

VITAL-TOTAL MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG  
STRONG FAMILIES AND THEIR ASSOCIATION  
WITH SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND  
PERSONALITY VARIABLES

By

PAUL WARREN AMMONS

Bachelor of Science  
Abilene Christian College  
Abilene, Texas  
1969

Master of Social Work  
University of Arkansas  
Little Rock, Arkansas  
1973

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
December, 1976



VITAL-TOTAL MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG  
STRONG FAMILIES AND THEIR ASSOCIATION  
WITH SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND  
PERSONALITY VARIABLES

Thesis Approved:

*Nick Stinnett*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Elaine Jorgensen*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Kenneth H. Davis*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Arthur Wright*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman D. Durhan*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to all those who have contributed to the completion of this study. Special thanks are extended to my friend and adviser, Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose unquenchable optimism and helpful comments have provided a supportive mileau in which to work. He has mastered the art of remaining sympathetic and humane without sacrificing the expectation of intellectual rigor, a seeming rarity in academia.

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 colleagues at Maude Carpenter Children's Home who have encouraged me in so many ways during the past several years of research and study, I extend my thanks. To my parents, Cleo and Madeline Ammons, who value education, I offer my love and appreciation.

To my girls, Carol Leigh and Paula, who have immeasurably enriched my concept of a satisfying family life, I extend the special love of a father. And to Frances, who has been both mother and, during my weekly treks to Stillwater, father to eight foster children, I offer a very special thank you. Her sacrificial love 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 . . . . .	6
Hypotheses . . . . .	8
Definition of Terms . . . . .	9
Limitations . . . . .	12
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	13
Family Strength . . . . .	13
Marital Success . . . . .	15
Successful Parent-Child Relationships . . . . .	25
Summary . . . . .	28
III. PROCEDURE . . . . .	30
Selection of Subjects . . . . .	30
Administration of Instruments . . . . .	31
Instruments . . . . .	31
Analysis of Data . . . . .	34
IV. RESULTS . . . . .	36
Description of the Subjects . . . . .	36
The Item Analysis of the <u>Vital-Total</u> <u>Relationship Scale</u> . . . . .	39
Responses of Strong Family Members to the <u>EPPS</u> . . . . .	39
Responses of Strong Family Members Who Expressed the Highest <u>Vital-Total Relationship Scale</u> Scores to the <u>EPPS</u> . . . . .	41
Examination of Hypotheses . . . . .	41
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	65
Results . . . . .	67
Discussion . . . . .	68
Recommendations . . . . .	73
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	75

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	83
APPENDIX B - MODIFIED <u>EPPS</u> . . . . .	98
APPENDIX C - <u>VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE</u> . . . . .	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects . . . . .	37
II. Item Analysis Based on Comparisons of Upper and Lower Quartiles of <u>Vital-Total Relationship</u> <u>Scale</u> Scores . . . . .	40
III. Responses of Strong Family Members to <u>EPPS</u> . . . . .	42
IV. Responses of Strong Family Members Who Expressed the Highest <u>Vital-Total Relationship Scale</u> Scores to <u>EPPS</u> . . . . .	43
V. Association Between <u>Vital-Total Relationship Scale</u> Scores and Length of Marriage . . . . .	46
VI. H Score Reflecting Differences in <u>Vital-Total</u> <u>Relationship Scale</u> Scores According to Level of Personality Need for Sex . . . . .	52
VII. H Score Reflecting Differences in <u>Vital-Total</u> <u>Relationship Scale</u> . . . . .	53
VIII. Correlation Between the Responses of Husbands and Wives (Among Husband-Wife Pairs Who Have a Highly Vital Relationship) Concerning Level to Which They Possess Each of 15 Personality Needs . . . . .	60

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### Statement of the Problem

Anderson and Carter (1974) have observed that the family is the one social unit in human society that is inextricably interwoven with all other systems. Strong, viable families contribute much to the strength of these interrelated human systems, at both the micro and macro level. Conversely, instability on the part of the family is related to instability among these same systems. Healthy family functioning is thus seen as critical to insure the preservation of society and the emotional stability of its members.

Several research findings which underscore the importance of family strength might be cited. Glueck and Glueck (1970), for instance, in a longitudinal study of delinquent boys identified three variables from an original list of over 1,000 that were highly predictive of juvenile delinquency. Each of these variables were family-related: (a) inconsistent maternal discipline of the child, (b) lack of parental discipline, and (c) lack of family cohesiveness and affection. Mauch (1970), on the other hand, found that families whose members had well defined roles were least likely to be associated with delinquency.

The literature also suggests that individual mental health is highly correlated with the degree of family strength. Multi-problem families

are more likely to experience a wide variety of emotional difficulties than are more stable family units (Scherz, 1972). Using historical accounts as a basis for data gathering, Zimmerman (1972) has concluded that societies with strong family systems are more likely to survive adverse conditions than those whose family structure is less well organized.

While its position as a critical human system suggests that a viable family structure is essential, there is increasing evidence that all is not well with the American family. The number of divorces in the United States now exceeds 1,000,000 per year (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1976). Child neglect and abuse have become an almost epidemic problem (Cristal, 1975). These indices of family instability suggest the need for a better understanding of the characteristics of strong families.

#### Need for Research

Surprisingly, while family strength is often identified as a desirable end, very little research has been done to determine the elements of strong families (Gramms, 1967; Otto, 1975). Gramms (1967) has summarized the present situation: "Family strength 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 regarding the concrete, specific elements of family strength would be useful to the following: (a) family therapists, who are concerned with assisting dysfunctional families to develop more satisfying relationships; (b) to teachers in family life education programs in public schools, higher education, and family agencies;



(c) to those responsible for designing and conducting marriage and family enrichment programs. Ultimately, as Mace and Mace (1975) have suggested, the ability to develop strong, satisfying relationships should be incorporated into the socialization process itself, negating the need for restorative and preventative services such as these. The identification of the characteristics of such relationships is a 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 the literature describing American families, marriages, and parent-child relationships during the past 30 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 Cotrell, 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 need for intimate relationships applies to the parent-child, as well as the husband-wife dyad. Although they present it as an aside, Cuber and Haroff (1965) note that spouses who develop close relationships with one another often prefer that their children become more independent, thus allowing the mates to devote the time and energy necessary to maintain a vital relationship between themselves. The

impact of fostering this independence is unclear, although, given that both time and energy are limited, one might question whether there is a sufficient surplus of either among such couples to devote to achieving intimacy with their children.

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 characteristics of families who have been successful in accomplishing this end. Because the "interpersonal competence" necessary for the development of these relationships hinges on the personalities of individual family members (Landis and Landis, 1970), this study attempted to identify which specific traits are associated with the development of strong families. Further, since the term relationship denotes a two-way process of interaction, the degree of personality similarity-dissimilarity between husband and wife was also addressed.

It should be noted that the shift from the primacy of fulfilling instrumental tasks to that of fulfilling affective needs within the marital relationship is not complete and by no means universal. Many couples have enduring, mutually satisfying marriages without achieving the emotional gratification that characterizes the interpersonal marriage which Foote and Cottrell (1955) describe. Cuber and Haroff (1965) have observed that instrumental (utilitarian) couples are markedly different from intrinsic couples (that is, those couples whose relationship with each other has top priority among the several considerations which make up a total life) both in terms of their expectations and needs.

Gratification for instrumental couples comes from external sources, while the opposite is true of intrinsic couples, who strive to become "soul-mates" rather than merely partners in a mutually advantageous, if not thrilling, merger. Any study of family strength must account for this essential difference.

Although Cuber and Haroff's typology has been widely accepted and referenced (Burr, 1976), little follow-up research on these types of marital relationships has been conducted to date. In their original research Cuber and Haroff (1965) used the interview method for the collection of data. No objective scale or instrument has been developed in the interim that would measure the degree to which a person's marriage is characterized by each of the marital relationship types identified by Cuber and Haroff (1965):

1. Conflict-habituated - This type of relationship is dominated by tension and conflict--quarreling and ridicule are frequent.
2. Passive-congenial - This type of relationship is characterized by a low degree of satisfaction and has a dull, "lifeless" quality. The husband and wife from the beginning have had minimal personal involvement with each other and they usually indicate little feeling of disillusionment.
3. Devitalized - This type of relationship is similar to the passive-congenial except that the blandness that characterizes current marital interaction is the end result of a gradual deterioration in a once-meaningful relationship.
4. Vital - In a vital relationship husband and wife find immense satisfaction in their companionship with each other; there is a great deal of sharing in the relationship. All other

relationships are subordinate.

4. Total - Total relationships differ from vital relationships only in degree. Thus, the total relationship involves even more mutual sharing and companionship.

The purpose of this study was to develop a scale designed to measure the vital-total type marriage (combining the two types into one scale was considered desirable due to their great similarity) as conceptualized by Cuber and Haroff and to relate those scale scores to various sociological and psychological variables.

#### Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of this study was to identify and describe various demographic and personality characteristics of strong families in which the husband and wife have a vital-total relationship. Particular attention was devoted to an exploration of the degree of personality similarity-complementarity among vital marriages. The impact of the degree of vitality in the marriage relationship on parent-child interactions was another concern of this study.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. to develop a scale (the Vital-Total Relationship Scale) for measuring the vital-total type marriage relationship as conceptualized by Cuber and Haroff (1965);
2. to examine the relationship between the respondents' perceptions concerning the degree to which their marriage is characterized by a vital-total type relationship and each of the following background variables:
  - (a) sex, (b) age, (c) religious affiliation, (d) religious

orientation, (e) length of marriage, (f) socio-economic status, and (g) rural or urban place of residence;

3. To examine the relationship between the respondents' perceptions concerning the degree to which their marriage is characterized by a vital-total type relationship and each of the following personality variables as measured by the EPPS:  
(a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression;
4. to examine the relationship between the respondents' perceptions concerning the degree to which their marriage is characterized by a vital-total type relationship and each of the following parent-child variables: (a) number of children, (b) perceived closeness of self-child relationship, and (c) perceived closeness of spouse-child relationship;
5. to examine the degree of similarity or of dissimilarity among marriage partners reflecting a high degree of the vital-total type marital relationship concerning each of the following personality variables: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) intraception, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression (as reflected by Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores).

## Hypotheses

The specific hypotheses of this study were:

1. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) sex, (b) age, (c) religious affiliation, (d) religious orientation, (e) socio-economic status, and (f) rural or urban place of residence.
2. There is no significant association between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) length of marriage or (b) number of children.
3. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the individual possesses each of the following personality needs as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.
4. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) perceived closeness of self-child relationship or (b) perceived closeness of spouse-child relationship,
5. There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a highly vital relationship (as indicated by both the husband and wife expressing highest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores) concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which

they possess each of the following personality variables as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

6. There is no significant intercorrelation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a highly vital relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess each of the 15 personality needs listed above.

#### Rationale for Hypotheses

The rationale for relating the specific variables mentioned in the above hypotheses to the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores is that the literature indicates that personality characteristics and those particular demographic and background variables included in the hypotheses do exert an important influence upon marriage and family relationships.

#### Definition of Terms

##### Family Strengths:

... are those forces, and dynamic factors in the relationship matrix which encourage the development of the personal resources and potentials of members of the family and which make family life deeply satisfying and fulfilling to family members (Otto, 1975, p. 16).

Strong Families: are those families whose members have a high degree of happiness in the husband-wife and parent-child

relationships and whose members fulfill each others needs to a high degree. The family is also intact with both parents present in the home (Sauer, 1976).

Vital-Total Marriage: In a vital relationship husband and wife find immense satisfaction in their companionship with each other; there is a great deal of sharing in the relationship. All other relationships are subordinate. The total relationship differs from a vital relationship only in degree. Thus, the total relationship involves even more mutual sharing and companionship. As Cuber and Haroff (1965) have noted:

... when the close, intimate, confidential look is taken, the essence of the vital relationship becomes clear: the mates are intensely bound together psychologically in important life matters. Their sharing and their togetherness is genuine. It provides the life essence for both man and woman. The mates find their major satisfaction in life to be their relationship with their mates. It is hard to escape the word vitality--exciting mutuality of feelings and participation together in important life segments (pp. 55-56).

The following definitions are based upon Edwards' (1959) research and conceptualization:

Achievement: ambition, to succeed, to do one's best to accomplish something of great significance.

Deference: dependence, to follow orders (and others) to conform, to be conventional.

Order: neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule.

Exhibition: attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.



Autonomy: independence, to be free in decisions and actions;  
to be nonconforming without obligations.

Affiliation: need for people, friends, groups, to form strong  
attachments.

Intracception: need to know, to understand- what and why, to  
analyze and empathize.

Succorance: to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness  
from others.

Dominance: to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to  
persuade and influence others.

Abasement: conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to  
confess wrongs, admit inferiority.

Nurturance: to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to  
be generous.

Change: variety, novelty, to experiment, try new things,  
experience change in routine.

Endurance: perseverance, tenacity; to finish what is started,  
to stick to something even if unsuccessful.

Sex: need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things  
involving sex.

Aggression: to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell  
what one thinks of others.

Complementary Relationship: A "harmonic intermeshing" of needs.  
May be either Type I, in which the same need is gratified in  
both partners but at very different levels, or Type II, in  
which different needs are gratified (Ktsanes and Ktsanes,  
1968).

### Limitations

The primarily rural, White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (WASP) composition of the sample limits the applicability of the findings. A great deal of caution should be exercised in generalizing to other populations.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

#### Family Strength

As noted earlier, family strength is not an easy concept to pin down. Otto (1962, 1963, 1964, 1966, 1967, 1972, 1975), the most prolific writer in the area, has defined family strength as a process rather than an end product. His framework for identifying family strength consists of the following elements:

1. The ability to provide for the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs of a family.
2. The ability to be sensitive to the needs of the family members.
3. The ability to communicate.
4. The ability to provide support, security, and encouragement.
5. The ability to establish and maintain growth-producing relationships within and without the family.
6. The capacity to maintain and create constructive and responsible community relationships in the neighborhood and in the school, town, local, and state governments.
7. The ability to grow with and through children.
8. An ability for self-help and the ability to accept help when appropriate.
9. An ability to perform family roles flexibly.

10. Mutual respect for the individuality of family members.
11. A concern for family unity, loyalty, and interfamily cooperation.

Otto's framework stresses the ability to grow and remain flexible as the family moves through stages of development. It is this capacity to remain responsive to change that is central to strength.

Blackburn (1967) has defined a strong family in terms of reciprocal role fulfillment and satisfaction within the parent-child and husband-wife dyads. Within this context the family is seen as an important source of physical and emotional gratification.

Zimmerman and Cervantes (1960), taking another approach, have emphasized the contribution of family friends in determining strong families. Similarity and intimacy are the two interrelated characteristics of friendships that contribute to family success. Families who develop such friendships "strikingly" reduce the likelihood of divorce, desertion, juvenile arrest records and other phases of the breaking of homes and domestic relations.

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

orientations. Baumbeck (1971) in a study of the impact of adolescence on family conflict concludes that the development of a sound procedure for problem solving is critical if families are to work through crisis. Similarly, Anthony (1969) notes that strong families pool intellectual and emotional resources and work out constructive solutions together in times of crisis.

Ball (1976) found that satisfactory interfamilial communication was a characteristic of strong families. The factors that contribute to satisfying communication included: (a) talking out problems together, (b) honesty (openness), (c) listening, and (d) talking together.

Sauer (1976) reported that strong families were characterized by: (a) mutual respect and understanding, (b) expressions of appreciation among family members, (c) parental expressions of interest in their children and their activities, and (d) that religious convictions are important to their life style.

#### Marital Success

One way of further delineating family strength is to examine the factors that contribute to the success of husband-wife and parent-child subsystems. While the literature in each of these areas is more extensive than for the family as a whole, one is still confronted with the problem of pinning down what is meant by successful or strong marriage and parent-child relationships.

Stinnett and Walters (in press) have observed that "Marriage success involves more than a marriage which is permanent because there are permanent marriages in which the partners are miserable and maintain a very destructive relationship with one another" (p. 1). They suggest, as

does Bowman (1974), that a successful marriage is one in which the partners' level of satisfaction with their relations is at least what they expected from marriage. The more satisfaction they obtain above this level, the greater is the success of the marriage relationship.

Cuber and Haroff (1965) have stated, succinctly enough, that "the qualitative aspects of enduring marital relationships vary enormously" (p. 43). From their research among upper-middle class couples who had been married at least 10 years and who had never considered divorce or separation, Cuber and Haroff delineated two basic types of marriages. The utilitarian marriage, defined as "any marriage which is established and maintained for purposes other than to express an intimate, highly important personal relationship between a man and a woman," includes conflict habituated, passive-congenial, and devitalized relationships.

Hicks and Platt (1970) report:

Even though there is a lack of affection and companionship, the instrumental aspects of these specific marriages are all more than sufficiently met, therefore, the marriage is satisfactory enough to remain intact (p. 68).

At the other end of the continuum are successful marriages that meet affective or companionship needs in addition to instrumental task fulfillment. Cuber and Haroff (1965) categorize such marriages as intrinsic, which includes both vital and total relationships. They state:

When the close, intimate, confidential, empathetic look is taken, the essence of the vital relationships become clear: the mates are intensely bound together psychologically in important life matters. Their sharing and their togetherness is genuine. It provides the life essence for both man and woman (p. 55).

Among upper-middle class respondents, the intrinsic marriage represented a minority (Cuber and Haroff, 1965), although Burgess (1945), and

more recently Mace and Mace (1975), have expressed their belief that this type relationship is the "preferred choice of the great majority of men and women in our culture today" (p. 133).

In summary, then, marriage success involves continuation of the marriage and satisfaction with the marital relationship. Satisfaction is a qualitative term, and some marriage partners are satisfied with far less than others. There has been a movement toward companionship as an expectation, and away from mere instrumental task fulfillment (Levinger, 1966).

Foote and Cotrell (1955) have observed that the requisite skills needed for achieving intimacy in a companionship marriage are more complex than those required for an instrumental relationship. Interpersonal competence, the basis for developing a marriage based on companionship, is "... a totally different and highly flexible capacity to handle fluid relational situations and guide them in the direction of growth toward mutually satisfying intimacy" (Mace and Mace, 1975, p. 133).

### Communication

Communication has been identified as one prerequisite to the development of a happy marriage (Clarke, 1970). Navran (1967) found that happily married couples, in contrast to unhappily married couples: (a) talk more to each other, (b) convey the feeling that they understand what is being said to them, (c) have a wider range of subjects available to them, (d) preserve communication channels and have them open, (e) show more sensitivity to each other's feelings, (f) personalize their language symbols, and (g) make more use of supplementary nonverbal

techniques of communication.

Similar findings have been reported by Karlsson (1963) and Locke, Sabagh, and Thomas (1956). A study by Levinger and Senn (1967) found that disclosure of feelings tended to be correlated positively with "general" marital satisfaction, and was even more highly correlated with good feelings about the other person in the relationship. Recognition of the importance of communication in marriage success is exemplified by the number of communication programs that have proliferated in recent years (Sherwood and Scherer, 1975).

#### Quality of Relationship

The quality of the interpersonal relationship is another factor that has been associated with marital happiness (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Factors such as understanding, mutual respect, expression of appreciation and affection are important in contributing to a fulfilling marital relationship (Stinnett and Walters, in press). Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960) found that couples who reported "very happy" marriages are more likely to describe their relationship in terms of the emotional relationship they enjoy with their spouse. Conversely, those reporting less happiness in marriage focused on the situational aspects of marriage.

Similarly, Levinger (1966) surmised that in relation to marital happiness both husband and wife place a higher value on the affective aspects than on the instrumental aspects of task performance. Blood (1969) found that one major factor associated with marriage success is the wife's happiness with the amount of attention given to her by the husband.



Conversely, 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.

### Personality Factors

Perhaps the single factor most necessary for the development of a satisfactory companionship model marriage is a personality that allows for and facilitates intimacy. Studies in this area have fallen into three categories. On the one hand, some consideration has been given to the personality traits each partner brings with him into the marriage. In contrast, others have focused on the degree to which the personality traits of both partners are either similar or complement one another. Finally, there has been some interest in the similarity-dissimilarity of one's own perceptions of his personality as opposed to the perception of his mate.

Individual Personality Attributes. Murstein and Glauding (1966) reported, as one might expect, that a balance of positive personality attributes is important for marital happiness. These factors include:

1. Emotional stability and maturity
2. Self-control
3. Ability to demonstrate affection
4. Willingness to take on responsibility

5. Ability to overcome feelings of anger
6. Tendency to be conventional
7. Considerateness
8. Favorable self-perceptions
9. Optimism (Lantz and Snyder, 1969).

Emotional stability is strongly associated with marital happiness (Dean, 1966; 1968). A number of studies (Clements, 1967; and Crouse, Karlins, and Schroder, 1968), found that flexibility and a willingness to adapt to change correlate positively with marital happiness.

Stinnett and Walters (in press) 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 who are inconsiderate, selfish, uncooperative, aggressive, and moody tend to have unsatisfactory marriages and fewer friendships.

Using the 16 PF and the 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 gratification. Subjects with high superego (conscientiousness) tended to be highly devoted to the home, while 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.

Personality Similarity-Complementarity. Winch, Ktsanes, and

Ktsanes (1954) postulated that personality attributes will be complementary rather than homogenous. The complementary-needs hypothesis has received a great deal of research attention (Bowerman and Day, 1956; Cattell and Nesselroade, 1967; Katz, Goldstein, Cohen, and Stucker, 1963; Murstein, 1961; Tharp, 1963). To date, little evidence has been found that would substantiate the existence of a pattern of complementary differences. In fact, Hicks and Platt (1970) have observed that Blazer (1963) found "that marital dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction was strongly associated with need complementarity" (p. 67).

Cattell and Nesselroade (1967) found complementarity in the areas of guilt proneness and dominance facilitated marriage stability. On the other hand, large differences in enthusiasm, sensitivity, outgoingness and drive were contraproductive. Similarity, rather than complementarity, along the following dimensions was found to contribute to marriage success: enthusiasm, social boldness, emotional stability, and conscience. Murstein (1967) found support for homogamy as opposed to complementarity through a comparison of engaged versus random couples responses to the Rorschach and Thematic Apperception Test (TAT).

Self-Partner Congruence. Not surprisingly, individuals who are happy in their marriage view their spouses in favorable terms such as considerate, cooperative, generous, conventional, and responsible. Equally predictably, individuals who are dissatisfied with their marriage view their spouse more negatively. They are seen as: impatient with the mistakes of others, extremely dictatorial or passive, civil and unkind, blunt, aggressive, gloomy, complaining, slow to forgive, extremely skeptical and distrustful (Luckey, 1964).

In an earlier study, the same author (Luckey, 1960) found that

marital happiness is related to the congruence of the husband's self-concept, as determined by the Leary Interpersonal Checklist, with that held of him by his wife. The converse was not found to be true, a finding supported by Kotlar (1965). More recently, Burr (1971) reported that role discrepancies account for a considerable amount of variation in marital satisfaction.

#### Relative Power in the Relationship

The companionship model of marriage relations with its emphasis on freeing interpersonal relations seems inexorably moving toward role-equality (Scanzoni, 1972). Under these circumstances power in American marriages is not a matter of brute coercion and unwilling defeat so much as a mutual recognition of individual skills in particular areas of competence and of the partners' dual stakes in areas of joint concern (Blood and Wolfe, 1960).

Kirkpatrick (1963), summarizing the available research in this area, concluded that an equalitarian, democratic attitude is strongly associated with a positive marital adjustment, while feelings of superiority, or dominance by either partner are closely associated with marital dissatisfaction. This finding is supported by Sporkowski (1968) who found that among his sample of 730 undergraduates in several colleges that "higher marital preparedness" was associated with students whose families had developed democratic decision making practices.

#### The Interrelatedness of Intrinsic and Instrumental Components

Although the movement away from instrumental relationships and

toward intrinsic relationships seems clear enough, this is not to suggest that these are two mutually exclusive types, merely that marital type may be defined according to which aspect dominates (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Neither is it suggested that there has been enough movement to justify the conclusion that the companionship relationship now predominates. Blood and Wolfe (1960), in their cross-sectional study of 900 Detroit wives, measured relative satisfaction on both instrumental (expected and desired number of children, standard of living) and intrinsic (companionship, understanding, and love and affection) variables. They found that an important source of marital satisfaction for the wife is the husband's prestige or social status in the community. Hicks and Platt (1970), commenting on research conducted during the 1960's, stated:

The essence of the results suggest that the instrumental role of husband is more crucial to marital happiness than social scientists have previously believed. It may even be more critical than any other variable (p. 75).

Another finding that illustrates the continued importance of the instrumental components of marital satisfaction is reported by Levinger (1966), who found lower-class partners were quite concerned with financial problems and unstable physical actions of mates. Middle-class marriages were more concerned with psychological and emotional interaction. Levinger postulates a needs hierarchy and concludes intrinsic needs are not a concern until instrumental needs are met.

### Instrumental Needs

Premarital. Hicks and Platt (1970) observed:

If happiness in the institutional marriage is related to the ability to accept institutional role obligations, roles, customs, etc., then it might well follow that conventional family-oriented socialization practices would be linked with marital happiness (p. 65).

This presumption has been supported by recent research (Sporakowski, 1968; Whitehurst, 1968). Stinnett and Walters (in press) have summarized other pre-marital variables contributing to successful marriage:

1. Those who have been acquainted over one year are more likely to experience a happy marriage than those who have been acquainted less than one year.

2. Young marriages (those entered at age 19 or younger) have a higher rate of failure than marriages entered at a later age because of such factors as limited education, little income, low socio-economic background, continual need for parental support, high incidence of premarital pregnancy among this age group, emotional immaturity and lack of awareness of personality needs.

3. Parental-approval.

4. The evidence indicates that entering marriage primarily because of a genuine love for the partner and/or because they share many common interests is positively related to marriage success.

Post-Marital. The following variables have been found to be associated with marriage success and happiness.

1. Maintaining a positive relationship, but not living with one's in-laws (Burchinal, 1961).
2. Sexual enjoyment (Hicks and Platt, 1970).
3. Common interests (Burchinal, 1961).
4. Similar background in such areas as education, socio-economic status, race and nationality (Scanzoni, 1966).
5. The desire to have children (Kirkpatrick, 1963).
6. Similarity of the partners' perceptions of instrumental role requirements (Kotlar, 1965).
7. A stable income that is high enough to provide necessities (Cutright, 1971; Parke and Glick, 1967).

8. Job satisfaction and occupational status (Bernard, 1966; and Ridley, 1973).
9. Similar religious orientations (Dyer and Luckey, 1961).

### Successful Parent-Child Relationships

#### The Correlation of Marriage Satisfaction and the Parenting Dimension

Contrary to popular presumption, having children has not been found to be associated with marriage satisfaction (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Indeed, Bernard (1972) has reported that childless couples are more satisfied with their marriages than couples with children. Hurley and Polonen (1967) found among their sample of 40 college student marriages that marriage satisfaction declined as the number of children increased. Renee (1970) corroborates this finding. He reports that those persons who were raising children were more likely to be dissatisfied with their marital relationship than were couples who never had children or whose children were no longer living at home.

Luckey (1966) dissents somewhat from this view. She found no significant relationship between the number of children and marital satisfaction. It is significant to note that while an increase in the number of children may decrease marriage satisfaction (qualitative dimension), it also decreases the likelihood of divorce (endurance dimension) (U. S. Bureau of Census, 1976).

One explanation for the apparent decrease in satisfaction with marriage as the number of children increases is simply that the partners become so involved in parenting that they no longer have or take enough

time with their mate to continue a highly satisfactory relationship (Stinnett and Walters, in press). On the other hand, those couples who value the intrinsic marriage and invest the time necessary to maintain this type of marital relationship run the risk of neglecting their children in the process.

Cuber and Haroff (1965) quote from a woman who has developed and maintained a vital relationship with her husband:

We've been married over twenty years and the most enjoyable thing either of us does--well, outside of the intimate things--is to sit and talk by the hour. The children respect this too. They don't invade our privacy any more than they can help--the same as we vacate the living room when Ellen brings in a date, she tries not to intrude on us (p. 57).

#### Intrinsic Elements of Successful Parent-

##### Child Relationships

Communication. Satir (1964) has observed that communication provides a "blueprint" by which the child grows from infancy to maturity. Chaiklin and Frank (1973) found that accuracy of self-other perception is related to better child adjustment. Poor communication has, in turn, been found to be related to aggression, stealing, lying, rejection of parents, emotional disturbance, a high rate of juvenile delinquency, and a failure to identify with parental values.

Support, Satisfaction, Acceptance. Norris (1968) found parental satisfaction with the child to be positively related to the child's achievement of basic skills, school grades, and favorable teachers' comments for pre-adolescent boys. An earlier study (Mote, 1967) found the child's self-concept, high academic ability, achievement, and creativity were associated with parental satisfaction and support.



Hurley (1965) noted a positive relationship between parental acceptance and children's intelligence.

Thomas (1968) found a high relationship between parental support and adolescent conformity to significant others, even in situations in which it was very important for the respondents to be able to make up their own minds. Ahlstrom and Havighurst (1971) found a striking contrast in the degree of mutual support and affection in the family between maladaptive and adaptive groups of boys.

Warmth, Nurturance, and Love. Low anxiety and extroversion among college students have been found to be associated with perceived parental love (Siegleman, 1965). Similar results were found among fourth, fifth, and sixth grade boys (Siegleman, 1966). Skeils (1966) reports a dramatic increase (average 28.5 points) in the intelligence of mentally retarded infants who were transferred from the sterile, unresponsive atmosphere of an orphanage to one in which they received emotional stimulation, support, and nurturance from mother-surrogates. Richardson (1965) found that first year college women who score high on tests of creative thinking tend to perceive their former parent-child relationships as significantly more loving and less rejecting than do first year college women who score low on tests of creative thinking. Esty (1968), comparing college student leaders and non-leaders, found that leaders perceive their parents as more loving and less neglecting than non-leaders.

Relative Power in the Relationship. Elder (1963) noted that parents who are democratic are more likely to have their adolescents model their behaviors than parents who are authoritarian or permissive. Lang (1969) found that power exercised entirely by parents

(authoritarian) is likely to lead children to experience responsibility as external to themselves. Shared power (democratic), on the other hand, enables the child to experience responsibility as internal.

### Instrumental Aspects of Successful Parent-

#### Child Relationships

Lefkowitz, Walder, and Eron (1963) found that aggression in children increases as parents increasingly rely upon physical punishment for controlling the child's behavior. Bandura and Huston (1961) found that identification of the child with the parent decreases as the parents increase use of physical punishment.

Self-disclosure to each parent, parental identification and amount of religious behavior of undergraduate students was found to vary according to the subject's perception of the degree of religious devoutness of their mothers (Cooke, 1962). The devoutness of the father was not found to be associated with these variables.

Kahn (1968) found that sons who perceive their fathers to be satisfied with their jobs are more prone to choose a similar vocation than those who perceive their fathers to be less satisfied. Mauch (1970) states that the congruent role expectations for family members is important in the prevention of juvenile delinquency.

#### Summary

From an examination of the literature concerning successful family, husband-wife, and parent-child relationships several conclusions are suggested:

1. The family is in transition. There is a fundamental shift

from a family life that evolves around task performance, with each member assigned certain societally sanctioned roles, toward a family life in which family members are primarily responsible for meeting each others' emotional needs. Achievement of roles in this latter family-type is based on interpersonal competence, rather than assignment and sanction by society.

2. Interpersonal skills, such as good verbal and non-verbal communication, flexibility, sensitivity, empathy, and democratic decision making are critical to the success of the affective or companionship family.
3. These interpersonal skills are contingent upon personal adequacy, which is a reflection of the personality.
4. While there is a common recognition that certain personality needs contribute to the success of family as well as other relationships, it is not clear whether successful marriage partners balance each other in other areas of their personalities or whether they are similar in the degree to which they possess these personality needs.
5. Instrumental and companionship families are not mutually exclusive categories, but merely polar extremes on the same continuum. While the shift in contemporary family life has been toward the latter, successful families still have many elements of positive instrumental relationships, such as similar religious orientation, similar socio-economic backgrounds among marital partners, and engagement in activities together.

## CHAPTER III

### PROCEDURE

#### Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study were selected in the following manner:

1. Extension home economists in each of Oklahoma's 72 counties were asked to select two or more strong families in their county using these criteria:

- (a) the family members appear to have a high degree of happiness in the husband-wife and parent-child relationships;
- (b) the family members appear to fill each others needs to a high degree;
- (c) the family is intact with both parents present in the home;
- (d) the family has at least one school age child, 21 years or younger living at home.

2. Only respondents who rated themselves as having a high degree of satisfaction in their marital and parent-child relationships were used in the final sample.

The final sample consisted of 72 individuals representing 48 families.

### Administration of Instruments

The instrument used for this study was mailed to subjects during March and April, 1975. Cover letters (see Appendix A) explaining the research study and assuring anonymity were sent to 90 families. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included with each questionnaire.

### Instruments

A questionnaire, designed to measure various aspects of family life which a review of the literature indicated were possible components of family strength, was devised by Dr. Nick Stinnett, Associate Professor, Department of Family Relations and Child Development, at Oklahoma State University. Some of the various scales were taken from previously standardized instruments, while others were constructed specifically for this study.

The completed questionnaire was presented to a panel of four experts in the area of family relations. They were asked to rate the items in terms of the following criteria:

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

A revised version of the instrument, based on suggestions made by the judges, was then administered to 20 families. 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 A). Information regarding background and parent-child relations was determined from general sections of the questionnaire. Other sections in the questionnaire which were specifically used for this study included the Vital-Total Relationship Scale.

#### Vital-Total Relationship Scale

The Vital-Total Relationship Scale (see Appendix C) consists of seven statements designed to measure the degree to which the respondent perceives his or her marriage to be characterized by a vital-total relationship according to Cuber and Haroff's (1965) conceptualization of vital and total marriages. The Vital-Total Relationship Scale is designed to measure: (a) the degree of satisfaction a person derives from his marriage relationship, (b) degree of importance attached to the relationship, (c) degree of emotional involvement the couple has with each other, (d) the degree to which the couple does things together, and (e) the degree to which they enjoy living their lives together. Because of their similarity both the vital and total relationships were measured by the same scale.

A five-point Likert type scale was utilized on which respondents were asked whether they strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree with statements such as, "I would not hesitate to sacrifice an important goal in life if achievement of that goal would cause my marriage relationship to suffer."

The responses were scored in such a way that the highest score represented the highest degree of a vital-total relationship. A score of at least 25 out of 35 possible points was set by the researcher to

determine those respondents considered as having a high degree of a vital-total relationship.

#### Edwards Personal Preference Scale

A modified version of the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) (see Appendix B) developed by Constantine and Constantine (1971) was used to measure the marital partner's personality needs. The EPPS is a 15 item self-reporting scale designed to measure the following needs: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

Each of the 15 items in the scale used in this study is characterized by five numerical responses ranging from one to five. The answers were scored so that the highest level of need was given the highest score, and the lowest level of need the lowest score.

The various personality needs measured by the EPPS have been compared with similar scales from other standardized instruments, such as the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale, and the Guliford-Martin Personnel Inventory. These tests correlate rather highly with the EPPS, although as Edwards (1959) has observed, "It is not clear how even perfect agreement between self-ratings and inventory scores could be interpreted as bearing upon the nature of the variables being measured. . ." (p. 21).

The manual (Edwards, 1959) reports a test-retest reliability, at a one-week interval, of .79. The median split-half reliability coefficient was .78 with a sample of 1509 college students. Santee (1975) reports a

higher reliability for a modified version of the test.

#### Analysis of Data

A percentage and frequency count was 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 which items in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale significantly discriminated at the .05 level between the high and low quartiles of the sample. A split-half reliability was used to obtain an index of the reliability of the scale.

The ordinal level of the data and the relatively small sample size indicated that a non-parametric design would be most appropriate to examine the various hypotheses. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) age, (b) religious affiliation, (c) religious orientation, (d) length of marriage, (e) socio-economic status, and (f) place of residence.
2. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the individual possesses each of the following personality needs as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.



3. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and: (a) perceived closeness of spouse-child relationship and (b) perceived closeness of self-child relationship.

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

4. There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and: (a) length of marriage and (b) number of children.
5. There is no significant correlation between perception of husbands and wives among couples who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship (as indicated by both the husband and the wife expressing high Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores - scoring within a range of 25-35 out of a possible total of 35 points) concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess each of the following personality variables as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression scores.
6. There is no significant intercorrelation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess each of the 15 personality needs listed above.

## CHAPTER IV

### RESULTS

#### Description of the Subjects

A detailed description of the 72 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. Primarily, the sample was composed of rural, white, protestant, middle-aged, middle class individuals. Specifically, 88.89 per cent designated their place of residence as either a farm (48.61%) or small town under 25,000 population (40.28%). Ninety per cent of the sample was white and 80 per cent were Protestant. The largest percentage of respondents were either from the upper-middle (50%) or lower-middle (29.17%) socio-economic class as measured by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955). The majority of the sample were between the ages of 31 and 45 (79.17%).

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 59.72 per cent male and 40.29 per cent female. Although the majority (66.20%) of the sample had been married between 15 and 25 years, the range was from 5 to over 35 years of marriage.

Of the total number of strong families in this study, 24 couples were found to have a high degree of a vital-total relationship (as indicated by both the husband and wife scoring within a range of 25 or above out of a possible 35 points on the Vital-Total Relationship Scale).

TABLE I  
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Sex	Male	43	59.72
	Female	29	40.28
Race	White	65	90.28
	Black	5	6.95
	Indian	2	2.78
Age	20-25	1	1.39
	26-30	5	6.95
	31-35	15	20.83
	36-40	21	29.17
	41-45	21	29.17
	46-50	2	2.78
	over 50	7	9.72
Religion	Catholic	12	16.67
	Protestant	58	80.56
	None	2	2.78
Socio-Economic Status	Upper	6	8.33
	Upper-middle	36	50.00
	Lower-middle	21	29.17
	Upper-lower	6	8.33
	Lower-lower	3	4.17
Years Married	5 - 9	7	9.86
	10-14	9	12.68
	15-19	27	38.03
	20-24	20	28.17
	25-29	5	7.04
	30-34	1	1.41
	35+	2	2.82
Number of Children	2	27	37.50
	3	29	40.28
	4	5	6.94
	5	7	9.72
	6	2	2.78
	12	1	1.39
	13	1	1.39

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	Per Cent
Residence	Farm or Country	35	48.61
	Small Town under 25,000	29	40.28
	City of 25,000 to 50,000	3	4.17
	City of 50,000 to 100,000	5	6.94
	City over 100,000	0	0
Wife's Employment	Not employed	60	83.33
	Employed	12	16.67
Primary Source of Income	Husband	68	94.44
	Husband-Wife Equally	4	5.56

These 24 couples constituted the group with which Hypotheses V and VI were examined.

The Item Analysis of the Vital-Total  
Relationship Scale

In order to obtain an index of the validity of each item in the Vital-Total Relationship 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.

A split-half reliability coefficient of .83 was obtained in determining an index of the reliability of the items in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale.

Responses of Strong Family Members to the EPPS

A majority of the respondents indicated a High to Very High need for Nurturance (56.95%), Achievement (55.56%), Change (54.17%), Endurance (54.16%), and Intraception (52.12%). On the other hand, a Low to Very Low need for Exhibition (68.84%) and Aggression (63.08%) was reported. A high proportion of respondents reported a High to Very High need for Sex (49.23%), and Dominance (41.66%), a Low to Very Low need for Abasement (41.67%), and a moderate need for Succorance (48.61%).

In summary, based on these results a personality profile of strong family members indicates they have a high need for Nurturance, Achievement, Change, Endurance, Intraception, Sex, and Dominance; a low level

TABLE II  
 ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF UPPER AND LOWER  
 QUARTILES OF VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP  
SCALE SCORES

Item	$\chi^2$	Level of Sig.
My spouse and I enjoy doing many things together	27.51	.0001
I enjoy most of the activities I participate in more if my spouse is also involved	26.47	.0001
I receive more satisfaction from my marriage relationship than most other areas of life	24.44	.0001
My spouse and I have a positive, strong emotional involvement with each other	34.00	.0001
The companionship of my spouse is more enjoyable to me than most anything else in life	27.24	.0001
I would not hesitate to sacrifice an important goal in life if achievement of that goal would cause my marriage relationship to suffer	26.66	.0001
My spouse and I take an active interest in each other's work and hobbies	26.69	.0001

of need for Exhibition, Aggression, and Abasement; and a moderate need for Succorance.

Responses of Strong Family Members Who Expressed  
the Highest Vital-Total Relationship Scale  
Scores to the EPPS

Responses to the EPPS were also obtained for those strong family members who expressed the highest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores. There were 48 such respondents (24 couples). A majority of these respondents indicated a High to Very High need for Achievement (56.25%), Intraception (54.17%), and Endurance (50%). A Low to Very Low need for Exhibition (72.92%) and Aggression (66.66%) was reported.

A high proportion of respondents expressed a High to Very High need for Nurturance (47.91%) and Affiliation (45.83%); and a Low to Very Low level of need for Autonomy (43.75%) and Abasement (45.83%). A moderate need for Succorance (47.92%) and Order (41.67%) was also reported.

In summary, based on these results, a personality profile of strong family members expressing the highest degree of a vital-total marriage relationship indicate they have a high need for achievement, intraception, sex and endurance; a low level of need for exhibition and aggression; and a moderate level of need for succorance and order.

#### Examination of Hypotheses

##### Hypothesis I

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) age, (b) sex, (c) religious affiliation, (d) religious orientation, (e) socio-economic status, and (f) rural or urban place of residence.

TABLE III

RESPONSES OF STRONG FAMILY MEMBERS TO EPPS\*

Need	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Achievement	3	4.17	4	5.56	25	34.72	29	40.28	11	15.28
Deference	3	4.17	23	31.94	26	36.11	17	33.61	3	13.89
Order	3	4.17	9	12.50	27	37.50	23	31.94	8	11.11
Exhibition	21	29.17	30	41.67	16	11.11	5	6.94	0	0
Autonomy	11	15.49	16	22.54	23	32.39	12	16.90	9	12.68
Affiliation	1	1.39	12	16.67	24	33.33	27	37.50	8	11.11
Intracception	2	2.82	11	15.49	21	29.58	27	38.03	10	14.09
Succorance	4	5.56	9	12.5	35	48.61	17	23.61	7	9.72
Dominance	4	5.56	20	27.78	18	25.00	24	33.33	6	8.23
Abasement	17	23.61	13	18.06	28	38.89	11	15.28	3	4.17
Nurturance	2	2.78	5	6.94	24	33.33	28	38.89	13	18.06
Change	3	4.17	8	11.11	22	30.56	29	40.28	10	13.89
Endurance	2	2.78	6	8.33	25	34.72	25	34.72	14	19.44
Sex	3	4.62	4	6.15	26	40.00	21	32.31	11	16.92
Aggression	15	23.08	26	40.00	16	24.62	6	9.23	2	3.08

\*Percentages are based on the total number of responses to each item.



TABLE IV  
 RESPONSES OF STRONG FAMILY MEMBERS WHO EXPRESSED THE HIGHEST  
VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE SCORES TO EPPS\*

Need	Very Low		Low		Moderate		High		Very High	
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Achievement	3	6.25	3	6.25	15	31.25	23	47.92	4	8.33
Deference	1	2.08	15	31.25	17	35.47	14	29.17	1	2.08
Order	2	4.17	6	12.50	20	41.67	16	33.33	4	8.33
Exhibition	14	29.17	21	43.75	8	16.67	5	10.42	0	0
Autonomy	*5	10.42	16	33.33	14	29.17	6	12.50	6	12.50
Affiliation	0	0	7	14.58	19	39.58	19	39.58	3	6.25
Intracception	*1	2.08	10	20.83	10	20.83	21	43.75	5	10.42
Succorance	3	6.25	6	12.50	23	47.92	12	25.00	4	8.30
Dominance	3	6.25	14	29.17	11	22.92	17	35.42	3	6.25
Abasement	13	27.08	9	18.75	17	35.42	7	14.58	2	4.17
Nurturance	2	4.17	4	8.33	19	39.58	16	33.33	7	14.58
Change	2	4.17	7	14.58	17	35.42	19	39.58	3	6.25
Endurance	2	4.17	5	10.42	17	35.42	15	31.25	9	18.75
Sex	2	4.17	3	6.25	16	33.33	16	33.33	9	18.75
Aggression	13	27.08	19	39.58	11	22.92	2	4.17	1	2.08

\*Percentages are based on the total number of responses to each item.

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).

Hypothesis I (a)

There is no significant relationship between the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and age of the respondent.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of .08 was found, which was not significant. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis I (b)

There is no significant relationship between the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the sex of the respondent.

A Mann-Whitney U value of .27 was obtained, which was not significant. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis I (c)

There is no significant relationship between the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and religious affiliation of strong family members.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of .45 was attained. This value was not significant.

Hypothesis I (d)

There is no significant relationship between the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and religious orientation.

The results indicated there is no significant difference in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the degree of religious orientation.

Hypothesis I (e)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the socio-economic status of the respondent.

An obtained Kruskal-Wallis value of 3.56 was not significant. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis I (f)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and rural or urban place of residence.

Once again, the null hypothesis was accepted. A non-significant Kruskal-Wallis value of 2.26 was attained.

Hypothesis II

There is no significant correlation between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) length of marriage and (b) number of children.

Hypothesis II (a)

There is no significant correlation between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and length of marriage.

When the Spearman Correlation Coefficient was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that a significant relationship did exist between scores on the Vital-Total Relationship Scale and the length of the respondents' marriage.

As shown in Table V, a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of .27 was obtained, reflecting a significant relationship at the .02 level. The longer the period of time these couples were married the higher their Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores.

TABLE V  
ASSOCIATION BETWEEN VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE  
SCORES AND LENGTH OF MARRIAGE

Variable	Spearman Correlation Coefficient	Level of Significance
Length of marriage	.27	.02

Hypothesis II (b)

There is no significant association between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and number of children.

A non-significant Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of .19 was obtained. No significant association between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the number of children was found.

Hypothesis III

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the individual possesses each of the following personality needs as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) domaninance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression.

Each section of the hypothesis was examined separately by means of the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance.

Hypothesis III (a)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for achievement.

No significant differences existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the need for achievement. A non-significant Kruskal-Wallis value of 1.93 was obtained.

Hypothesis III (b)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for deference.

When this hypothesis was examined an H score of 1.81 was obtained. This value was not significant.

Hypothesis III (c)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for order.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 1.68 was found. This value was not significant, thus the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis III (d)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for exhibition.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that no significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the level of need for exhibition. A Kruskal-Wallis value of 5.67 was obtained.

Hypothesis III (e)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for autonomy.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 6.41 was obtained. This value was found to be non-significant.

Hypothesis III (f)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for affiliation.

When this hypothesis was examined an H score of 1.52 was obtained indicating no significant difference in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's level of need for affiliation.

Hypothesis III (g)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for intraception.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that no significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's personality need for intraception. A Kruskal-Wallis value of 3.10 was obtained.

Hypothesis III (h)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for succorance.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 1.99 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's personality need for succorance.

Hypothesis III (i)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for dominance.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 3.02 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's personality need for dominance.

Hypothesis III (j)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for abasement.

No significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale

scores according to the respondent's personality need for abasement. A Kruskal-Wallis value of 4.7 was obtained.

Hypothesis III (k)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for nurturance.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 2.43 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and respondent's personality need for nurturance.

Hypothesis III (l)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for change.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that no significant relationship existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the respondent's personality need for change. A Kruskal-Wallis value of 2.82 was obtained.

Hypothesis III (m)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for endurance.

A Kruskal-Wallis value of 4.90 was obtained. This value indicates that no significant relationship existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for change.



Hypothesis III (n)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for sex.

As Table VI indicates when this hypothesis was examined an H score of 11.38 was obtained indicating a significant difference in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's personality need for sex. This difference was significant at the .01 level. Those respondents who indicated a very high level of need for sex expressed the highest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores, while those who indicated a moderate level of need for sex expressed the lowest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores.

Hypothesis III (o)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the degree to which the respondent reports the need for aggression.

As Table VII indicates when this hypothesis was examined an H score of 8.13 was obtained indicating a significant difference in the Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to the respondent's personality need for aggression. This difference was significant at the .05 level. Those respondents who indicated a high (six respondents) and those who indicated a very low level of need for aggression expressed the highest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores, while those who indicated a moderate level of need for aggression expressed the lowest Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores.

TABLE VI

H SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP  
SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED  
 FOR SEX\*

Description	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Significance
<u>SEX</u>				
Very High	11	42.36		
High	21	31.52	11.38	.01
Moderate	26	22.42		

\*No cases were reported for the categories Low and Very Low.

TABLE VII

H SCORE REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP  
SCALE SCORES ACCORDING TO LEVEL OF PERSONALITY NEED FOR  
 AGGRESSION\*

Description	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Significance
<u>AGGRESSION</u>				
High	6	41.33		
Moderate	16	23.50	8.13	.05
Low	26	30.46		
Very Low	15	40.00		

\*No cases were reported for the category Very High.

#### Hypothesis IV

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) perceived closeness of self-child relationship, and (b) perceived closeness of spouse-child relationship.

Each of the above sub-sections were examined with the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance.

#### Hypothesis IV (a)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the perceived closeness of self-child relationship.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that no significant relationship existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and perceived closeness of self-child relationship. The H value was 1.23.

#### Hypothesis IV (b)

There is no significant relationship between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the respondent's perception of spouse-child closeness.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine this hypothesis it was found that no significant relationship existed between Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and the respondent's perception of spouse-child closeness.

#### Hypothesis V

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of vital-total relationship (as indicated by both the husband and the wife scoring within a range of 25 or above out of the possible 35 points on the Vital-Total Relationship

Scale) concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess each of the following personality variables as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (c) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nuturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression scores.

Each of the sub-sections of this hypothesis was examined by the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient.

Hypothesis V (a)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for achievement.

As indicated in Table VIII, when this hypothesis was examined a correlation of .37 was obtained indicating a significant positive association between husbands and wives perceptions concerning the degree to which they possess the personality need for achievement. This correlation was significant at the .01 level. These results indicate that the husband-wife pairs possessed similar levels of the need for achievement.

Hypothesis V (b)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for deference.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (c)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for order.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of  $-.17$  was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (d)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for exhibition.

A non-significant Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of  $-.14$  was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (e)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for autonomy.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a correlation of  $.19$  was obtained. This value was not significant.

Hypothesis V (f)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for affiliation.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a

non-significant correlation of .36 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (g)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for intraception.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of  $-.09$  was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (h)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for succorance.

A non-significant Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of  $.13$  was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (i)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for dominance.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient of  $.25$  was obtained. This value was not significant.

Hypothesis V (j)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for abasement.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of .11 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (k)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for nurturance.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of .34 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (l)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for change.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of .16 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

Hypothesis V (m)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high



degree of a vital total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for endurance.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of .11 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

#### Hypothesis V (n)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for sex.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a correlation of .47 was obtained indicating a significant, positive association between husbands and wives perceptions concerning the degree to which they possess the personality need for sex. These results indicate that the husband-wife pairs possessed similar levels of the need for sex.

#### Hypothesis V (o)

There is no significant correlation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband-wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess the personality need for aggression.

As Table VIII indicates when this hypothesis was examined a non-significant correlation of .24 was obtained. The null hypothesis was thus accepted.

#### Hypothesis VI

There is no significant intercorrelation between perceptions of husbands and wives among husband and wife pairs who have a high degree of a vital-total relationship (as indicated by both the

TABLE VIII

CORRELATION BETWEEN THE RESPONSES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES  
(AMONG HUSBAND-WIFE PAIRS WHO HAVE A HIGHLY VITAL  
RELATIONSHIP) CONCERNING LEVEL TO WHICH THEY  
POSSESS EACH OF 15 PERSONALITY NEEDS

Personality Need	Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient	Level of Sig.
Achievement	.37	.01
Deference	.01	NS
Order	-.17	NS
Exhibition	-.14	NS
Autonomy	.19	NS
Affiliation	.36	NS
Intracception	-.09	NS
Succorance	.13	NS
Dominance	.25	NS
Abasement	.11	NS
Nurturance	.34	NS
Change	.16	NS
Endurance	.11	NS
Sex	.47	.01
Aggression	.24	NS

husband and the wife scoring within a range of 25 or above out of a possible 35 points on the Vital Total Relationship Scale) concerning the self-rating with respect to the degree to which they possess each of the following personality variables as measured by the EPPS: (a) achievement, (b) deference, (c) order, (d) exhibition, (e) autonomy, (f) affiliation, (g) intraception, (h) succorance, (i) dominance, (j) abasement, (k) nurturance, (l) change, (m) endurance, (n) sex, and (o) aggression scores.

When this hypothesis was examined the Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient revealed that a significant, positive correlation existed between:

1. The need for nurturance (to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous) among wives and the need for Exhibition (attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself) among husbands. A correlation of .43 was significant at the .02 level.
2. The need for Autonomy (independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations) among wives and the need for Affiliation (need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments) among husbands. A correlation of .47 was significant at the .01 level).
3. The need for Succorance (to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others) among wives and the need for affiliation (need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments) among husbands. A correlation of .37 was significant at the .05 level.
4. The need for Deference (dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional) among wives and the need for intraception (need to know, to understand-what and

- why, to analyze and empathize) among husbands. A correlation of .40 was significant at the .003 level.
5. The need for Intraception (need to know, to understand-what and why-to analyze and empathize) among wives and the need for Succorance (to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others) among husbands. A correlation of .42 was significant at the .02 level.
  6. The need for Affiliation (need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments) among wives and the need for Dominance (to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others) among husbands. A correlation of .54 was significant at the .03 level.
  7. The need for Order (neatness, to have organization by systematic, and plan in advance, orderly schedule) among wives and the need for nurturance (to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous) among husbands. A correlation of .37 was significant at the .05 level.
  8. The need for Autonomy (independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be non-conforming without obligations) among wives and the need for Sex (need for the opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex) among husbands. A correlation of .44 was significant at the .02 level.
  9. The need for Affiliation (need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments) among wives and the need for Sex (need for the opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex) among husbands.

A correlation of .60 was significant at the .001 level.

10. The need for change (variety, novelty, to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine) among wives and the need for Aggression (to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others) among husbands. A correlation of .39 was significant at the .04 level.
11. The need for Aggression (to attack contrary views, to criticize to tell what one thinks of others) among wives and the need for Achievement (ambition, to succeed, to do one's best to accomplish something of great significance) among husbands. A correlation of .39 was significant at the .04 level.
12. The need for Sex (need for the opposite sex, for sexual activities, to do things involving sex) among wives and the need for Affiliation (need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments) among husbands. A correlation of .43 was significant at the .02 level.
13. The need for Endurance (perseverance, tenacity, to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful) among wives, the need for Nurturance (to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous) among husbands. A correlation of .41 was significant at the .03 level.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient also revealed that a significant, negative correlation existed between the need for Succorance (to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others) among

wives and the need for Nurturance (to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous) among husbands. A correlation of  $-.45$  was significant at the  $.02$  level.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

While the literature concerning the American family has emphatically pointed to a transition 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 the characteristics of successful, strong intrinsic families. The major purpose of this study, therefore, was to (a) develop a scale (the Vital-Total Relationship Scale) for measuring the vital-total (intrinsic) marriage relationship as conceptualized by Cuber and Haroff (1965), (b) examine the relationship of marital vitality to various demographic and personality variables, (c) examine selected dimensions of parent-child relationships within highly vital marriages, and (d) examine the degree of personality need similarity-complementarity among highly vital marriages.

The 72 respondents comprising the sample were recommended as strong family members by extension home economists in all 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. Only those couples (42 respondents, 24 couples) in which both spouses expressed a high (scoring within a range of 25 or above out of a possible 35 points on the Vital-Total Relationship Scale) degree of a vital-total relationship were used in the examination of

personality similarity-complementarity.

A questionnaire was developed to obtain information concerning background information and satisfaction with parent-child relationships as well as marital relationships. A modified version of the Edwards Personal Preference Scale (EPPS) (Edwards, 1959) as reported by Constantine and Constantine (1971) was used to determine personality needs, and the Vital-Total Relationship Scale was developed to measure the degree of vitality among marriages.

Percentages and frequencies were used to analyze the respondents' 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 utilized to determine which items on the Vital-Total Relationship Scale 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 scale.

The Spearman Rank Correlation Coefficient was used to determine if there was a significant association between the respondents' Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores and (a) length of marriage and (b) number of children. The same test was utilized to determine the degree of personality similarity-complementarity among highly vital marriages (Hypotheses V and VI).

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized to determine if a significant difference existed in the respondents' degree of vital-total relationship according to (a) age, (b) religious affiliation, (c) religious orientation, (d) length of marriage, (e) socio-economic status, place of residence, (f) perceived closeness of self-child relationship, (g) perceived closeness of spouse-child relationship,



and (h) the degree to which the individual possessed each of the 15 personality needs measured by the EPPS (Edwards, 1959). The Mann-Whitney U-test was used to determine if a significant difference existed in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores according to sex of respondent.

### Results

Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores were found to be significantly related to:

1. Length of Marriage. High vital-total respondents had been married longer than less vital-total respondents.
2. Level of Need for Sex. High vital-total respondents were found to express a greater need for sex than less vital-total respondents.
3. Level of Need for Aggression. High vital-total respondents were found to express less need for aggression than less vital-total respondents.

Couples expressing a high degree of a vital-total relationship were found to be similar concerning the degree to which they possessed the personality need for:

1. Sex.
2. Achievement.

Couples expressing a high degree of a vital-total relationship were found to complement each other 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.

## Discussion

### Personality Factors

A major conclusion of this study is that strong family members and also those strong family members who had a high degree of vital-total marital relationship expressed high levels of personality needs which tend to contribute to successful interpersonal relationships. For example, the respondents expressed high levels of need for intracception (need to understand, to analyze and empathize), affiliation (need for people, to form strong attachments), nurturance (to give help, support,

kindness to others), and succorance (to receive help, encouragement); each of these needs tends to promote supportiveness in relationships and specifically would increase the likelihood of the husband and wife mutually reinforcing each other's positive self-concept and giving each other psychological strokes.

The respondents also indicated a high level of need for achievement (ambition, to succeed) and endurance (perseverance, tenacity). It is logical that these needs would contribute to successful marriage and family relationships in that they reflect a desire to accomplish a goal (a successful marriage and family life) and the perseverance and determination to continue working toward that goal. These findings are related to the results of Walters, Parker, and Stinnett (1972) indicating that those college students who perceived the most important factor in achieving marital success to be determination to make the marriage succeed expressed the most favorable perceptions toward marriage. The present findings also seem to give some support to the thesis of Adams (1951) that one of the most important factors in determining marital success is the mutual determination of the couple to make the marriage work. These findings are particularly interesting in view of the fact that determination is so often an ignored concept in marriage and family life education.

Perhaps the two needs for achievement and endurance would also contribute to the development of commitment which is important to the success of marital relationships and which Masters and Johnson (1974) found in their research to be one of the most important factors in developing successful, fulfilling sexual relations. The present findings may also be related to research indicating a positive, significant

relationship between commitment and marital need satisfaction (Stevenson and Sinnett, in press).

The strong family members in this study also had low levels of those needs which, if possessed to extreme degrees, may be contraproductive to successful relationships. For example, they had low to very low levels of need for exhibition (need to be the center of attention) and aggression (to attack contrary views), and autonomy (independence, to be free in decisions and actions).

The results of this study also suggest the general conclusion that marriage partners who have a high degree of a total-vital relationship tend to complement each other in terms of their personality needs. This complementary relationship conforms to what Ktsanes and Ktsanes (1968) have termed Type II complementarity (that is, different needs are gratified in each of the partners; whereas, in Type I complementarity the same need is gratified in each partner but at very different levels). For instance, the wife's need to understand and empathize (intraception) was found to be significantly and positively associated with the husband's need to receive help, encouragement and kindness from others (succorance). Rogers (1961, 1972) has noted that the ability to understand the other is critical to a helping relationship. Thus, the wife's expressions of empathy are perceived as supportive and helpful by the husband, gratifying the needs of both.

The notion of complementary needs, originally postulated as a theory of mate selection (Winch, 1952) has received scant research support to date (Hicks and Platt, 1970). A plausible explanation for the high degree of complementarity among vital-total couples is offered by Christenson (1971), who has observed that complementary needs may be

developed after marriage if there is a strong desire for marriage success, as would be the case among couples who are striving to achieve a vital-total relationship.

It was found that vital-total couples expressed a similar, high need for sex, and that this need distinguished them from the strong family members who did not have as high a degree of a vital-total marriage relationship. This finding may be explained by the significant, positive association between sex and affiliation needs, which suggests that vital-total couples appear to view sex as a reflection of the overall interpersonal relationship and as a means of achieving and maintaining a strong, intimate attachment with their mate. It is this ability and desire to achieve emotional intimacy with one's mate that distinguished vital and total couples from utilitarian (a marriage which is developed and maintained for purposes other than to express an intimate relationship) types in Cuber and Haroff's (1965) original conceptualization.

The finding that a significant positive association existed between the wife's need for nurturance and the husband's need for exhibition reflects a complementary relationship. The wife's need to give help, express sympathy and kindness is complemented by the husband's need to be the center of attention and to be noticed. Both the husband and wife are getting their needs fulfilled in a satisfactory manner and it is logical that this need compatibility contributes to a satisfying marital relationship.

This same reciprocal need gratification was found between the wife's need for succorance and the husband's need for affiliation. Thus, the wife's need to receive encouragement, help and kindness from others is

complemented by the husband's need for people and his desire to form strong attachments.

A complementary relationship was also reflected in the finding that the wife's need for affiliation was significantly and positively associated with the husband's need for dominance. This finding coincides with other research showing that marriage stability is positively associated with differences in dominance between spouses (Cattell and Nesselroade, 1967).

The findings of this study concerning the various complementary needs among those couples having a high degree of vital-total marriage relationship suggest that there is a great deal of husband-wife interdependence. There appears to be a high degree of mutual giving and receiving concerning the fulfillment of basic personality needs. Often the husbands and wives give and take in different ways.

The findings of the present study suggest that among vital-total couples the "give and take" that is commonly assumed to be necessary for marital success and happiness can be mutually gratifying in the sense that in the process of meeting the needs of the partner one's own needs can be met. Perhaps this mutual need fulfillment should be emphasized more by marriage and family counselors and family life educators. Too often there is the assumption that giving in a marriage may be necessary for success, but that in order to focus on meeting the needs of one's mate it is necessary to sacrifice one's individuality and the right to personal need gratification. These findings clearly indicate more of a symbiotic (mutually beneficial) relationship.

### Environmental Factors

Number of Children. The finding that no significant differences in Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores were found according to the respondent's number of children appears to be related to the results of Luckey (1966) who found no relationship between marital satisfaction and number of children. These findings do not support the results of Hurley and Palonen (1967) who found marital satisfaction declined as the number of children increased.

Number of Years Married. Stinnett, Carter, and Montgomery (1972) found that older husbands and wives reported that their marriage had become better over time, which would seem closely related to the present finding that Vital-Total Relationship Scale scores showed a significant increase as the number of years of marriage increased. These findings are unlike those of either Rollins and Carter (1974), who reported a U-shaped curve (a decline in marital satisfaction over the earlier stages, followed by an increase over the later stages), or Blood and Wolfe (1960) who found the trend to be a general decline in marital satisfaction over the family life cycle.

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are suggested for future research:

1. It is suggested that this study be replicated with a national sample.
2. It would be beneficial to repeat this study obtaining a greater representation of lower socio-economic groups, various racial and ethnic groups, and a larger representation

of urban families.

3. Additional in-depth information on relationship patterns and personality characteristics among strong family members might be obtained by use of a combination of techniques using questionnaires, interviews, and audio-visual tapings.
4. It would also be fruitful to compare strong families with families having severe relationship problems, with respect to the 15 personality needs included in this present study and also with respect to the association between husband's and wife's personality needs.
5. A longitudinal study should be initiated among engaged couples to determine if need compatibility is present at the beginning of their marriage or if it is developed as the relationship progresses through the years.



A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, C. R. Preparing for Marriage: A Guide to Marital and Sexual Adjustment. New York: C. P. Dutton and Co., Inc., 1951.
- Ahlstrom, W. M., and R. J. Havighurst. "Family Life in Midadolescence." In W. Ahlstrom, 400 Losers. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Anderson, R. E., and I. E. Carter. Human Behavior in the Social Environment: A Social Systems Approach. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1974.
- 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.)
- Bandura, A., and A. C. Huston. "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63 (1961), 311-318.
- Baumbeck, J. S. "Today's Adolescent and His Family: Conflict, Stress, and Crisis." Iowa Journal of Social Work, 4 (1971), 43-50.
- 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, J. "Marital Stability and Patterns of Status Variables." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 421-439.
- Bernard, J. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Co., 1972.
- Blackburn, C. W. "What is a Strong Family?" International Journal of Religious Education, 3 (1967), 35-36.
- Blazer, J. A. "Complementary Needs and Marital Happiness." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 89-95.
- Blood, R. V. Marriage. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Blood, R. V., and D. M. Wolfe. Husbands and Wives: The Dynamics of Married Living. Glenco, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

- Bowerman, C. F., and B. R. Day. "A Test of the Theory of Complementary Needs as Applied to Couples During Courtship." American Sociological Review, 21 (1956), 602-605.
- Bowman, H. A. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.
- Burchinal, L. G. "Correlates of Marital Satisfaction for Rural Married Couples." Rural Sociology, 26 (1961), 282-289.
- Burgess, E. W., and H. J. Locke. The Family: From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1945.
- Burr, W. R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 368-372.
- Burr, W. R. Successful Marriage: A Principles Approach. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1976.
- Cattell, R. B., and J. 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.
- Chaiklin, H., and C. L. Frank. "Separation, Service Delivery, and Family Functioning." Public Welfare, 31, 1 (1973), 2-7.
- Christenson, H. J., and K. Johnson. Marriage and the Family. (3rd ed.). New York: The Roland Press, 1971.
- Clarke, C. "Group Prodecures for Increasing Positive Feedback Between Married Couples." The Family Coordinator, 19 (1970), 324-328.
- Clemments, W. 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.
- Constantine, Larry M. and Joan M. "Sexual Aspects of Multilateral Relations." The Journal of Sex Research, 7 (1971), 204-225.
- Cooke, T. F. "Interpersonal Correlates of Religious Behavior." Dissertation Abstracts, 23 (1962), 1103.
- Cristal, H., and F. Tucker. "Managing Child Abuse Cases." Social Work, 20, 5 (1975), 392-395.
- Crouse, B., M. Karlins, and H. Schroder. "Conceptual Complexity and Marital Happiness." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30 (1968), 643-646.
- Cuber, J. F., and P. B. Haroff. Sex and the Significant Americans. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1965.

- Cutright, P. "Income and Family Events: Marital Stability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1971), 291-306.
- Dean, D. G. "Emotional Maturity and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 454-457.
- Dean, D. G. "Alienation and Marital Adjustment." Sociological Quarterly, 9 (1968), 186-192.
- Duvall, E. M. Family Development. (4th ed.). New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1971.
- Dyer, D., and E. B. Luckey. "Religious Affiliation and Selected Personality Scores as They Relate to Marital Happiness of a Minnesota College Sample." Marriage and Family Living, 23 (1961), 46-47.
- Edwards, A. L. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule (Manual). New York: Psychological Corporation, 1959.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. "Parental Power Legitimation and Its Effects on the Adolescent." Sociometry, 25 (1963), 50-65.
- Esty, J. F. "Early and Current Parent-Child Relationships Perceived by College Student Leaders and Nonleaders." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 1169-1170.
- 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.
- Glueck, S., and E. Glueck. Toward a Typology of Juvenile Offenders. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1970.
- Gramms, A. "Sources of Family Strength." International Journal of Religious Education, 43, 9 (1967), 4-5.
- Gurin, G., J. Veroff, and S. Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Hicks, M. W., and M. Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33 (1970), 553-573.
- Hurley, J. R. "Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Childrens' Intelligence." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, 11 (1965), 19-31.
- Hurley, J. R., and D. Polonen. "Marital Satisfaction and Child Density Among University Student Parents." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 483-484.
- Kahn, E. R. "Sociometric Variables, Parental Identification and Son's Interests." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 757-758.

- Karlsson, G. Adaptability and Communication in Marriage. Towanda, New Jersey: The Bedminster Press, 1963.
- Katz, L., J. Goldstein, M. Cohen, and S. Stucker. "Need Satisfaction, Perception, and Cooperative Interactions in Married Couples." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 209-213.
- Kirkpatrick, C. The Family. New York: The Roland Press Co., 1963.
- Kotlar, S. L. "Middle-Class Marital Role Perceptions and Marital Adjustment." Sociological and Social Research, 49 (1965), 283-293.
- Ktsanes, T., and V. Ktsanes. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate-Selection." In R. F. Winch and G. L. Wolf (Eds.), Selected Studies in Marriage and the Family (3rd. ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Landis, J. T., and M. G. Landis. Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Landis, J. T., and M. G. Landis. Building a Successful Marriage (6th ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Lantz, H. R., and E. C. Snyder. Marriage: An Examination of the Man-Woman Relationship. New York: Wiley, 1969.
- Lefkowitz, M. M., L. O. Walder, and L. Eron. "Punishment, Identification, and Aggression." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, 9 (1963), 157-159.
- Levinger, G. "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applications for Divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 36 (1966), 803-807.
- Levinger, G., and D. Senn. "Disclosure of Feelings in Marriage." Merrill-Palmer Quarterly of Development and Behavior, 12 (1967), 237-249.
- Locke, H., G. Sabagh, and M. M. Thomas. "Correlates of Primary Communication and Empathy." Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 29 (1956), 115-124.
- Luckey, E. B. "Marital Satisfaction and Congruent Self-Spouse Concepts." Social Forum, 39 (1960), 153-157.
- Luckey, E. B. "Marital Satisfaction and Congruent Personality Correlates of Spouse." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26 (1964), 4-8.
- Luckey, E. B. "Number of Years Married as Related to Personality Perception and Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 44-48.

- 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.
- Masters, W. H., and V. E. Johnson. The Pleasure Bond. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1974.
- Matthews, V. C., and C. S. Michanovich. "New Orientations on Marital Maladjustment." Marriage and Family Living, 25 (1963), 300-304.
- Mauch, G. "Antisocial Behavior: When and How Does a Person Become Antisocial." In Horl, Reinfried, Die Zukunft Unserer Kinder (2nd ed.). Olten, Switzerland: Walter, 1970.
- Mote, F. B. "The Relationship Between Child Self Concept in School and Parental Attitudes and Behavior in Child Rearing." Dissertation Abstracts, 27 (1967), 3319.
- Murstein, B. I. "The Complementary Needs Hypothesis in Newlyweds and Middle-Aged Couples." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63 (1961), 194-197.
- Murstein, B. I. "Empirical Tests of Role, Complementary Needs in Mate Selection." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 695.
- Murstein, B. I., and V. Glauding. "The Relationship of Marital Adjustment to Personality: A Factor Analysis of the Interpersonal Check List." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 37-43.
- Navran, L. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, 6, 2 (1967), 173-184.
- Norris, N. P. "Parental Understanding, Parental Satisfaction and Desirable Personality Characteristics in Preadolescent Boys." Dissertation Abstracts, 28 (1968), 4709-4710.
- Otto, H. A. "What is a Strong Family?" Marriage and Family Living, 24 (1962), 77-81.
- Otto, H. A. "Criteria for Assessing Family Strength." Family Process, 2 (1963), 329-339.
- Otto, H. A. "The Personal and Family Strength Research Projects--Some Implications for the Therapist." Mental Hygiene, 48 (1964), 439-450.
- Otto, H. A. "The Minister and Family Strengths." Pastoral Psychology, 17, 163 (1966), 21-28.
- 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. "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 Use of Family Strength Concepts and Methods in Family Life Education: A Handbook. Beverly Hills, California: The Holistic Press, 1975.
- Parke, R., and P. C. Glick. "Prospective Changes in Marriage and the Family." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 29 (1967), 249-256.
- Reeder, D. A. "A Model of Family Characteristics for Problem Solving Behavior in Families With a Mentally Retarded Child." Dissertation Abstracts, 34B (1973), 1758B.
- Renee, K. S. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32 (1970), 54-66.
- Richardson, R. "Parent-Child Relationships and Divergent Students." Dissertation Abstracts, 24 (1965), 5542.
- 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.
- Rogers, C. R. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. Becoming Partners: Marriage and Its Alternatives. New York: Dell, 1972.
- Rollins, B. C., and K. L. Cannon. "Marital Satisfaction Over the Family Life Cycle: A Reevaluation." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36 (1974), 271-
- Sauer, K. H. "Relationship Patterns of Strong Families." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, 1976.)
- Satir, V. M. Conjoint Family Therapy. Palo Alto: Science and Behavior Books, 1964.
- Santee, Richard T. "Self-Other Orientations and the EPPS." Journal of Personality Assessment, 3, 39 (1975), 293-296.
- Scanzoni, J. "Family Organization and the Probability of Disorganization." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28 (1966), 407-411.
- Scanzoni, J. Sexual Bargaining: Power Politics in American Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Scherz, F. H. "Theory and Practice of Family Therapy." In Roberts, R. W. and R. H. Nee, Theories of Social Casework. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1972.

- Sherwood, J. J., and J. J. Scherer. "A Model for Couples: How Two Can Grow Together." Small Group Behavior, 16, 1 (1975), 11-29.
- Siegelman M. "College Students' Personality Correlates of Early Parent-Child Relationships." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29 (1965), 558-564.
- Siegelman, M. "Loving and Punishing Parental Behavior and Introversion Tendencies in Sons." Child Development, 37 (1966), 985-992.
- Skeils, H. M. "Adult Status of Children With Contrasting Early Life Experiences." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, No. 105.31 (1966), 1-12; 54-59.
- Southwood, H. B. "The Origin of Self Awareness and Ego Behavior." International Journal of Psychoanalysis, 54, 2 (1973), 235-237.
- Sporakowski, M. J. "Marital Preparedness, Prediction and Adjustment." Family Coordinator, 17 (1968), 155-161.
- Stevenson, P., and N. Stinnett. "Family Commitment: Examination of a Theoretical Framework." Home Economics Research Journal, in press.
- Stinnett, N., L. M. Carter, and J. E. Montgomery. "Older Persons' Perceptions of Their Marriages." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 665-670.
- Stinnett, N., and J. Walters. Relationships in Marriage and Families. New York: Macmillan (in press).
- Tharp, R. G. "Psychological Patterning in Marriage." Psychological Bulletin, 60 (1963), 97-117.
- Thomas, D. L. "Parental Control and Support in Socialization and Adolescent Conformity: A Cross National Study." Dissertation Abstracts, 29 (1968), 3689-3690.
- U. S. Bureau of Census. Statistical Abstracts of the United States, 1975. 96th ed. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.
- Walters, J. K., K. Parker, and N. Stinnett. "College Students' Perceptions Concerning Marriage." Family Perspective, 7 (1972), 43-49.
- Whitehurst, R. N. "Premarital Preference Group Orientation and Marriage Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30 (1968), 397-401.
- Winch, R. F. The Modern Family. New York: Holt, 1952.
- Winch, R. F., T. Ktsanes, and V. Ktsanes. "The Theory of Complementary Needs in Mate Selection: An Analytic and Descriptive Study." American Sociological Review, 19 (1954), 242.

Wolkenstein, A. S. "Evolution of a Program for the Management of Child Abuse." Social Casework, 57, 5 (1976), 309-316.

Zimmerman, C. C. "The Future of the Family in America." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 34 (1972), 323-333.

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



APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

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 this 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 \_\_\_\_\_  
                                    4. Husband and wife  
                                        about equally \_\_\_\_\_
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:
- Divorce \_\_\_\_\_
- Death of spouse \_\_\_\_\_
15. How many children do you have? \_\_\_\_\_
16. What are their ages? \_\_\_\_\_
17. Have you been satisfied with the number and spacing of children born to your marriage?
1. Yes, I am satisfied \_\_\_\_\_
2. No, Children were born too soon after marriage \_\_\_\_\_
3. No, Too many children were born \_\_\_\_\_
4. No, Spacing of children was too close together \_\_\_\_\_
5. No, Spacing of children was too far apart \_\_\_\_\_
6. No, Did not have as many children as desired \_\_\_\_\_

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

18. 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
19. What is the age of your oldest child living at home? \_\_\_\_\_
- Is this child boy \_\_\_\_\_ or girl \_\_\_\_\_ ?
20. Indicate the degree of closeness of your spouse's relationship with your child (oldest child living at home) on the following scale (with 5 representing the greatest degree of closeness and 1 representing the least degree).
- 1          2          3          4          5
21. Please rate the happiness of your marriage on the following 5 point scale (5 represents the greatest degree of happiness and 1 represents the least degree of happiness). Circle the point which most nearly describes your degree of happiness:
- 1          2          3          4          5
22. 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
23. What would you most like to change about your marriage relationship?
24. What do you feel has contributed most to making your marriage satisfying?
25. What do you feel has contributed most to making your relationship with your child strong?
26. What would you most like to change about your relationship with your oldest child living at home?
27. 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

28. (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?

29. 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

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

31. 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

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

33. 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 degree and 1 represents the least.)

1            2            3            4            5

34. What exactly do you do that makes him/her feel good about himself/herself?

35. 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.	—	—	—	—	—

## 36. 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.	—	—	—	—	—
4. You are concerned with promoting your spouse's welfare and happiness.	—	—	—	—	—

## 37. Rate the degree to which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse understands your feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
2. You understand your spouse's feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
3. Your child understands your feelings.	—	—	—	—	—
4. You understand your child's feelings.	—	—	—	—	—

## 38. Rate the degree of affection 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.	—	—	—	—	—

## 39. Rate the degree of interest which:

	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1. Your spouse has in you.	—	—	—	—	—
2. You have in your spouse.	—	—	—	—	—

40. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your marriage relationship by circling the appropriate response. There are no right or wrong answers. The response code is as follows: SA = Strongly Agree; A = Agree; U = Undecided; D = Disagree; SD = Strongly Disagree:

- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1. My spouse and I quarrel very often in private.   | SA A U D SD |
| 2. My spouse and I quarrel very often in public.  | SA A U D SD |
| 3. My spouse and I often put each other down.   | SA A U D SD |
| 4. My spouse and I are often sarcastic with each other.   | SA A U D SD |
| 5. My spouse and I often ridicule each other.   | SA A U D SD |
| 6. My spouse and I often bring up each other's "mistakes" of the past.  | SA A U D SD |
| 7. Our marriage satisfaction has declined over the years.   | SA A U D SD |
| 8. My spouse and I do not feel as emotionally close to each other now as we did in the earlier period of our marriage.  | SA A U D SD |
| 9. My spouse and I spend much less time together now than we did in the earlier period of our marriage.   | SA A U D SD |
| 10. My spouse and I enjoy being with each other less now than we did in the earlier period of our marriage.   | SA A U D SD |
| 11. In comparison with the earlier years of our marriage much more of the time that my spouse and I now spend together is duty time such as entertaining, participating in the children's activities at school, and participating in various church and civic activities. | SA A U D SD |
| 12. I feel that much of the life has gone out of our marriage.  | SA A U D SD |
| 13. From the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have never done many things together.  | SA A U D SD |
| 14. From the beginning of our marriage most of the time that my spouse and I have spent together has been "duty" time such as entertaining and participating in various church and civic activities.  | SA A U D SD |

15. From the beginning of our marriage I have received less satisfaction from our marriage relationship than from some other areas of life such as homemaking, career, children, and community involvement. SA A U D SD
16. From the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have not had a strong emotional involvement with each other. SA A U D SD
17. Since the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have not experienced a great deal of enjoyment in simply talking with each other. SA A U D SD
18. Since the beginning of our marriage my spouse and I have shared few common interests. SA A U D SD
19. While there is little open conflict between my spouse and me, neither is there much to really excite me about the marriage. SA A U D SD
20. My spouse and I enjoy doing many things together. SA A U D SD
21. I enjoy most of the activities I participate in more if my spouse is also involved. SA A U D SD
22. I receive more satisfaction from my marriage relationship than from most other areas of life. SA A U D SD
23. My spouse and I have a positive, strong emotional involvement with each other. SA A U D SD
24. The companionship of my spouse is more enjoyable to me than most anything else in life. SA A U D SD
25. I would not hesitate to sacrifice an important goal in life if achievement of that goal would cause my marriage relationship to suffer. SA A U D SD
26. My spouse and I take an active interest in each other's work and hobbies. SA A U D SD
41. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your spouse satisfying; (rate on following 5 point scale with 5 representing greatest degree of determination and 1 representing the least degree.)

1      2      3      4      5



42. Rate your degree of determination to make your relationship with your child satisfying: (5 representing the greatest degree and 1 representing the least).

1      2      3      4      5

43. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make your marriage relationship satisfying: 5 representing the greatest degree and 1 representing the least).

1      2      3      4      5

44. Rate your spouse's degree of determination to make relationship with child satisfying: (5 representing the greatest degree and 1 representing the least).

1      2      3      4      5

45. Please indicate below who usually makes the decision about each of the following:

	Usually Husband	Usually Wife	Husband and Wife about equally
1. Family Finances	_____	_____	_____
2. Childrearing	_____	_____	_____
3. Religious matters	_____	_____	_____
4. Where to spend vacation	_____	_____	_____
5. Whether wife shall work	_____	_____	_____
6. Where to live	_____	_____	_____
7. Whether husband changes jobs	_____	_____	_____

46. Are you satisfied with the way in which you and your spouse make decisions?

No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_\_

47. When there is a serious disagreement between you and your spouse about a course of action to take who usually gets his/her way?

48. When there is conflict (serious disagreement) between you and your spouse, how does he/she usually deal with it?

49. Please indicate how often your spouse responds to conflict (serious disagreements) in each of the following ways:

	Very often	Often	About half the time	Some- times	Hardly ever
1. Tries to avoid talking about it.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Tries to convince the other person why his viewpoint is wrong.	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

- |  | Very<br>often | Often | About half<br>the time | Some-<br>times | Hardly<br>ever |
|--|---------------|-------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 3. Tells the other person off.   | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
| 4. Considers disagreements as a game of wits and tries to outmaneuver the other person.  | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
| 5. Tries to identify exactly what the problem is, what are the feelings of each person about the problem, and the different ways of solving the problem. | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
50. When there is a conflict (serious disagreements) between you and your spouse or another family member, how do you usually deal with it?

51. Please indicate how often you respond to conflict in each of the following ways:

- |  | Very<br>often | Often | About half<br>the time | Some-<br>times | Hardly<br>ever |
|--|---------------|-------|------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Try to avoid talking about it.  | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
| 2. Try to convince the other person why his viewpoint is wrong.  | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
| 3. I consider a disagreement as a game of wits and try to outmaneuver the other person.  | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |
| 4. I try to identify exactly what the problem is, what are the feelings of each person about the problem, and the different ways of solving the problem. | _____         | _____ | _____                  | _____          | _____          |

52. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your spouse: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1            2            3            4            5

53. Indicate below how much conflict you experience with your child: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1      2      3      4      5

54. Indicate below how much conflict your spouse experiences with your child: (5 represents a great degree of conflict and 1 represents very little conflict).

1      2      3      4      5

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

1. Your spouse

Very Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Uncertain \_\_\_\_\_  
Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Very Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_

2. Your child

Very Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Satisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Uncertain \_\_\_\_\_  
Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_  
Very Dissatisfied \_\_\_\_\_

56. 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?)

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

58. We would like to get information about communication patterns in families. Indicate the degree to which each of the following applies to you, your spouse and your child. (5 indicates highest degree; 1 indicates lowest degree).

	You					Your spouse					Child				
1. Listens well	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Tries to see things from the other's point of view	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. Communicates messages that are contradictory.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. Is sensitive to the feelings of others.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

	You					Your spouse					Child				
5. Likes to talk more than listen.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. Rarely shares his/her feelings with others	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Says directly what he/she thinks.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. "Hints" at what he/she wants rather than being direct.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Does not let other know what is bothering him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Checks to be sure he/she understands what others are saying when the communication process is unclear.	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

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

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

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

62. 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

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

64. 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

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

66. 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

67. 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

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

69. From the following list of values which are often considered to be important in human development, please check the five (5) values which you consider most important for an individual to learn.

- |   |       |
|---|-------|
| 1. Determination and perseverance   | _____ |
| 2. Self-reliance  | _____ |
| 3. Seeing each person as having dignity and worth. (This involves respecting rights and needs of others.) | _____ |
| 4. Moral courage. (Courage to stand by one's inner convictions)   | _____ |
| 5. Spiritual development  | _____ |
| 6. Cooperation  | _____ |
| 7. Honesty and integrity  | _____ |
| 8. Loyalty  | _____ |
| 9. Self-discipline  | _____ |
| 10. Feeling genuine concern and responsibility  | _____ |
| 11. Initiative  | _____ |
| 12. Intellectual inquisitiveness  | _____ |
| 13. Responsibility in performing tasks  | _____ |
| 14. Self-respect  | _____ |
| 15. Friendliness  | _____ |
| 16. Appreciation  | _____ |
| 17. Assuming responsibility for the consequences of one's own behavior                                    | _____ |

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

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

Score yourself on each of the needs. For scoring, use the 1 to 5 point scale. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of that need. Keep in mind that 1 represents the lowest level of the need, while 5 represents the highest level of the need.

- |  |   |   |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. ACHIEVEMENT - ambition, to succeed, to do one's best to accomplish something of great significance.         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. DEFERENCE - dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional.                      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. ORDER - neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule.               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. EXHIBITION - attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. AUTONOMY - independence, to be free in decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations.      | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. AFFILIATION - need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments.                                 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. INTRACCEPTION - need to know, to understand - what and why, to analyze and empathize.                       | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. SUCCORANCE - to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others.                                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. DOMINANCE - to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others.                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. ABASEMENT - conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority.             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. NURTURANCE - to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous.                                   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. CHANGE - variety, novelty, to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. ENDURANCE - perseverance, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

14. SEX - need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex.
15. AGGRESSION - to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others.

Please go back and see if you have answered each question.

APPENDIX B

MODIFIED EPPS



## EDWARDS PERSONAL PREFERENCE SCALE -

## MODIFIED VERSION

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

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

Score yourself on each of the needs. For scoring, use the 1 to 5 point scale. Circle the point on the scale which best describes your level of that need. Keep in mind that 1 represents the lowest level of the need, while 5 represents the highest level of the need.

- |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. ACHIEVEMENT - ambition, to succeed, to do one's best to accomplish something of great significance.    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. DIFFERENCE - dependence, to follow orders (and others), to conform, to be conventional.                | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. ORDER - neatness, to have organization, be systematic, and plan in advance; orderly schedule           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. EXHIBITION - attention, to be the center of things, to be noticed, to talk about oneself.              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. AUTONOMY - independence, to be free to decisions and actions; to be nonconforming without obligations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. AFFILIATION - need for people, friends, groups, to form strong attachments.                            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. INTRACPTION - need to know, to understand - what and why, to analyze and empathize.                    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. SUCCORANCE - to receive help, encouragement, sympathy, kindness from others.                           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. DOMINANCE - to be a leader, to lead, direct and supervise, to persuade and influence others.           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. ABASEMENT - conscience, to feel guilty and accept blame; to confess wrongs, admit inferiority.        | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. NURTURANCE - to give help, sympathy, kindness to others, to be generous.                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

12. CHANGE - variety, novelty, to experiment, try new things, experience change in routine. 1 2 3 4 5
13. ENDURANCE - perseverance, tenacity; to finish what is started, to stick to something even if unsuccessful. 1 2 3 4 5
14. SEX - need for opposite sex, for sexual activities; to do things involving sex. 1 2 3 4 5
15. AGGRESSION - to attack contrary views, to criticize, to tell what one thinks of others. 1 2 3 4 5

Please go back and see if you have answered each question.

APPENDIX C

VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE

VITAL-TOTAL RELATIONSHIP SCALE

My spouse and I enjoy doing many things together.	SA	A	U	D	SD
I enjoy most of the activities I participate in more if my spouse is also involved	SA	A	U	D	SD
I receive more satisfaction from my marriage relationship than from most other areas of life.	SA	A	U	D	SD
My spouse and I have a positive, strong emotional involvement with each other.	SA	A	U	D	SD
The companionship of my spouse is more enjoyable to me than most anything else in life.	SA	A	U	D	SD
I would not hesitate to sacrifice an important goal in life if achievement of that goal would cause my marriage relationship to suffer.	SA	A	U	D	SD
My spouse and I take an active interest in each other's work and hobbies.	SA	A	U	D	SD

VITA 2

Paul Warren Ammons

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

**Thesis:** VITAL-TOTAL MARITAL RELATIONSHIPS AMONG STRONG FAMILIES AND THEIR ASSOCIATION WITH SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC AND PERSONALITY VARIABLES

**Major Field:** Higher Education

**Minor Field:** Family Relations and Child Development

**Biographical:**

**Personal Data:** Born in Longview, Washington, July 8, 1948, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Cleo C. Ammons. Married December 22, 1968 to Frances Stewart. Father of two daughters, Carol Leigh and Paula Michelle.

**Education:** Attended Snowflake (Arizona) High School 1962-1965; received the Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology from Abilene (Texas) Christian College in May, 1969; received the Master of Social Work degree in 1973 at the University of Arkansas; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree in December, 1976 at Oklahoma State University.

**Professional Experience:** Served as caseworker for the Children's Homes, Inc., Paragould, Arkansas, 1970-1972. Employed as Director of Child Placement Services, Turley Children's Home, Tulsa, Oklahoma, 1973-1974. Served as Teaching Parent, Maude Carpenter Children's Home, Wichita, Kansas, 1974-1974, and as Assistant Professor of Social Work, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 1976.

**Professional Organizations:** National Association of Social Workers, National Council on Family Relations, Academy of Certified Social Workers. Licensed as a Clinical Social Worker.