesis 1.
3. There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in hypothesis 1.
4. There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in hypothesis 1.
5. There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in hypothesis 1.
6. There is no significant relationship between the

wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in hypothesis 1.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to examine the following hypotheses:

7. There is no significant correlation between the Family Commitment Scale scores and each of the following:
 - (a) expressed Affection scores, (b) expressed Control scores, (c) expressed Inclusion scores, (d) wanted Affection scores, (e) wanted Control scores, (f) wanted Inclusion scores.
8. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
 - (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.
9. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
 - (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with

- wives' expressed Control scores.
- (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with
wives' expressed Control scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Control scores
with wives' wanted Control scores.
10. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
- (a) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with
wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with
wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with
wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with
wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
11. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
- (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with
wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with
wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with
wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with
wives' wanted Inclusion scores

12. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
 - (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

13. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following:
 - (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
 - (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores.
 - (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of the Subjects

A detailed description of the 85 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. Primarily, the sample was composed of white, Protestant, middle-aged, middle class individuals residing in smaller cities or rural areas. Specifically, 82.35 percent designated their residence as either a farm (48.23%) or small town under 25,000 population (34.12%). Ninety-seven percent of the sample was white, and eighty-one percent were Protestant. The largest percentage of respondents were either from the upper-middle (33.33%) or lower-middle (47.62%) socio-economic class as measured by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955). The majority of the sample were between the ages of 36 and 45 (58.82%).

More heterogeneity was evident in terms of the sexual composition of respondents and the number of years they had been married. The sample consisted of 40 percent male and 60 percent female. The majority (87.64%) of the sample had been married between 15 and 25 years. The largest percentage of respondents (52.56%) indicated that the wife was not employed outside the home. The majority of the sample had three children.

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Sex	Male	34	40.00
	Female	51	60.00
Race	White	82	97.62
	Black	1	1.19
	Indian	1	1.19
Age	20-25	1	1.18
	26-30	7	8.23
	31-35	18	21.18
	36-40	27	31.76
	41-45	23	27.06
	46-50	6	7.06
	over 50	3	3.53
Religion	Catholic	10	12.05
	Protestant	68	81.93
	Mormon	1	1.20
	None	4	4.82
Degree of Religious Orientation	Very Much	17	20.00
	Much	41	48.23
	Moderate	24	28.23
	Little	3	3.53
	Very Little	0	0.00
Socio-Economic Class	Upper	1	1.19
	Upper-Middle	28	33.33
	Lower-Middle	40	47.62
	Upper-Lower	15	17.86
	Lower-Lower	0	0.00
Size of Residence	On a farm or in country	41	48.23
	Small town under 25,000	29	34.12
	City of 25,000 to 50,000	8	9.41
	City of 50,000 to 100,000	4	4.71
	City over 100,000	3	3.53
Wife's Employment	Not employed outside home	38	52.56
	Employed full-time	13	25.60

TABLE I (Continued)

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

The Item Analysis of the Family Commitment Scale

In order to obtain an index of the validity of the items in the Family Commitment Scale, the Chi-Square test was utilized to determine if each item significantly differentiated between those subjects scoring in the upper quartile and those scoring in the lower quartile on the basis of the total scores. All of the items in the scale were found to be significantly discriminating at the .001 level.

Responses of Strong Family Members to the Family Commitment Scale

A majority of the respondents indicated a High to Very High degree of commitment of you to your spouse (95.29%), your spouse to you (94.11%), your child to you (92.95%), and you to your child (90.58%). Most of the respondents reported a High to Very High degree to which: you are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness (95.29%), your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness (94.11%), you stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble (92.58%), and your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble (90.58%).

In summary, based on these results a commitment profile of strong family members indicates they have an extremely high degree of commitment toward their spouse and a high degree to which they promote their spouse's welfare and happiness.

Mean FIRO-B Scores of Husbands and Wives

Among Strong Families

The mean FIRO-B scores of husbands and wives among strong families

TABLE II
ITEM ANALYSIS OF THE FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
How would you rate the degree of commitment of:			
1. Your spouse to you.	2	34.29	.0001
2. You to your spouse.	3	31.22	.0001
3. Your child to you.	4	37.58	.0001
4. You to your child.	3	34.29	.0001
Rate the degree to which:			
5. Your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble.	3	25.71	.0001
6. You stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble.	3	23.23	.0001
7. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness.	2	34.27	.0001
8. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness.	2	31.22	.0001

TABLE III

RESPONSES OF STRONG FAMILY MEMBERS TO THE FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE

Item Item	Very High		High		Average		Low		Very Low	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
How would you rate the degree of commitment of:										
1. Your spouse to you.	59	69.41	21	24.70	5	5.88				
2. You to your spouse.	58	68.23	23	27.06	3	3.53			1	1.18
3. Your child to you.	43	50.59	36	42.35	3	3.53	2	2.35	1	1.18
4. You to your child.	53	62.35	24	28.23	7	8.23			1	1.18
Relate the degree to which:										
5. Your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble.	67	78.82	10	11.76	5	5.82			3	3.53
6. You stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble.	64	75.29	15	17.29	3	3.53			3	3.53
7. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness.	58	68.23	22	25.88	5	5.88				
8. You are concerned with promot- ing your spouse's welfare and happiness.	57	67.06	24	28.23	4	4.71				

are presented in Table IV. The Inclusion score refers to one's general social orientation. The mean expressed Inclusion score of 3.78 indicates that husbands and wives among strong families are reasonably sociable, but they have a tendency to move away from others. The mean wanted Inclusion score of 2.34 suggests that husbands and wives are very selective about persons with whom they associate.

The Control dimension of the FIRO-B pertains to responsibility and leadership behavior. A low mean expressed Control score of 1.89, as indicated in Table IV, suggests that these husbands and wives avoid making decisions and taking on responsibility. It is not that they do not make decisions or take on responsibility, it is that they tend to be very cautious in their decision-making process. The wanted Control score of 3.65 suggests that the husbands and wives are selective in who they allow to control them or to assume responsibility that affects them. This score represents little dependency needs from a variety of people. Dependency needs may come from only a few selected individuals.

The Affection dimension, unlike Inclusion, concerns itself with the need for intimate relationships rather than superficial ones. The expressed Affection score of 3.61 suggests that husbands and wives of strong families are affectionate, yet they have a tendency to move away from others and to be cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships. The wanted Affection score of 5.34 means that husbands and wives are more comfortable if other people initiate close, intimate relationships with them.

TABLE IV
MEAN FIRO-B SCORES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES
AMONG STRONG FAMILIES

FIRO-B Sub Scales	Mean Score
Expressed Inclusion	3.78
Expressed Control	1.89
Expressed Affection	3.61
Wanted Inclusion	2.34
Wanted Control	3.65
Wanted Affection	5.34

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the following: (a) sex, (b) length of marriage, (c) closeness of the relationship with the child, (d) degree of marital happiness.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis I (a)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

The Mann-Whitney U-test revealed a z value of $-.93$ which indicated that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

Hypothesis I (b)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

When the Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to this hypothesis, an H value of 1.33 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

Hypothesis I (c)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed

Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

A Kruskal-Wallis H value of 0.83 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis I (d)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

The Mann-Whitney U-test revealed a z value of -1.19 which indicated that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis II (a)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

A Mann-Whitney U-test z value of -0.14 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed

Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

Hypothesis II (b)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

When the Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to this hypothesis, an H value of 3.98 was obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

Hypothesis II (c)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed an H value of 0.71 which indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis II (d)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

A Mann-Whitney z value of -0.66 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis III (a)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

When the Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to this hypothesis, a z value of -3.06 was obtained. This value indicates that a significant difference (.001 level) existed between husbands and wives concerning the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores. The females reported significantly higher scores than the males.

The expressed Affection score, 4.06 for females, suggests that they are affectionate, yet they have a tendency to move away from others and to be cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships. The expressed Affection score, 2.94 for males, means even more of a tendency to move away from others than the females expressed. The males express more extreme caution in initiating the development of close, intimate relationships.

Hypothesis III (b)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

A Kruskal-Wallis H value of 4.49 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

TABLE V
Z SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES
IN EXPRESSED AFFECTION SCORES ACCORDING TO SEX

Variable	No.	Mean Score	Z Score	Level of Sig.
SEX				
Male	34	2.94	-3.06	.001
Female	51	4.06		

Hypothesis III (c)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed an H value of 0.30 which indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis III (d)

There is no significant relationship between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

A Mann-Whitney U value of -0.39 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis IV

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis IV (a)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

When the Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to this hypothesis, a z

value of -0.42 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

Hypothesis IV (b)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 1.46 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

Hypothesis IV (c)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed an H value of 0.44 which indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis IV (d)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

A Mann-Whitney U value of -0.69 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis V

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis V (a)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

When the Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to this hypothesis, a z value of -1.08 was obtained indicating that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

Hypothesis V (b)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed an H value of 2.99 which indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

Hypothesis V (c)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 2.27 was obtained. This value indicated

that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis V (d)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

When the Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to this hypothesis, a z value of -1.18 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis VI

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance (when comparing three or more groups) or Mann-Whitney U-test (when comparing two groups). The results are presented below.

Hypothesis VI (a)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

A Mann-Whitney U value of -0.69 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and sex.

Hypothesis VI (b)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

The Kruskal-Wallis test revealed an H value of 3.62 which indicated that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and length of marriage.

Hypothesis VI (c)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 1.08 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and closeness of the relationship with the child.

Hypothesis VI (d)

There is no significant relationship between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

When the Mann-Whitney U-test was applied to this hypothesis, a value of -0.15 was obtained, indicating that no significant relationship existed between the wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores and degree of marital happiness.

Hypothesis VII

There is no significant correlation between Family Commitment Scale scores and each of the following: (a) expressed Affection scores, (b) expressed Control scores, (c) expressed Inclusion scores, (d) wanted Affection scores, (e) wanted Control scores, (f) wanted Inclusion scores.

TABLE VI

SPEARMEN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE SCORES AND
 EACH OF THE FIRO-B SUB-SCALE SCORES

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	<u>Family Commitment Scale Scores</u> r	Level of Significance
Expressed Affection	.22	.04
Expressed Control	-.03	N.S.
Expressed Inclusion	.06	N.S.
Wanted Affection	.06	N.S.
Wanted Control	.05	N.S.
Wanted Inclusion	.04	N.S.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that the only significant correlation was between the Family Commitment Scale scores and expressed Affection, which was significant at the .04 level.

Hypothesis VIII

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that no significant correlations existed between the perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning any of the FIRO-B dimensions listed in this hypothesis. These results are presented in Table VII.

Hypothesis IX

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that no significant correlations existed between the perceptions of husbands

TABLE VII

SPEARMEN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE AFFECTION DIMENSION OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' wanted Affection scores	.30	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' expressed Affection scores	-.09	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' expressed Affection scores	-.07	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' wanted Affection scores	.09	N.S.

and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning any of the FIRO-B dimensions listed in this hypothesis. These results are presented in Table VIII.

Hypothesis X

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that the only significant correlation was between the husbands' wanted Inclusion scores and the wives' wanted Inclusion scores. A positive correlation of .44 existed between the husbands' wanted Inclusion scores and the wives' wanted Inclusion scores which was significant at the .01 level. These results are presented in Table IX.

Hypothesis XI

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that no significant correlations existed between the perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning any of the FIRO-B

TABLE VIII

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE CONTROL DIMENSION OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Control scores with Wives' wanted Control scores	.20	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Control scores with Wives' expressed Control scores	-.06	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Control scores with Wives' expressed Control scores	.02	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Control scores with Wives' wanted Control scores	.03	N.S.

TABLE IX

SPEARMEN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE INCLUSION DIMENSION OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.44	.01
Husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.25	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.06	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.29	N.S.

dimensions listed in this hypothesis. These results are presented in Table X.

Hypothesis XII

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that no significant correlations existed between the perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning any of the FIRO-B dimensions listed in this hypothesis. These results are presented in Table XI.

Hypothesis XIII

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the following: (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient. The results indicated that no significant correlations existed between the perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning any of the FIRO-B dimensions listed in this hypothesis. These results are presented in Table XII.

TABLE X

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE AFFECTION AND INCLUSION DIMENSION
 OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.32	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.24	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.23	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.30	N.S.

TABLE XI

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE AFFECTION AND CONTROL DIMENSION
 OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' wanted Control scores	.13	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' expressed Control scores	.04	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Affection scores with Wives' expressed Control scores	.30	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Affection scores with Wives' wanted Control scores	.11	N.S.

TABLE XII

SPEARMAN RANK CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS REFLECTING ASSOCIATIONS
 BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE
 PAIRS CONCERNING THE CONTROL AND INCLUSION DIMENSION
 OF THE FIRO-B

FIRO-B Sub-Scale Scores	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Husbands' wanted Control scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.05	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Control scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.10	N.S.
Husbands' wanted Control scores with Wives' expressed Inclusion scores	.08	N.S.
Husbands' expressed Control scores with Wives' wanted Inclusion scores	.05	N.S.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

While the literature concerning the American family has evolved from instrumental (meeting socially defined roles) to intrinsic (meeting the emotional needs of other family members) task fulfillment within the nuclear family, virtually no recent research has sought to describe personality patterns and commitment of successful, strong, intrinsic families. The major purpose of this study, therefore, was to (a) use the Family Commitment Scale to measure the degree of (intrinsic) commitment present in strong families, (b) examine the personality patterns of husbands and wives among strong families, and (c) relate personality patterns to selected background characteristics and degree of family commitment.

The 85 respondents comprising the sample were recommended as strong family members by extension home economists in 77 counties in Oklahoma and also indicated on the questionnaire that they rated their husband-wife and parent-child relationships as either satisfactory or very satisfactory. A questionnaire was developed by Stinnett (1975) to obtain information concerning background information and degree of family commitment as well as personality patterns. The Family Commitment Scale was used to measure the degree of commitment present in a family, and the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior test was used to measure three fundamental dimensions of interpersonal

relationships or personality patterns: Inclusion, Control, and Affection.

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the respondents' sex, race, age, religion, degree of religious orientation, socio-economic class, size of residence, wife's employment, number of children, and number of years married. An item analysis using the Chi-square test was utilized to determine which items on the Family Commitment Scale discriminated between the high and low quartiles of the sample.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized to determine if a significant relationship existed between the respondents' FIRO-B scores according to length of marriage and closeness of the relationship with the child. The Mann-Whitney U-test was used to determine if a significant relationship existed between the respondents' FIRO-B scores and sex and degree of marital happiness.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to determine if there was a significant association between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning the dimensions of the FIRO-B.

Results

The results indicated that a significant difference (.001 level) existed between husbands and wives concerning the expressed Affection dimension of the FIRO-B scores. The females reported significantly higher scores than the males. A positive correlation was found between the Family Commitment Scale and expressed Affection which was significant at the .04 level.

The results indicated that the only significant correlation was between the husbands' wanted Inclusion scores and the wives' wanted

Inclusion scores which was significant at the .01 level.

Based on the responses of strong family members to the Family Commitment Scale, the findings suggest that family members have an extremely high degree of commitment toward their spouse and a high degree to which they promote their spouses' welfare and happiness.

The mean FIRO-B scores of husbands and wives among strong families suggest that their interpersonal relationships, in the dimensions of Inclusion, Control, and Affection, are cautious and selective; however, they are not of a compulsive quality. The FIRO-B profile of the strong family members is as follows:

Expressed Inclusion score (3.78): indicates that husbands and wives among strong families are reasonably sociable, but they are cautious about their social relationships.

Wanted Inclusion score (2.34); suggests that husbands and wives are very selective concerning persons with whom they associate.

Expressed Control score (1.89): reflects a tendency for husbands and wives to take time in making decisions or assuming responsibility. They tend to be very cautious in this dimension.

Wanted Control score (3.65): suggests that husbands and wives are selective in who they allow to control them or with respect to assuming responsibility that affects them.

Expressed Affection score (3.61): indicates that husbands and wives are affectionate, yet they have a tendency to be cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate, relationships.

Wanted Affection score (5.34): suggests that husbands and wives are more comfortable if other people initiated close, intimate relationships.

There was no significant relationship found between the:

1. Expressed Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B scores and each of the following: (a) sex, (b) length of marriage, (c) closeness of the relationship with the child, (d) degree of marital happiness.
2. Expressed Control dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.
3. Expressed Affection of the FIRO-B and (a) length of marriage, (b) closeness of the relationship with the child, (c) degree of marital happiness.
4. Wanted Inclusion dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.
5. Wanted Control dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.
6. Wanted Affection dimension of the FIRO-B and each of the variables listed in Hypothesis I.
7. There was no significant correlation between the Family Commitment Scale scores and each of the following: (a) expressed Control scores, (b) expressed Inclusion scores, (c) wanted Affection scores, (d) wanted Control scores, (e) wanted Inclusion scores.

There was no significant correlation found between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs concerning:

8. (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted

Affection scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Affection scores.

9. (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Control scores.
10. (a) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' wanted Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' expressed Inclusion scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
11. (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.
12. (a) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores, (b) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' expressed Affection scores, (c) husbands' wanted Affection scores with wives'

expressed Control scores, (d) husbands' expressed Affection scores with wives' wanted Control scores.

13. (a) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores, (b) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (c) husbands' wanted Control scores with wives' expressed Inclusion scores, (d) husbands' expressed Control scores with wives' wanted Inclusion scores.

Conclusions and Discussion

A major conclusion of this study is that strong family members are cautious and selective in their interpersonal relationships and possess a very high degree of commitment. For example, as indicated by mean FIRO-B scores and according to the clinical interpretation of the FIRO-B (Ryan, 1971), the respondents see themselves as being sociable; however, only in a cautious manner will they extend themselves to others. They feel even more comfortable if only a few select people initiate social contact with them. The respondents see themselves as being very cautious in assuming responsibility or taking control, and they are less selective in who they allow to assume responsibility and take control. The respondents see themselves as expressing affection, yet being cautious about initiating the development of close, intimate relationships. They tend to feel more comfortable if other people initiate the close relationship; however, they tend to be selective in who they allow to approach them.

In analyzing the results of the mean FIRO-B scores of the husbands and wives among strong families, it appears that the FIRO-B profile suggests personality patterns reflecting honesty in their interpersonal

relationships. For example, in the Affection dimension of the FIRO-B, the respondents express and give as much affection as they want others to express and give to them (as indicated by the mean expressed and wanted Affection scores). In the Control dimension, the respondents express and take less control than they want other people to assume such responsibility. However, the separation of the mean scores are small, and the data suggest that the respondents are very selective in who they allow to take control. The respondents in the Inclusion dimension express a cautious desire for social contact with others; however, they are even more selective in who they want to approach them, as illustrated by a higher mean score for expressed Inclusion than for wanted Inclusion. Therefore, it may be concluded that members of strong families, even though cautious and selective, are projecting true and honest behavior patterns in what they see themselves expressing and what they want from others, based upon their similar expressed and wanted mean scores for all the dimensions measured by the FIRO-B. These results suggest that psychological game-playing may be minimized by these strong family members due to the agreement between their expressed and wanted behavior.

The conclusion of this study that strong family members are cautious and selective in their interpersonal relationships coincides with the research of Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960) who found that successful families were very selective in their friendships. The successful families in the Zimmerman and Cervantes study tended to select friends who were similar to them and with whom they had much in common. Also, relatives composed from three-tenths to one-half of the successful families' friends.

The finding that the strong family members in this study expressed

a very high degree of commitment to each other agrees with previous research indicating that one element central to the stability and strength of family life is commitment (Stevenson and Stinnett, 1976; Matthews, 1970). The present study also supports the thesis of Kanter (1968) that many of our social problems stem from the lack of commitment.

The finding that the females reported significantly higher expressed Affection scores than did males may be due to a cultural expectation that females are more demonstrative and affectionate than males, resulting in males feeling less free to express affection (Brenton, 1966). This finding may help to explain other research evidence indicating that males tend to be more satisfied in marriage than females (Stinnett, Collins, and Montgomery, 1970; Landis and Landis, 1973).

The finding that Family Commitment Scale scores were positively and significantly correlated with expressed Affection scores is related to research indicating that commitment is a major factor contributing to family strength and stability (Stevenson and Stinnett, 1976; Matthews, 1977). This finding also coincides with Kanter's (1968) observation that commitment-building mechanisms in communes were important in developing feelings of intimacy and group identity among commune members. The present findings suggest that expressed affection tends to contribute to feelings of commitment among family members. Also, the findings may suggest that the presence of commitment encourages the expression of affection among family members.

The finding that a significant positive correlation existed between husbands' and wives' wanted Inclusion scores indicate that husbands and wives among these strong families are very similar in degree of social contact that they desire. They are also similar in being very selective

in their social contact. This finding reflects compatibility between these husbands' and wives' desire for social contact.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for future research:

1. It is suggested that this study be replicated with a national sample composed of a greater representation of various ethnic groups, socio-economic groups and urban families.
2. It may be beneficial to select strong families where the ages of the husbands and wives are equally distributed within the following age groups: 20-25, 26-30, 31-35, 36-39, 40-44, 45-49, and 50 and over. The results of each age group could then be compared.
3. There may be merit in investigating the perceptions of children concerning the strengths of their families.
4. It may be interesting to have some information about age at which the couples married and if they have been married more than once.
5. It would be informative to compare strong families with families that have severe relationship problems.
6. A longitudinal study should be initiated among couples who are in the age range of 20-25 to determine their personality patterns and commitment; then monitor any changes as the relationships progress through the years to age 55.
7. It would be extremely beneficial to develop a

behaviorial training program that would reinforce and develop relationship skills, personality patterns and commitment which have been identified as characteristics of strong families.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, Florence A. "Role of the Self-Concept in Student Marital Adjustment." Family Life Coordinator, 11 (1962), 43-45.
- Ammons, Paul Warren. "Vital-Total Marital Relationships Among Strong Families and Their Association with Selected Demographic and Personality Variables." (Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1976).
- Anthony, E. J. "The Mutative Impact on Family Life of Serious Mental and Physical Illness in a Parent." Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 14 (1969), 433-453.
- Ball, O. L. "Communication Patterns in Strong Families." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1976).
- Barton, K., G. Kawash, and R. D. Catell. "Personality Motivation, and Marital Role Factors as Predictors of Life Data in Married Couples." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.
- Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Company, 1972.
- Blackburn, Clark W. "What is a Strong Family?" International Journal of Religious Education, 3 (1967), 35-36.
- Bowman, Henry A. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1974.
- Brenton, Myron. The American Male. Greenwich, Connecticut: Fawcett, 1966.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family. 27 (1965), 243-254.
- Burgess, E. W., and H. J. Locke. The Family: From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1945.
- Buros, Oscar Krisen (ed.) The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook. vol. 1. New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972.
- Burr, Wesley R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 368-372.

- Cattell, Raymond B., and John R. Nesslerode. "Likeness and Completeness Theories Examined by 16 Personality Factor Measures on Stably and Unstably Married Couples." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7 (1967), 351-361.
- Chilman, O. A., and D. L. Meyer. "Single and Married Undergraduate Personality Needs and Self-Rated Happiness." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 67-76.
- Clements, William H. "Marital Interaction and Marital Stability: A Point of View and a Descriptive Comparison of Stable and Unstable Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 697-702.
- Crockett, H. T., H. Babchuk, and T. A. Ballweg. "Change in Religious Affiliation and Family Stability: A Second Study." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (1969), 464-468.
- Cutright, P. "Income and Family Events: Marital Stability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 291-306.
- Figley, Charles R. "Child Density and the Marital Relationship." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 372-382.
- Foote, N. R., and L. S. Cottrell. Identity and Interpersonal Competence. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Fromm, E. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row, Inc., 1956.
- Gabler, John, and Herbert A. Otto. "Conceptualization of 'Family Strengths' in Family Life and Other Professional Literature." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26 (1964), 221-222.
- Grams, A. "Sources of Family Strength." International Journal of Religious Education, 43, 9 (1967), 4-5, 41.
- Gurin, Gerald, Joseph Veroff, and Sheila Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Hicks, Mary W., and Marilyn Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1970), 553-554.
- Hill, Reuben. Family Development in Three Generations. Cambridge: Schenkman Publishing Company, 1970.
- Hurley, John R. and Donna P. Palonen. "Marital Satisfaction and Child Density Among University Student Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 483-484.
- Hurvitz, N. "Control Roles, Marital Strain, Role Deviation, and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 27 (1965), 29-31.

- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Commitment and Social Organization: A Study of Commitment Mechanisms in Utopian Communities." American Sociological Review, 33 (1968), 499-576.
- Kieren, Dianna, and Irving Tallman. "Spousal Adaptability: An Assessment of Marital Competence." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 247-256.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford. The Family. New York: The Roland Press Co., 1963.
- Landis, Judson T., and Mary G. Landis. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Lantz, Herman, and Eloise Snyder. Marriage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Levinger, G. "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry, 27 (1964), 433-448.
- Lively, E. L. "Toward Concept Clarification: The Case of Marital Interaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31 (1969) 108-114.
- Luckey, Eleanor B. and Joyce K. Bain. "Children: A Factor in Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 43-44.
- Luckey, Eleanor B. "Marital Satisfaction and Congruent Self-Spouse Concepts." Social Forum, 39 (1960a), 153-157.
- Luckey, Eleanor B. "Marital Satisfaction and its Association with Congruence of Perception." Marriage and Family Living, 22 (1960b), 49-54.
- McGuire, C., and G. D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research Paper in Human Development, No. 3 (revised). Austin: University of Texas, 1955.
- Mace, D., and V. Mace. "Marriage Enrichment: Wave of the Future." Family Coordinator, 24 (1975), 132-136.
- Matthews, V. C., and C. S. Michanovich. "New Orientations on Marital Maladjustment." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 300-304.
- Meyerowitz, Joseph H. "Satisfaction During Pregnancy." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 38-42.
- Navran, Leslie. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, 6, 2 (1967), 173-184.
- Orden, Susan R., and Norman M. Bardburn. "Working Wives and Marriage Happiness." American Journal of Sociology, 74 (1969), 392-407.

- Otto, H. A. "Criteria for Assessing Family Strength." Family Process, 2 (1963), 329-339.
- Otto, H. A. "How can a Family Deliberately Build Strengths?" International Journal of Religious Education, 43, 9 (1967), 6-7; 40-41.
- Otto, H. A. "The Minister and Family Strengths." Pastoral Psychology, 17, 163 (1966), 21-28.
- Otto, H. A. "Has Monogamy Failed?" In Carr, G. B. (ed.) Marriage and Family in a Decade of Change. Reading Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1972.
- Otto, H. A. "The Personal Family Strength Research Projects--Some Implications for the Therapist." Mental Hygiene, 48 (1964), 439-450.
- Otto, H. A. The Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, California: The Holistic Press, 1975.
- Otto, H. A. "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962), 77-81.
- Reeder, Darrell. "A Model of Family Characteristics for Problem Solving Behavior in Families With a Mentally Retarded Child." Dissertation Abstracts, 34B (1973), 1758B.
- Renee, Karen S. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 54-66.
- Ridley, C. A. "Exploring the Impact of Work Satisfaction and Involvement on Marital Interaction When Both Partners are Employed." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 35 (1973), 229-237.
- Rollins, Boyd C., and Harold Feldman. "Marital Satisfaction Over the Family Life Cycle." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 20-28.
- Ryan, Leo R. Clinical Interpretation of the FIRO-B. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1971.
- Scanzoni, John. "Family Organization and the Probability of Disorganization." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 407-411.
- Scanzoni, John. Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in American Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Schutz, William. Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior Test. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc., 1958.
- Spanier, Graham B. "Romanticism and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 474-480.

- Stevenson, Paul, and Nick Stinnett. "Family Commitment: Examination of a Theoretical Framework." Home Economics Research Journal, in press.
- Stinnett, Nick, Janet Collins, and James E. Montgomery. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 428-433.
- Stinnett, Nick, and Kathryn H. Sauer. "Relationship Characteristics of Strong Families." Accepted for publication in Family Perspective, 1976.
- Stinnett, Nick, and James Walters. Relationships in Marriage and Families. New York: McMillian, 1977.
- Stroup, Atlee L. Marriage and Family: Developmental Approach. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Stuckert, R. D. "Role Perception and Marital Satisfaction--A Configurational Approach." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 415-419.
- U. S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1973, 94th ed. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1974.
- Walters, James, and Nick Stinnett. "Parent-Child Relationships: A Decade Review of Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (February, 1971), 70-111.
- Zimmerman, Carle C., and Lucius F. Cervantes. Successful American Families. New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1960.
- Zimmerman, C. C. "The Future of the Family in America." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 323-333.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

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

74074

August 12, 1975

Dear Friend:

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

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

Your answers are anonymous and confidential since you are asked not to put your name on the questionnaire. Please answer each question as honestly as you can. We are not interested in how you think you should answer the questions, but we are interested in what you actually feel and do in your family situation.

It is expected that the information gained from this research will be of benefit to families and also of benefit to persons in the helping professions such as teachers, ministers, and counselors.

We appreciate your participation in this research. It is only through the contribution of persons such as you that we can gain greater understanding of marriage and family relationships.

Thank you,

Sincerely yours,

Nick Stinnett, Ph.D.
 Associate Professor
 Department of Family Relations and Child Development

NS/jg

Enclosures

Oklahoma State University
Division of Home Economics

Department of Family Relations
and Child Development

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

Please check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question. Your answers are confidential and anonymous since you do not have to put your name on the questionnaire. Please be as honest in your answers as possible. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. Family Member: Mother _____ Father _____
2. Race:
 1. White _____
 2. Black _____
 3. Indian _____
 4. Oriental _____
 5. Other _____
3. Age: _____
4. What church do you attend?
5. Who earns most of the income for your family?
 1. Husband _____
 2. Wife _____
 3. Other _____
6. What is the educational attainment of the husband?
7. What is the educational attainment of the wife?
8. Husband's occupation:
9. Wife's Occupation:
10. Major source of income for the family:
 1. Inherited savings and investments _____
 2. Earned wealth, transferable investment _____
 3. Profits, royalties, fees _____
 4. Salary, Commissions, (regular, monthly, or yearly) _____
 5. Hourly wages, weekly checks _____
 6. Odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity _____
 7. Public relief or charity _____
11. Residence:
 1. On farm or in country _____
 2. Small town under 25,000 _____
 3. City of 25,000 to 50,000 _____
 4. City of 50,000 to 100,000 _____
 5. City of over 100,000 _____

12. Indicate below how religious your family is: (Rate on the 5 point scale with 5 representing the highest degree of religious orientation and 1 representing the least.)

1 2 3 4 5

13. How long have you been married to your present spouse? _____

14. If this is not your first marriage, was your previous marriage ended by:
1. Divorce _____
 2. Death of spouse _____

15. How many children do you have? _____

16. What are their ages? _____

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

22. What do you feel has contributed most to making your marriage satisfying?
23. What do you feel has contributed most to making your relationship with your child strong?
24. What would you most like to change about your relationship with your oldest child living at home?
25. Now we would like to find out how satisfied you are with your mate's performance of certain marriage roles at the present time. Please answer each question by circling the most appropriate letter at the left of each item.

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

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

- | | | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|----|-----|
| 1. Providing a feeling of security in me. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 2. Expressing affection toward me. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 3. Giving me an optimistic feeling toward life. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 4. Expressing a feeling of being emotionally close to me. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 5. Bringing out the best qualities in me. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 6. Helping me to become a more interesting person. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 7. Helping me to continue to develop my personality. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 8. Helping me to achieve my individual potential (become what I am capable of becoming.) | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 9. Being a good listener. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 10. Giving me encouragement when I am discouraged. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 11. Accepting my differentness. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |
| 12. Avoiding habits which annoy me. | VS | S | U | US | VUS |

13. Letting me know how he or she really feels about something. VS S U US VUS
14. Trying to find satisfactory solutions to our disagreements. VS S U US VUS
15. Expressing disagreement with me honestly and openly. VS S U US VUS
16. Letting me know when he or she is displeased with me. VS S U US VUS
17. Helping me to feel that life has meaning. VS S U US VUS
18. Helping me to feel needed. VS S U US VUS
19. Helping me to feel that my life is serving a purpose. VS S U US VUS
20. Helping me to obtain satisfaction and pleasure in daily activities. VS S U US VUS
21. Giving me recognition for my past accomplishments. VS S U US VUS
22. Helping me to feel that my life has been important. VS S U US VUS
23. Helping me to accept my past life experiences as good and rewarding. VS S U US VUS
24. Helping me to accept myself despite my shortcomings. VS S U US VUS
- 26, Some people make us feel good about ourselves. That is, they make us feel self-confident, worthy, competent, and happy about ourselves. What is the degree to which your spouse makes you feel good about yourself? Indicate on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the greatest degree and 1 represents the least degree.)
- 1 2 3 4 5
27. (a) What exactly does your spouse do that makes you feel good about yourself?
- (b) What exactly does your spouse do that makes you feel bad about yourself?

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

1 2 3 4 5

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

34. How would you rate the degree of commitment of:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very Low
1. Your spouse to you.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. You to your spouse.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Your child to you.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. You to your child.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

35. Rate the degree to which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very Low
1. Your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. You stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

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

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

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

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

43. Rate how comfortable you and your spouse were with each other during your engagement:
1 2 3 4 5
44. Rate the degree to which you feel comfortable in sharing your problems with your spouse:
1 2 3 4 5
45. Rate the degree to which you think your spouse feel comfortable in sharing his/her problems with you:
1 2 3 4 5
46. Rate the degree to which you think your child feels comfortable in sharing his/her problems with you:
1 2 3 4 5

47. Rate the degree to which you think your child feels comfortable in sharing his/her problems with your spouse:
1 2 3 4 5
48. Rate how comfortable you now feel with your spouse:
1 2 3 4 5
49. Rate how comfortable you think your spouse now feels with you:
1 2 3 4 5
50. Rate how comfortable you now feel with your child:
1 2 3 4 5
51. Rate how comfortable you think your child now feels with you:
1 2 3 4 5
52. Indicate below how much conflict (serious disagreements) you experience with your spouse:
1 2 3 4 5
53. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your child:
1 2 3 4 5
54. Indicate below how much conflict your spouse experiences with your child:
1 2 3 4 5
55. Please indicate how often you and your spouse respond to conflict situations in each of the following ways: (5 represents very often; 1 represents very rarely.)
- | | You | | | | | Your spouse | | | | |
|--|-----|---|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Is specific when introducing a gripe. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Just mainly complains. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Sticks to one issue at a time. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Is intolerant. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Is willing to compromise. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Calls others names (such as neurotic, coward, stupid, etc.) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Brings up the past. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Uses sarcasm. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. Checks to be sure he/she correctly understands the other person's feeling about the disagreement. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. Respects right of the other person to disagree. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

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

- | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|-------------------|-------|
| 1. Your spouse | | 2. Your child | |
| Very satisfied | _____ | Very satisfied | _____ |
| Satisfied | _____ | Satisfied | _____ |
| Uncertain | _____ | Uncertain | _____ |
| Dissatisfied | _____ | Dissatisfied | _____ |
| Very dissatisfied | _____ | Very dissatisfied | _____ |

57. If the communication pattern between you and your spouse is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what do you think has made it unsatisfactory?)

58. If the communication pattern between you and your child is good, what do you think has made it good? (If unsatisfactory, what do you think has made it unsatisfactory?)

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

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

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

62. Indicate the degree to which each of the following behaviors describe you and your spouse: (5 indicates the behavior is very common and 1 indicates the behavior is very rare.)

	You					Your spouse				
1. Is judgemental toward others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Does not try to control other's behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. Uses strategy (psychological games) to get others to do what he/she wants them to do.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. Acts disinterested in others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. Does not act superior toward others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Is open minded to the ideas of others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

63. How often do you and your spouse do things together? (Rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely.)

1 2 3 4 5

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

65. How often do you do things with your child? (Rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely.)

1 2 3 4 5

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

67. How often does your spouse do things with your child? (Rate on the following 5 point scale, with 5 representing very often and 1 representing very rarely.)

1 2 3 4 5

Many families today experience the pressure of having to do many different things in day to day living.

68. How much of a problem is today's busy pace of life for your family? (Rate on the following 5 point scale with 5 indicating it is a great problem and 1 indicating it is little or no problem.)

1 2 3 4 5

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

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

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

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

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

72. How often does your family see your:

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

APPENDIX B

FIRO-B

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

1. Usually 2. Often 3. Sometimes 4. Occasionally 5. Rarely 6. Never

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

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

1. Most People 2. Many People 3. Some People 4. A Few People 5. One or Two People 6. Nobody

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

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

1. Most People 2. Many People 3. Some People 4. A Few People 5. One or Two People 6. Nobody

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

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

1. Usually 2. Often 3. Sometimes 4. Occasionally 5. Rarely 6. Never

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

APPENDIX C

FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE

FAMILY COMMITMENT SCALE

How would you rate the degree of commitment of:

	Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low
1. Your spouse to you.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. You to your spouse.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Your child to you.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. You to your child.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Rate the degree to which:

	Very High	High	Average	Low	Very Low
5. Your spouse stands by you when you are in trouble.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
6. You stand by your spouse when he/she is in trouble.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
7. Your spouse is concerned with promoting your welfare and happiness.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
8. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

2
VITA

Charles Arthur Leland
Candidate for the Degree of
Doctor of Education

Thesis: FIRO-B PERSONALITY PATTERNS AND COMMITMENT AMONG STRONG FAMILIES

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Jackson, Michigan, August 16, 1948, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Leland. Married May 11, 1974 to Debbie Roebuck.

Education: Attended Edison (Tulsa, Oklahoma) High School 1963-1967; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Radio and Television from Oklahoma State University in May, 1972; received the Master of Science degree in Family Relations and Child Development from Oklahoma State University in May, 1973; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in July, 1977 at Oklahoma State University.

Professional Experience: Employed as the Regional Coordinator for Drug Related Services at Bi-State Mental Health Foundation, Ponca City, Oklahoma, 1975-1976. Served as a Vocational and Psychological Counselor for the Guthrie Job Corps Center, Guthrie, Oklahoma 1974-1975.

Professional Organizations: Phi Kappa Phi, Omicron Nu, Higher Education Alumni Council of Oklahoma.