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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Historically and currently, sociologists have held great interest in role theory, role behavior, and their attendant sociological correlates from both theoretical and empirical vantage points. Role behavior, as a sociological articulation of personality components such as ego structure, has also been of intrinsic interest to the social scientist, as it forms the structural linkage between the social framework of the society and the individual actor as a participant in the system. Moreover, sociologists investigating the family have long held scholarly interest in role performance as an index of marital stability and congruent spouse-other role conceptions. Considerable sociological interest has been directed toward the role conceptions and role performance of various marital and familial roles. Nevertheless, the interrelationship between marital, familial, and external role performances and their attendant sociological and socio-psychological variables has seen only scant, secondary treatment in the sociological literature.
The purpose of this study is the empirical investigation of the association between the role-generated variables (role preferences, role performance priorities, role strain, and role pressure), the configuration of the marital relationship, and the self-esteem of married women. The social roles under investigation are those of wife-mother-housekeeper-other which, although mutually contradictory in expectations, demands, and performance are nevertheless all expected of the same position-incumbent, that is, the married woman with children and/or external role commitments (voluntary community involvement, professional life, paid employment, etc.). Due to the nature of role priorities and/or preferences, and the time differentially allocated to performance in each of these role sectors, an individual performing any specific constellation of multiple roles will be limited in his time allocation, with the result that some of the roles will have a higher amount of time allotted to them than other roles held by the same position-incumbent. Several aspects of multiple role allocation and specific role priorities and preferences will be investigated. Also, the associational relationship between these variables and other situational, structural, and socio-psychological determinants will be established.

As one aspect of the analysis, this study seeks to investigate the patterns of role priorities, preferential roles and the amount of discrepancy between a woman's
consciously acknowledged normative role requirements and her actual role performance (role pressure) in order to assess the association between these variables and her level of self-esteem and the configuration of her marital relationship. By utilizing independent measures of self-esteem and marital configuration, it will be possible to determine the degree of association between these and the above-mentioned variables.

Within the universe of married women, white upper-middle class women have the highest role multiplicity, i.e., they are accorded a status-position that includes multiple contradictory expectations, demands, and priorities. In addition to the usual role demands of wife and mother, the upper-middle class married woman has the further role expectations of consciously and directly being involved in the career pattern of the professional life of her husband and, also, of actively participating in community leadership and/or a professional life that exact further role demands and expectations upon her time and her physical and psychic energy. Due to this complexity of roles available to these women, it is from this population that the research sample will be primarily drawn. Additional profile data, such as age, religious preference, number of children, type of housing and other situational determinants will also be presented. Some of these factors will be used in order to
properly assess the behavioral and attitudinal information obtained from the respondents.

A major aspect of this investigation will be an empirical assessment of the relationship between these respondents' configuration of marital interaction and the level of self-esteem of the female marriage partner. Cuber and Harroff,\(^1\) in their research based on unstructured, lengthy, intimate interviews concerning the relationships between men and women of the upper-middle class, categorized marriages in this class into two generalized types—Intrinsic and Utilitarian. Intrinsic marriages, as delineated by Cuber and Harroff, were defined as marriages in which "the relationship of a man and a woman has top priority among the several considerations which make up a total life."\(^2\) This type of marriage pattern, in essence, subordinates all other life valences, e.g., careers, children, material possessions, etc., to the centrality of the psychological relationship between the husband and wife. Giving first priority to the private and personal needs of the marriage relationship, this type of marital configuration is characterized by "lack of conventionality," vitality, joy of sharing, and "vibrant pairdom."\(^3\)


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 132.

\(^3\)Ibid., pp. 135, 137.
Delineating characteristics of the Utilitarian marriages were found to be a segregation of tasks and roles, limited companionship, use of the marriage "as a convenient background" to the couples' professional lives and, in general, "any marriage which is established or maintained for purposes other than to express an intimate, highly important personal relationship between a man and a women." The Utilitarian marriage type, as delineated by Cuber and Harroff, was found to be the dominant mode among their 437 interviewees. Moreover, this style of life was adjudged to be, perhaps, more in line with the total life commitments of upper-middle class ways of life, e.g., career, children, a prestigious social life, etc., and, therefore, more viable to most of the persons in this class.

A part of this study will be the investigation of the extent to which this apparent dichotomization of marriage configurations may be placed along a unidimensional continuum. In this way, the study seeks to provide a measurement device to rank the marriage of each respondent relative to these marriage types. A relationship will then be sought between the woman's marriage configuration as determined by this scale and, among other important correlates, her level of self-esteem.

Ibid., pp. 109, 113-131.
Theoretical and Research Background of the Present Study

The concept of role and its attendant corollaries, i.e., role strain/role conflict and role pressure has received considerable attention and interest from sociologists. Arising from the work of Durkheim and the contributions of Cooley to the theory of the self, early American sociological theoretical interest centered on Sumner's well-known distinction between mores and folkways, and Ross' work in social behaviorism. Thomas and Znaniecki, in their theory of personality, further evolved the development of theoretical and empirical sociological thought in this area. Moreover, Znaniecki's contribution to role theory is his linkage of cultural and social systems via the social role.

---


The advancement of role theory as a theoretical vantage point has had its framework in both symbolic interactionism with Cooley, Mead, and I. W. Thomas and in structural functionalism, with the interest and work of Parsons and Merton. Role theory has, moreover, emerged from a basically theoretical interest to encompass both the theoretical development of role theory, such as Merton's paper on the role-set, and numerous empirical studies on role conflict, role consensus, and role conceptions in the various institutional sectors of societal organization.

11 Cooley, Human Nature and the Social Order.
14 Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1951).

Role strain/role conflict has been dealt with empirically and theoretically, defined as the result of incompatible behavioral expectations held by various position-members toward a particular position-incumbent in a specific role-set. A theoretical and empirical investigation of female role strain and role conflict has been that of Podell, who attributes an empirically demonstrated lack of female role conflict to a high degree of toleration of tentativeness and ambiguity held by the society, with role conflict being conceptualized as a lack of congruence between internalized values and normative role expectations. Soysa, in an intensive study of married women, found the existence of two discernible responses to role conflict: that of overtly denying it, but nevertheless revealing it in response to relatively unstructured stimuli, such as sentence completion tests and Thematic Apperception Tests; and that of being aware of the presence of role conflict and dealing with it as a normal feature of existence. Other


empirical investigations have studied role strain/role conflict as they evince themselves as outcomes of changing role patterns in a particular institutional social system. 21

Role priorities in a specific institutional sphere, that of the family, have been investigated from a variety of empirical vantage points. Angrist, in a study of the relationship of role constellations (taken as a variable) to women's leisure activities, found that the type of leisure activity, not the amount, differentiates role categories, with domestic help a statistically significant intervening variable for certain sample categories of women. 22

In an investigation of the secondary features involved in the husband-wife primary relationship, Lopata23 reported on the results of a study of 622 young suburban and urban women interviewed in 1956 and in 1962. One of the purposes of the interviews was to obtain the woman's perception of her roles as homemaker, wife and mother. Lopata


found that, presented with an open-ended statement asking the most important roles of a woman, in terms of rank order, 33 per cent of the interviewees gave the wife role first place, while only 62 per cent of the respondents mentioned the role of wife at all. The homemaker role was listed by only 17 per cent as first in importance, while the mother role was mentioned by 81 per cent of the total sample, 37 per cent putting it in the first priority position.

Also, Lopata stated that, as each respondent did not combine this universal set of duties and levels of relations into the same hierarchical order, five basic "ideal types" could be considered as present in the sample: the husband-oriented, the time-cyclical-oriented, the mother-child-oriented, the home-oriented, and the self-oriented.24

Weiss and Samuelson, in a national representative sample study25 of 569 women 21 and over, investigated the extent to which the major social roles available to women provided bases for feelings of worth. Utilizing a brief open-end schedule format, they posited the four social roles of housework, job, family (relationship between husband and children), and informal interaction outside the home (associational memberships). The findings from this study show

24 Ibid., p. 123.

that 51 per cent of the married women espouse the housework role as a determinant of feelings of usefulness and importance, there being found no significant difference due to educational level. Of the married employed women, irrespective of educational level, 60 per cent referred to their job as a basis for feelings of usefulness and importance. Concerning the family role, only when there are children was this social role found to be associated with feelings of worth and importance; that is, in the childless marriages where caring for the husband is the only nexus for the family role—the family role ceases to be seen as a basis for feelings of worth. The authors conclude that in marriage, housework takes on and maintains value even after the children leave home. For a majority of their sample, children, as compared to the husband, are the significant factor in giving the woman a sense of importance and usefulness.

In the sociological literature, the social role has been theoretically regarded as a major variable in the societal and personal identity of an individual. In the psychological literature, the linkage between the social role and the position-incumbent's level of self-esteem, that is, ego level, dominance feeling, also has had both

scholarly interest and empirical documentation, such as in the work of Coppersmith, Wylie and Stotland, et al. Thus far, empirical sociological interest in role research has been centered in the above-mentioned aspects, while investigations into the priority management of multiple incompatible role expectations as they impinge on a single position-incumbent have been singularly neglected. Moreover, the linkage between these variables, the marital relationship configuration, and self-esteem has yet to be empirically demonstrated. Investigated from a sociological theoretical framework, a study of the association between the management of the multiple roles of the married woman and her concomitant level of self-esteem should lead to the empirical documentation of the validity of these roles as indicators of self-esteem.

The Study: Purposes, Definitions and Hypotheses

The three related purposes of this empirical research are:

1. to establish scales and indices to measure role


performance, role pressure, role strain and the marital relationship configuration (the latter being developed from the work of Cuber and Harroff);

2. to delineate, by empirical investigation, the patterns and types of role performance, preference, and priority, and their associational linkage with the marital relationship configuration of the wives of professional men;

3. to statistically test a series of hypotheses that involve these aforementioned variables and the woman's level of self-esteem.

As this is an empirical investigation of role pressure, role performance, role strain, role priority and marital relationships and the association of these variables with self-esteem, functional, concise definitions of terms are necessary to clarify and link the study to a theoretical and conceptual base. Following the suggestion of Biddle and Thomas,30 the terms "role pressure" and "role strain" will be used to differentiate between two theoretical perspectives from which the particular area of role theory under consideration may be viewed. As defined by these authors, "role pressure" "pertains to all those factors relating to role which singly or in combination are sources of potential difficulty for the individual." "Role strain," in contrast, 

they use as defined by Goode as "the felt difficulty in ful-
filling role obligations." 31

The theoretical linkage between role pressure and
role strain Biddle and Thomas summarize as follows:

Both the pressure and the strain are role related.
The pressure may derive from conflicts of demands
and norms, from opposing evaluations of the actor
by others, from differences between the actor's con-
ceptions of himself and the statements about him by
others, from interdependencies excessive in hinder-
ance or cost, from a problematic complement of posi-
tions, from a discontinuous transition between posi-
tions . . . and many others. And role strain differs
from threat, anxiety, and stress in general by
virtue of its being generated by role phenomena. 32

The third theoretical construct to be considered
relative to this area of role theory is that of "role per-
formance." "Role performance" is conceptualized here to
mean the fulfillment of specific physical and/or psycho-
logical tasks in juxtaposition to a particular, stated,
complementary object: that of wife-husband, mother-child,
housekeeping-home, and outside activities—the community.
"Role priority," as theoretically conceived, means the order
of preference (i.e., first, second, third and fourth) in
which, given a choice, the demands of multiple roles and/or
role expectations are fulfilled by any one position-
incumbent. Although it is an implicit component of role

32 Biddle and Thomas, Role Theory, p. 62.
pressure and role strain, role priority also can and will be viewed explicitly as an independent variable.  

As a theoretical abstraction, the marital relationship configuration will be derived from the research of Cuber and Harroff, and will utilize their definitions of Intrinsic-Utilitarian marital relationships (as discussed earlier in this chapter). The theoretical basis for the conceptualization of the referent "self-esteem" is found in the work of Maslow. He employs "self-esteem" as synonymous with "dominance-feeling, feeling of superiority, ego level, ego strength, ascendancy, feeling of power or drive to power feeling or adequacy." Further delineation of this and the other aforementioned theoretical concepts, with reference to their operational use, will appear in the following chapter, on the research design.  

In this study, five major associations of the variables will be investigated, theoretically assuming the null hypothesis. It is hypothesized:

1. that there will be no significant association between the four role performance task areas and self-esteem.

---

33 Cuber and Harroff, The Significant Americans, pp. 106-145. 


35 Maslow, "A Test for Dominance-Feeling (Self-Esteem)," p. 255.
2. that there will be no significant association between the marital relationship configuration and self-esteem.

3. that there will be no significant association between the marital relationship configuration and role performance/role priority.

4. that there will be no significant association between the marital relationship configuration and role strain/role pressure.

5. that there will be no significant relationship between role strain/role pressure and self-esteem.
CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

The previous chapter contains the formulation of the hypotheses of this study and the definitions of the theoretical concepts which delineate the phenomena under consideration. This chapter treats six additional aspects of this investigation: the research design, the measuring instruments, the pre-test, the population universe, the collection of the data, and the characteristics of the sample.

The Research Design

An integral portion of the design of the present research was that of providing for the collection of data from which inferences of causal relationships could be drawn between the variables being measured. The acquisition of the necessary data was effected through the use of a schedule with a forced-choice format, administered to a population universe of upper-middle class, married, white women, who were wives of professional men. A total of 457 women participated in the investigation: 151 as members of professional auxiliaries, 264 as members of special interest and cultural organizations, 19 as members of professional
women's organizations, and 23 on an individual basis.

The initial step consisted of creating four role behavior scales, a role pressure scale, a role strain index, and a marital configuration scale. Following the empirical demonstration of scalability and the determination of the range of scores on each scale, every respondent was accorded a rank placement on each of the specific scales. In addition, the Maslow test for dominance-feeling\(^1\) was utilized to empirically ascertain and provide a rank ordering of the self-esteem of each respondent. The entire schedule, as administrated, is photographically reproduced\(^2\) as Appendix A.

The above-mentioned analysis was accomplished for the sample as a whole, with the median on each scale taken as the arbitrary division between high and low scores. On any specific measurement index, the respondents who fell on the median were placed in the category which would then give the closest approximation to equal numbers in the high and low rankings. The testing of relevant hypotheses was then accomplished by dividing the entire sample population into three major categories. These classifications were: women who never had children, women with at least one child or


\(^{2}\)The author is particularly indebted to Dr. Abraham Maslow for permission to reproduce his measure of self-esteem, "The Social Personality Inventory," referred to in footnote 1.
more living in the home, and women who had children, but whose children all had left the parental home. After testing the relevant hypotheses on each of these groups, the three categories were recombined in order to investigate associations between some of the variables for the total sample.

The Measuring Instruments

The hypotheses tested in this investigation required that nine different behavioral and attitudinal areas be subjected to measurement. These measures were:

I. the role priority rank listing

II. the four role behavior scales:
   1. the measurement of wife role behavior
   2. the measurement of mother role behavior
   3. the measurement of house role behavior
   4. the measurement of "other" role behavior

III. the role pressure scale

IV. the role strain index

V. the Cuber Intrinsic-Utilitarian Marriage Scale

VI. the Maslow Social Personality Inventory

The role priority rank listing

The first page of the research instrument listed four role configurations which the respondent was asked to rank order (assign ranks 1 through 4) in terms of degree of importance. These were the roles of wife, mother, house,
and "other." For further clarification of how these roles were presented, the reader is referred to page one of Appendix A, in which one of the first pages of the research instrument is reproduced. As there are twenty-four possible permutations of the four role configurations, the study, in fact, employed twenty-four different cover pages. Each of these appeared in equal numbers as the initial page of the questionnaire, so as to eliminate the possibility of the ordering presented affecting the response.

The four role behavior scales

The measure of behavior in each of the four areas previously delineated (wife-mother-house-other) derived from an analysis of the forced-choice answers by each respondent to a predetermined set of questions. The items related to the different areas were intermixed, so as to avoid any awareness on the part of the respondent that a later segregation of the patterns of behavior would occur.

As mentioned earlier, the research instrument is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix A. The responses appropriate to the role behavior scale consist of Section II of the research instrument and part of the questions in Section I of the questionnaire. In order to further clarify the content of each of the specific scales, the responses appropriate to each behavioral sector (wife-mother-house-other) have been grouped separately in Appendix C.
For each behavioral area, only those questions which were applicable to a particular respondent were included in the scoring procedure. Applicability of any specific item was determined by a unique combination of items on "general information" and particular cases of items in each role behavior area. In this way, each respondent could only be scored on those tasks which were objectively possible in her particular situation. Because of the complexities of the logical structure of such an analysis, a digital computer program using Fortran IV was devised by the author to perform this process on the O.S.U. IBM 7094. An exact delineation of the logical scoring sequence can best be presented in the manner in which it was accomplished. For this reason, the entire computer program for determining the respondents' scores on the role behavior scales is reproduced in Appendix D. The required information was coded on two IBM cards per respondent. The first card contained the responses to the questions in Section I of the research instrument. This section of the questionnaire has been repeated as Appendix B, with the numerical coding procedure superimposed. The second card contained the responses to the questions in Section II of the research instrument. As stated earlier, this section of the questionnaire has been presented in regrouped form as Appendix C. Here, also, the numerical coding procedure has been superimposed. Thus the information as to the card and column number on which the response
to a particular question appears presents a complete description of the analysis leading to the role behavior scale scores for each respondent.

A summary of the procedure for scoring each behavioral area shows it to consist of several systematic operations. In each role sector, the number of applicable questions for a given respondent was ascertained (e.g., ten questions applicable out of the fifteen questions appearing for this area). A score of 0 or 1 was assigned to each item, according to whether the answer indicated no temporal or psychic involvement (0), or temporal or psychic involvement (1) as assessed by that particular item. To obtain the "normalized total score" for each behavioral area, the total score was divided by the number of applicable questions. This method led to a "normalized total score" between 0 and 1 for each of the four behavioral areas. For those respondents who have never had children, the mother scale was, of course, excluded. That is, only those women with children were assigned a score on the scale.

The following table (Table 1) presents the maximum possible numerical score (before normalization) in each role sector, the actual distribution of scores obtained, and the mean, the median, and the standard deviation for each of the scales.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Sector</th>
<th>Maximum Possible Unnormalized Score</th>
<th>Distribution of Normalized Scores</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>.2500 1.000</td>
<td>.6353</td>
<td>.6250</td>
<td>.1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.0000 1.000</td>
<td>.5356</td>
<td>.5556</td>
<td>.1446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.1579 1.000</td>
<td>.6426</td>
<td>.6316</td>
<td>.1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.1000 1.000</td>
<td>.4383</td>
<td>.4000</td>
<td>.1901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the distribution of scores on each of the four behavioral scales ranged from 0.0 or almost 0.0 to 1.0. The score of 0.0 that was obtained by five of the respondents with children on their mother role is, in itself, markedly interesting. The score distributions, the means, medians, and standard deviations, are demonstrably similar—although not identical—for the different role behavior scales. A detailed examination of the scores in each role sector shows that each of the distributions represents a reasonable approximation to a normal curve.

Although each of these role sectors has been and will continue to be referred to as a scale, the numerical reported score is simply a fraction representing that portion of the role tasks possible to the respondent that she actually undertakes. Thus the usual statistical assessments of scalability are not pertinent, and have not been applied.
As a comparative measure of respondents' performance in a particular role sector, the validity of the scores on any given scale lies in the width of the range of the distribution; the reliability of any scale score depends directly upon the assumed honesty and memory of the respondent.

On the other hand, the reliability and validity of the scale scores is further demonstrated by the written comments of the respondents. As an illustration, the following quotes from the two respondents who had the highest scores on the mother scale (1.000 and .9444) seem appropriate:

Every moment they [the children] are of primary interest. Every night they are in [our] prayers for their welfare. . . . the children are our first concern.

When there is no school we are together constantly.

The role pressure scale

The role behavior scales were utilized not only as discussed above, but also were incorporated as components of the "role pressure" of the respondent in regard to her mother-wife-house-other constellation of roles. The crucial component of role pressure was conceptualized as the discrepancy existing between the respondent's stated normative role requirements (role priority rank listing) and her temporal and/or psychic actual performance in these various roles.

To operationalize this concept, the role priority rank listing was utilized vis-a-vis the role behavior scale
scores obtained from the respondent. It was hypothesized that for any given respondent, the higher the preference given a particular role and the greater the discrepancy between her actual performance of the role and the maximum possible performance of the role, the higher will be her "role pressure" with respect to that role. In each case, the role performance scale value has been constructed so that, for any respondent, the maximum possible score for the performance of any of the four roles is 1.0. For a particular respondent, the role pressure on role 1, denoted by the symbol $P_1$, we shall define as:

$$P_1 = Y_1 \left(1.0 - X_1\right)$$

where

$$X_1 = \text{the role performance scale score of the respondent on role scale 1}$$

and

$$Y_1 = 2(5 - \text{preference factor of the respondent for role 1})$$

The respondent's total "role pressure" score is the sum of her role pressure in each of the four areas. That is,

$$\text{Total Role Pressure Score} = \sum_{i=1}^{4} P_i$$

This results in a linear scale, on which each respondent receives a ranking between 0 and 20. For those women
who have never had children, the above sum is taken over three role sectors only, resulting in a possible score between 0 and 18. Therefore all respondents will have been ranked on a comparative basis for use in correlation with all other variables in the research. By defining role pressure in this way, each respondent's total role pressure score is determined by treating role pressure scores on each of the four role behavior scales independently. That is, since this operational procedure does not demand a direct comparison of the respondent's numerical scores (e.g., .821, .621) on the different role scales, the final rank ordering of respondents is virtually independent of the mean values of the scores on the individual scales. Table 2 illustrates the computation of role pressure.

**TABLE 2**

**SAMPLE ROLE PRESSURE CALCULATION FOR A HYPOTHETICAL RESPONDENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Actual Role Performance ($X_1$)</th>
<th>Role Preference</th>
<th>$Y_1$</th>
<th>$P_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Role Pressure for Respondent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The IBM 7094 was utilized for the computation of the respondents' role pressure scores. The following table (Table 3) presents the minimum, maximum, mean, and median scores for both the respondents who have had and have not had children.

**TABLE 3**

THE ROLE PRESSURE SCALE, A STATISTICAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Scores</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women who have had children</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women who have not had children</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The role strain index

An attitudinal index was designed by the author to measure the degree of the respondent's actual conscious awareness of "role pressure," namely "role strain." As role strain is not necessarily coterminous with the objective assessment of role pressure, role strain can be utilized as an independent variable. The questions comprising the role strain index are contained in Section III of the research instrument (Appendix A) and stand empirically as an independent unit.

The index consists of twelve statements, each item juxtaposing two of the four role sectors in terms of temporal and/or psychic demands. To insure against a "halo
"effect," half of the items were designed such that a response of "SA" indicates high role conflict (numbers 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 12) while high role conflict is evinced by a response of "SD" on the other items (numbers 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11). Each of the following role combinations were utilized twice, in order to establish two separate sub-scales: wife-mother, mother-other, wife-house, wife-other, house-mother, and house-other. Employing the Likert method of summated ratings, the responses to each item were given rankings of 0 to 4. The respondents' total scores were assessed, taking into account the lower maximum possible score for the respondents who did not have children. This entire procedure was programmed by the author for the IBM 7094, as was the split-half test for internal reliability.

Using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula, it was determined that at least 96 separate items would be needed to obtain a reliability of .90 or above. The necessity of the additional number of questions required in this technique had been anticipated; however, the complexity and length of the research instrument dictated the restriction to twelve items. Thus, as a measure of role strain, this set of items can be adjudged only to indicate a range of scores, not a scalable dimension. The following table (Table 4) presents the minimum, maximum, mean, and median

---

scores as well as the standard deviations for both the respondents who had had and have not had children.

**TABLE 4**

THE ROLE STRAIN INDEX, A STATISTICAL SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Scores</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women who have had children</strong></td>
<td>Min: 2</td>
<td>Max: 34</td>
<td>17.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women who have not had children</strong></td>
<td>Min: 0</td>
<td>Max: 15</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Cuber Intrinsic-Utilitarian Marriage Scale

The Cuber Intrinsic-Utilitarian marriage inventory, initially composed of nineteen items derived and excerpted from the work of Cuber and Harroff,¹ is presented as Section V of the research instrument (Appendix A). Items 1 and 2 of the inventory were to be responded to by mutually exclusive categories of women, i.e., those with and without children, and were regarded as a single composite question. From this inventory, an attitudinal-behavioral scale was developed by the author to classify the respondent's marriage in terms of Intrinsic-Utilitarian characteristics. The degree to which a respondent's marriage is composed of Intrinsic and/or Utilitarian components on this scale will be utilized as an

independent variable in association with the role-related variables (role performance, role pressure, role strain and role priority) and the woman's level of self-esteem. It is important to note that performance on the wife role behavior scale and the respondent's score on the Cuber Scale are somewhat interrelated, as the two scales contain some similar components. Nevertheless, the salient difference between the two scales is that the wife role behavior scale refers only to her role performance, whereas the Cuber Scale is explicitly concerned with the actual configuration of the marital relationship that exists between the respondent and her husband.

In the creation of the Cuber Scale, the author employed the scaleogram analysis technique developed initially by Guttman\(^5\) and more recently elaborated by Ford.\(^6\) The original inventory was so designed that the "halo effect"

---


would be mitigated by the utilization of both positive and
negative response items to indicate the same pattern of
behavior and attitude. In the construction of the Scale,
the numerical procedure employed was that of assigning the
higher value to the more Intrinsic response, the lower value
to the more Utilitarian response. The entire scaleogram
analysis was programed in Fortran IV and carried out on the
O.S.U. IBM 7094.

The scaleogram technique specifies that the initial
rank ordering of the respondents be made by assigning a
linear progression of numerical values to the response cate-
gories for each item, and applying the method of summated
ratings. The subsequent rank ordering of the items them­
selves from the question with the least number of responses
in the most positive category to that question with the
least number of responses in the most negative category
gives rise to the initial parallelogram. A dichotomization
of the response patterns for each item is then imposed upon
the data, following the scaleogram dicta that a continuous
distribution of marginal totals must be maintained and that
the marginal frequencies should not permit more than 80 per
cent of the total number of responses to any particular
item to fall into either dichotomous category.7 For the
nineteen-item inventory, the best placement of the cutting

7Ford, "Rapid Scoring Procedure for Scaling Attitude
points resulted in a coefficient of reproducibility of .798
and a coefficient of scalability\(^8\) of .346.

In scaleogram analysis, items with identical marginal
totals represent identical measures applied to the sample
population. Retention of such items is not only redundant,
but will result in the introduction of spurious errors.
Thus, a maximization of both the coefficients of reproducibility
and scalability was sought by eliminating (in various
combinations) items with similar marginal frequencies.
Within any group of items having similar marginal totals,
the item or items introducing the largest number of scale
errors were removed. When two items of equal merit but
similar marginal totals were encountered, the selection of
the item for elimination depended upon the best judgment of
the investigator. Items for which more than one cutting
point was possible were, after elimination by the above-
mentioned process, often reintroduced with a new cutting
point into a second group of marginal totals, and the process
of elimination was again repeated.

This procedure, along with the guideline that the dif-
ference in the marginal frequencies should be more than 5
per cent, led to the establishment of a ten-item scale. A
list of the specific questions that comprise this final

\(^8\)Herbert Menzel, "A New Coefficient for Scaleogram
Analysis," \textit{Public Opinion Quarterly}, XVII (Summer, 1953),
268-280.
Cuber Scale, along with the marginal totals for each item, is presented in Table 5. These questions are repeated in Appendix E, with the cutting points signified by a slash, and the dichotomous numerical values appropriate to each cutting point indicated in the response positions.

TABLE 5

THE CUBER INTRINSIC-UTILITARIAN MARRIAGE SCALE, THE ITEMS WITH THEIR MARGINAL FREQUENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Responses Below Cutting Point</th>
<th>Responses Above Cutting Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Scale, the coefficient of reproducibility is .843; the minimum marginal reproducibility is .669; and the coefficient of scalability is .508. In going from the nineteen-item to the ten-item scale, 45 per cent of the data was lost; however, the coefficient of scalability was increased by 49 per cent. Figure 1 on page 35 is a shortened version of the Guttman parallelogram, reproduced by picturing the response associated with every tenth rank order, starting with the first. The reproducibility for this group of respondents is approximately .84, and we may
FIGURE 1
A SHORTENED VERSION OF THE GUTTMAN PARALLELOGRAM
FOR THE CUBER INTRINSIC-UTILITARIAN
MARRIAGE SCALE
thus consider this abbreviated parallelogram as representative of the parallelogram for the entire sample.

In accord with the theory of scaleogram analysis a coefficient of reproducibility of .84 implies a somewhat diffuse, not perfectly unidimensional continuum (a perfect approximation to an "ideal" scale being .90 or above). The use of the Cuber Scale in external prediction problems is nevertheless empirically valid, in that this quasi-scale has the full mathematical advantages of a scalable area. Moreover, the rank ordering may properly be used for correlating any outside variable with this area; that is, this scaling technique may be said to have empirically demonstrated the existence of a single dominant factor that is measured by the respondents' scores.  

The Maslow Social Personality Inventory

To measure the self-esteem of each respondent, a scale developed by A. H. Maslow was utilized. This scale, originally used on urban, middle-class women of college intelligence, has been used widely in psychological and professional counseling. Containing 52 items, this


10Ibid., p. 160.

11Maslow, "A Test for Dominance-Feeling (Self-Esteem)," pp. 267-270.
personality measure is based on feelings and attitudes rather than behavior per se, thereby making it a singularly valid indicator of self-esteem for use in this study in which normative role behavior is to be considered an independent variable. Maslow found, at the outset, a correlation of the Inventory with the Allport A-S test of dominance behavior.\(^{12}\) Also, the reliability and validity of the Inventory were demonstrated by Maslow to be \(.88-.90\) and \(.896-.908\), respectively.\(^{13}\) The method of obtaining a respondent's score on the Inventory is fully described in the original paper by Maslow cited immediately above.

The following table (Table 6) presents the minimum, maximum, mean and median scores, as well as the standard deviation for the 457 respondents in the present study.

**TABLE 6**

**THE SOCIAL PERSONALITY INVENTORY, A STATISTICAL SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution of Scores</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>Median Score</th>
<th>Standard Deviation of Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>-45.95</td>
<td>-53.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Theoretically, the widest possible range of scores on the Inventory is from \(-234\) to \(+246\). With his original sample

\(^{12}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 266.\)

\(^{13}\text{Ibid.},\ p.\ 262.\)
population of 845, Maslow obtained a range of -145 to +182, with a mean of -8, a median of -11, and a standard deviation of 55.56. On the other hand, the scores in the present study should most properly be compared to those Maslow obtained for a midwestern state university, for which the median result was -35.0.\textsuperscript{14}

**The Pre-test**

In order to initially validate the research instrument and to supplement the quantitative numerical data with introspective and subjective interpretations, twelve interviews were undertaken with upper-middle class, married, white women. These discussions, all taking place in the Columbus, Ohio Standard Metropolitan Area, utilized both the initial form of the research instrument and an interview format.

The women that were interviewed were selected from a wide geographical area. The interviews took place in their homes, and lasted for approximately two hours. The first and last of these interviews were separated by a period of two weeks. The age range of the interviewees varied widely (from under 30 to over 50), as did the number and ages of their children. Their socio-economic status was upper-middle class, as all of their husbands were professional

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 263.
men (e.g., real estate broker, attorney, M.D., prominent judge, etc.). Incomes ranged from between $10,000 and $20,000 to several over $50,000, while religious affiliations were for the most part Protestant, there being two members of the Jewish faith and one Catholic. All had at least attended college, with four having received graduate degrees.

In order to validate and augment the research instrument, information was solicited on such topics as the following: quantity vs. quality of the four role performance areas and role strain. Also, responses were encouraged concerning the importance of community activities for a married couple and the opinion of the interviewee as to whether she had found the roles of mother, wife and housekeeper disillusioning and/or satisfying.

The findings of the interviews resulted in small modifications of the research instrument. However, the most important single insight gained was the variety of "styles of life" within this particular socio-economic class. In particular, this pre-test underscored, how, given these various "life styles," individual adaptations, and the various stages of the life cycle, an empirical research instrument can systematize and select out common, modal characteristics of these women's lives and the sociologically important valances in their marriages. These interviews thus substantiated the methodological legitimacy of the
proposed research, and, in terms of the empirical findings based on these interviews, possible associations between variables were already becoming apparent.

**The Population Universe**

The total population universe from which the sample was drawn consisted of members of fifteen organizations in the Columbus, Ohio Standard Metropolitan Area. These white, upper-middle class, married women were all active members of at least one of the following types of groups: professional auxiliaries, cultural organizations, philanthropic and civic groups, and/or professional women's associations. An additional sample of professional women was obtained by private solicitation.

**Collection of the Data**

The research instrument used for this investigation was the forced-choice format schedule reproduced in Appendix A. It consisted of six specific sections of items: general background information, role priority rank listing, role performance, role strain, the Cuber Intrinsic-Utilitarian Marriage Scale, and the Maslow Social Personality Inventory. Each of these components has been explicitly dealt with heretofore, the only exception being the items for the general background information. In the utilization of the background information, two aims were held to be important: first, that this information include items on the
respondent's educational level, age, religious preference, and family income level; second, that specific items in this section serve as additional controls to modify and/or interpret subsequent responses on the schedule. The husband's occupational group and the total family income served as a control and a verification of socio-economic status, the concepts employed being those of Kahl\textsuperscript{15} and of Cuber and Harroff.\textsuperscript{16} The manner in which the remainder of the items were used for controls is described in Appendix B.

In order to gain access to the population universe, the investigator had to obtain the permission and cooperation of the organizations involved. In many specific instances, this required the presence of the researcher in front of the governing bodies of the organizations, at which time the author explained the avowed purpose of the study and asked for assistance in the completion of the investigation. In all, fifteen specific organizational units voluntarily co-operated, three additional groups denying access.

Within a two-month period, all of the organizations were initially contacted and permission was requested to gain access to each of the groups. The actual collection of the data was accomplished by the administration of the schedules to the members of the specific organizations at

\textsuperscript{16}Cuber and Harroff, The Significant Americans, pp. 4-8.
one of their monthly meetings. At this time, the investigator explained that the purpose of the study was to ascertain how "the wives of professional men manage the myriad demands on their time as wives, mothers, housekeepers, and community leaders," and asked for each member's co-operation. In so doing, as outlined in the prior solicitation of access to the groups under discussion, it was made decidedly clear that the participation of any specific individual in this study was strictly on a voluntary basis, and, as the schedules were administered in large groups, the anonymity of each respondent was assured. This professional avowal of the actual anonymous nature of this study was to facilitate the co-operation of the respondents. This technique has been shown to be methodologically advantageous when a high level of voluntary participation is needed, and, also, when the social and personal characteristics of the respondents, such as the respondent's feelings of incompetence, may underscore a need for masking identity. A feeling of inadequacy has its counterpart in low self-esteem; this augments the importance of anonymity in obtaining the responses of women with low self-esteem.

The members of the organizations were, however, requested to respond to the first page of the research

instrument in the presence of the investigator. After the completion of this task, the first page was returned to the investigator. To make certain the respondent did not tear off two pages of the questionnaire by accident, this front "tear-off" sheet was printed on paper of a different color from that of the remainder of the questionnaire. The main purpose of removing the first sheet was to make certain that the respondent had no opportunity to change her original responses to this page after reading and/or responding to the rest of the schedule.

The respondents were then requested to complete the rest of the questionnaire at their leisure. Written comments were solicited, and a space was provided on the last page of the questionnaire for this purpose. Finally, they were asked to return the completed schedule (minus, of course, the first page) by mail, using the addressed, stamped envelope which had been attached for this purpose. Administering the questionnaire to the women in groups assured anonymity and, also, the respondents did not have to complete the schedule in the presence of others. Upon the return of the respondents' questionnaires by mail, a coding procedure re-matched the initial page with the remainder of the schedule.

In addition to the above method of data collection, an additional 25 women were contacted individually and asked
to participate in the study. The same methodology was used, in that the first page of the schedule was responded to in front of and returned to the investigator. This supplementary group of respondents, all of whom were married professional working women of this socio-economic class, was deemed methodologically necessary to the efficacy of the investigation, as this group was expected to evince a lifestyle dissimilar to that of a majority of the rest of the respondents.

The total number of questionnaires distributed, including both usable and nonusable completed schedules, is shown in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number solicited</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total returns</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable returns</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the questionnaires presented to the potential respondents, 84.7 per cent were returned. Of these, 90.3 per cent were usable, the remainder being unusable due to a page apparently skipped by accident or the marital status of the respondent (i.e., single, divorced, widowed). Whereas 76.5 per cent of the total population universe were usable
returns (completed schedules of white, married women), the crucial factor is the 84.7 per cent total return, as this is the proper measure of the total response achieved.

**Characteristics of the Sample**

The final sample consisted of 457 respondents out of the population universe of 597. Almost all of the respondents in the sample were upper-middle class and upper class (86.0 per cent), with 13.7 per cent in the lower middle class, due to their level of family income. All of the respondents were wives of professional men, some of the husbands being of a higher financial position and/or an older age than their professional colleagues.

In terms of the respondents' level of education, 93.5 per cent had either attended college, graduated from college or attended or graduated from graduate school. Graph I summarizes the educational levels of the respondents.

There were 329 Protestants, 29 Catholics and 73 Jewish respondents in the sample, the remainder of the 457 being 5 Unitarians, Greek Orthodox, etc., and 20 who espoused no religious affiliation. In terms of the three major religious affiliations, the sample was 71.9 per cent Protestant, 6.3 per cent Catholic, and 15.7 per cent Jewish.
Graph I.--Educational Levels of the Sample Population.

- Attended High School: 1
- Graduated from High School: 38
- Attended College: 144
- Graduated from College: 173
- Attended Graduate School: 30
- Received Graduate Degree: 70
Concerning the age range of the respondents, the majority (72.9 per cent) were found to be between thirty and sixty years of age. Graph II presents the distribution of the ages of the respondents.

Graph II.—Age Distribution of the Sample Population.
The income distribution of the families of the respondents was found to be concentrated in the $10,000-$30,000 range, with 68.9 per cent in this combined category. Graph III is a concise presentation of the range of income associated with the sample (see p. 49).
Graph III.—Family Income Distribution of the Sample Population.
CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

As an additional methodological step in the preparation of the raw data for further analysis, each of the scale scores for a particular respondent was punched on a single IBM card. This procedure, entailing the compilation of seven separate measures along with salient background and statistical information for every respondent, was written in Fortran IV and run on the O.S.U. IBM 7094. At this point, it had been decided that the chi square test of significance would be the appropriate statistic to use, in this, the initial analysis of the interrelationship of the major variables in the investigation. Thus, the synthesis of the data collected in this study (originally stored on four cards per respondent) onto one card for each respondent made possible the use of the IBM sorter for this stage of the investigation.

At the outset of the examination of the associational linkage between variables, it was regarded as methodologically pertinent to test for a possible relationship between self-esteem and education. The findings regarding this association should be considered as important in two ways:
first, in that there is a cultural belief held and espoused by both professionals in the behavioral sciences and hence by educated, articulate laymen that the higher the level of education attained, the higher is the individual's self-esteem; second, that if self-esteem is dependent on the level of education attained, then the measure of self-esteem utilized in this investigation can be methodologically justified only for a strictly circumscribed, homogeneous population of women with a similar educational background.

The empirical results, however, indicated no significant relationship between level of education and level of self-esteem. The test of association is shown in Table 8.

**TABLE 8**

LEVEL OF EDUCATION AND SELF-ESTEEM SCALE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Education</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>456*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 1.54; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.} \]

*One respondent did not answer the level of education background item.
This realization of the lack of a significant association between education and self-esteem emphasizes the statistical importance of self-esteem when related to other variables, as any associations found to exist cannot be adjudged spurious, that is, deriving their statistical power from a significant, positive association between self-esteem and education.

From this point on, the analysis of the interrelationships between variables will be best accomplished by dividing the entire sample population into three major categories: women with at least one child or more living in the home; women who never had children; and women who had children, but whose children all had left the parental home. Finally, these categories will be recombined and other tests of association made concerning the total sample population. Then comparisons will be made between the findings of this investigation and those of the pertinent, relevant literature in the area.

Women with Children Living at Home

Age range

Comprising 70.4 per cent of the total sample population, 322 women were found to have at least one child living at home. These women were concentrated mainly in the thirty to fifty age range. The following graph (Graph IV) shows the distribution among age categories for this group.
Graph IV.--Age Distribution of Women with at Least One Child Living at Home.
The associations between variables

The relationship between other role performance and self-esteem, for those respondents who had children living at home, was found to be significant at the .001 level. That is, high other role performance is significantly associated with high self-esteem, low other role performance with low self-esteem. This relationship is shown in Table 9.

**TABLE 9**

**OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 31.49; \text{ d.f.} = 1; P < .001.\]

The relationship between these respondents' scores on the Cuber Intrinsic-Utilitarian Marriage Scale and their self-esteem provokes additional consideration. This association is shown in Table 10.
TABLE 10
CUBER SCALE AND SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 5.01; \text{d.f.} = 1; P < .05.$

This relationship, significant at the .05 level, shows an inverse association between the variables under study. That is to say, for any respondent, a high score on the Cuber Scale is significantly associated with low self-esteem, while a low score on the Cuber Scale is related to high self-esteem. Moreover, when these respondents' scores on the Cuber Scale are related to their other role performance, no significant association is found (see Appendix F, Table 31).

Significant relationships were also found to exist between the respondents' scores on the Cuber Scale and on the wife role performance and wife role priority rank listing, with a high score on the Cuber Scale associated with high wife performance and wife role priority rank listing. Table 11 and Table 12 show these associations.
TABLE 11
HIGHEST ROLE PRIORITY AND CUBER SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Role Priority</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-wife</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>306*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 7.27; \text{ d.f.} = 1; P < .01.$

*All of the women with children at home who responded to the "tear-off" sheet.

TABLE 12
WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 6.17; \text{ d.f.} = 1; P < .02.$

Returning to the question of an association between role performance and self-esteem for women with children living at home, no direct relationships were found other than that mentioned previously, namely the direct association between other role performance and self-esteem.
However, an inverse relationship was found to obtain. Significant at the .01 level, high self-esteem was associated with low house performance, while low self-esteem was linked to high house performance. This relationship is shown below (Table 13).

**TABLE 13**

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>175</strong></td>
<td><strong>147</strong></td>
<td><strong>322</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7.38; \text{ d.f.} = 1; P < .01. \]

The absence of an association between self-esteem and the role performances of wife and mother are presented respectively in Table 32 and Table 33 in Appendix F.

Moreover, no relationship was found between these respondents' Cuber Scale scores and either house or mother role performance (see Appendix F, Tables 34 and 35). Role strain, however, proved to be a delineating variable, as a significant association was discerned between it and the respondents' Cuber Scale scores. Significant at the .01 level, this proved to be an inverse association, as high scores on the role strain index were related to low Cuber
Scales scores, and low role strain was linked to high scores on the Cuber Scale. This relationship is presented in Table 14.

**TABLE 14**

ROLE STRAIN AND CUBER SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 9.74$; d.f. = 1; $P < .01$.

In addition, an associational tendency was manifested between role pressure and the respondents' Cuber Scale scores, with high role pressure linked to low Cuber Scale score and low role pressure related to a high score on the Cuber Scale. This is shown in Table 15.

**TABLE 15**

ROLE PRESSURE AND CUBER SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 3.58$; d.f. = 1; N.S.
Neither role strain nor role pressure was found to be associated with self-esteem (see Appendix F, Tables 36 and 37, respectively).

This concludes the tests of association for those respondents who had at least one child living in the home. Attention is now turned to those women who had never had children. It is interesting to note that a test of association based on the self-esteem of the women in these two categories showed no significant relationship (Appendix F, Table 38).

Women Who Had Never Had Children

Age range

Forty women, a small percentage of the total sample under study, had never had children. A large percentage (42.5) of these women were under the age of thirty, with the remaining women somewhat equally distributed among the other age categories. A graphic display of the age classification of these women is given in Graph V on the following page.
Graph V.—Age Distribution of Women Who Have Never Had Children.
The associations between variables\(^1\)

For women without children, no significant relationship was found between other role performance and self-esteem, in direct contrast to the result for women who had children at home (see Appendix F, Table 39). On the other hand, a strong association (significant at the .01 level) was found between other role performance and the Cuber Scale score for these women, with high other role performance related to a high score on the Cuber Scale. The transition point on the other role performance has been redefined at a higher level, as most of these women (who did not have children) had much higher other role performance scores than the women in the total sample. This test of association, presented in Table 16, was found to be significant at the .01 level (and almost the .001 (for the .001 level, \(X^2 = 10.827\))).

\(^1\)Since this group of women was limited in number (N=40), at various times in the analysis the transition point between categories on the scales was redefined as other than the scale median, in order to obtain cell values high enough to allow the application of Chi Square. Unless specifically stated otherwise, however, the following associations can be assumed to utilize the original medians.
TABLE 16
OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (above .6000)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (.6000 and below)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 9.95; \text{d.f.} = 1; \ P < .01 \]

When testing for a relationship between the respondents' Cuber Scale scores and self-esteem, it was found that for this group of respondents a high score on the Cuber Scale was associated with high self-esteem, as shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17
CUBER SCALE AND SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.51; \text{d.f.} = 1. \text{ For a discussion of the level of significance, see the accompanying text.} \]

At first glance, the Chi Square of 3.51 in Table 17 does not appear particularly significant, however, when Table 17 is compared with Table 10, one only need note that the
direction of this association (for women who have never had children) is completely reversed from that for women whose children are at home. Using Table 10 as the predicting hypothesis for Table 17, the one-tailed Chi Square test of association becomes operative, with a Chi Square of 2.71 required for significance at the .05 level. Thus one must attribute sufficient significance to this result that it be consistent with any overall theoretical framework used in the interpretation of the present investigation.

Again in contrast to the women who had children at home, for the present group no significant relationships were found between wife role priority rank listing or wife role performance and the respondents' scores on the Cuber Scale (see Appendix F, Tables 40 and 41, respectively). It is, however, noteworthy that this group of women had overall wife role performances higher than the rest of the total sample.

In further dissimilarity to the women with children at home, no relationship was found between house role performance and self-esteem, for the women who did not have children (see Appendix F, Table 42). Also, no relationship was found between role strain or role pressure

---

and the Cuber Scale scores (see Appendix F, Tables 43 and 44, respectively), again highlighting the difference between the two classifications of women. On the other hand, similar to the women who had children at home, the women who had never had children were found to have no relationship between wife role performance, role strain or role pressure and self-esteem (see Appendix F, Tables 45, 46 and 47, respectively), nor was any relationship found between house role performance and the Cuber Scale (Appendix F, Table 48).

Women with Children, but No Children at Home

Age range

Women with children, but with no children living at home, comprised 20.8 per cent (N=95) of the total sample population. Concentrated mainly in the forty to sixty age groups, their complete age distribution is shown in Graph VI, on the following page.

The association between variables

In similarity to the women with children at home, and in contrast to the women who did not have children, a tendency toward a significant relationship was found for the women whose children had all left the parental home between wife role priority rank listing and the Cuber Scale scores, as well as between role strain and the Cuber
Graph VI—Age Distribution of Women Who Have Children, with All Children Away from Home.

Scale scores. That is to say, a positive relationship tended to exist between wife role priority and a high score on the Cuber Scale, while an inverse tendency toward significant association was found to exist between the variables of role strain and Cuber Scale scores for these women.
These associations are shown in Tables 18 and 19, respectively.

### TABLE 18

**HIGHEST ROLE PRIORITY AND CUBER SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Role Priority</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-wife</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 3.65; \text{d.f.} = 1; \text{N.S.}\]

### TABLE 19

**ROLE STRAIN AND CUBER SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 3.62; \text{d.f.} = 1; \text{N.S.}\]

Although all of the same tests of association were made for this group as for the other two categories of women, no significant associations were found between any of the following variables: any of the role performance scales and self-esteem (Appendix F, Tables 49, 50, 51 and
52); role strain or role pressure and self-esteem (Appendix F, Tables 53 and 54); Cuber Scale score and self-esteem (Appendix F, Table 55); any of the role performance scales and the Cuber Scale score (Appendix F, Tables 56, 57, 58, and 59); and role pressure and the Cuber Scale (Appendix F, Table 60).

All Women Who Have Children of Any Age

Empirically assessing all of the 417 women in this study who have children of any age, further significant associations of importance were found. For these women a most provocative association was found between presence or absence of the children (living at home, not living at home) and the level of the respondent's self-esteem. That is, the presence of children in the home is significantly associated with high self-esteem, while the absence of the children from the parental home is significantly related to low self-esteem of the respondent. This relationship, significant at the .001 level, is shown in Table 20.
Whereas the above-mentioned finding in and of itself merits scholarly attention and has, perhaps, linkages to previously delineated empirical findings, other associations also proved to be theoretically and empirically significant. In assessing the relationship between self-esteem and the role performances of wife-mother-house-other, a positive association was found between other role performance and self-esteem, with high role performance linked to high self-esteem. This association, significant at the .001 level, is shown in Table 21.

### TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>253</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>417</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 28.51; \text{ d.f.} = 1; P < .001.\]
Also, self-esteem was found to be associated with mother role performance (with high self-esteem linked to high mother role performance), significant at the .001 level. This finding is shown in Table 22.

TABLE 22
MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 11.32; \text{d.f.} = 1; P < .001. \]

The significant linkage of these two variables, not found in either of the two separate categories previously mentioned (women with children at home; women with children, all children away), may be attributed mainly to the empirical finding of extremely low self-esteem among the women whose children have left the parental home. This, in the professional literature, has been delineated as "the empty-nest syndrome" and the present finding (Table 20) empirically documents, in part, this behavioral configuration.

In similarity to the finding for women with children at home, for all women with children a significant association holds between house role performance and self-esteem. That is, high house role performance is associated with low
self-esteem, and low house role performance associated with high self-esteem. This relationship, significant at the .05 level, is shown in the table below (Table 23).

**TABLE 23**

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X² = 5.25; d.f. = 1; P < .05.

A finding of high theoretical and empirical importance, the significant inverse relationship between self-esteem and the Cuber Scale scores for the women with children at home, was found to hold for all women with children. That is, significant at the .05 level (and almost the .02 (for the .02 level X² = 5.412)) high self-esteem is linked to a low Cuber Scale score and low self-esteem to a high score on the Cuber Scale. This relationship is shown in Table 24 on the following page.
Finally, for all of the women with children, two other direct significant relationships were found between wife role performance and the Cuber Scale scores and between house role performance and mother role performance. These associations, both significant at the .01 level, are shown in Tables 25 and 26, respectively.

### Table 24
**CUBER SCALE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$X^2 = 5.38; \text{ d.f. } = 1; P < .05$$

### Table 25
**WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$X^2 = 8.02; \text{ d.f. } = 1; P < .01.$$
TABLE 26
MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 8.64; \text{ d.f.} = 1. \ P < .01 \]

All Respondents

Considering all respondents (N=457) in this investigation as a single category, three associations were found to be significant: other role performance and self-esteem; house role performance and self-esteem; and wife role performance and the Cuber Scale. The directions of the relationships were: high other role performance was associated with high self-esteem—low other role performance with low self-esteem; high house role performance was linked to low self-esteem, low house role performance to high self-esteem; and high wife role performance was related to a high score on the Cuber Scale, low wife role performance to a low score on the Cuber Scale. These associations, and their levels of significance are shown in Tables 27, 28, and 29, respectively.
### TABLE 27

**OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 25.88; \text{d.f.} = 1; \, P < .001. \]

### TABLE 28

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 5.92; \text{d.f.} = 1; \, P < .02. \]

### TABLE 29

**WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 8.70; \text{d.f.} = 1; \, P < .01. \]
Comparison and Contrast of Present Findings and Other Research

Whereas the present study (and its attendant findings) is essentially unique, both in its purpose and its theoretical base, at certain junctures comparisons can be made with previous research in the family field. Lopata, in her study of 323 urban and 299 suburban married women with children, lies in closest proximity to the present study in terms of similarity of research procedures. Utilizing a methodology discussed previously, Lopata's findings regarding role priority rank listings stand in both agreement and contradiction to those found in the present investigation. In comparing the findings of the two studies, it should be noted that whereas Lopata utilized an open-ended statement asking "What are the important roles of a woman, in order of their importance?", the present study employed a forced-choice format of the roles of wife-mother-house-other. It is also significant that the percentages quoted for the present investigation are based on an N of 396; that is, of the total sample of 417 women with children, 21 were incapable of performing the required rank ordering of roles. Only

---

3 See Chapter 1, p. 10.
the category of women which children was adjudged to be relevant for comparative purposes, as all of Lopata's respondents had children. The following table (Table 30) presents the comparative data.

### TABLE 30

**STATED ROLE PRIORITIES: THE PRESENT STUDY AND THAT OF LOPATA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Priorities (Role Given 1st Place)</th>
<th>Present Study (N=396)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Lopata Findings* (N=652)</th>
<th>Urban %</th>
<th>Suburban %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages quoted here are from Lopata, "The Secondary Features of a Primary Relationship," Table 1, p. 118. Although the sum of the percentages in neither the urban nor the suburban column is 100 per cent, Lopata's tabular summary does not suggest which roles absorb the remaining first priority percentage.

As can be seen by a cursory examination of Table 30, discrepancies exist between the findings of the present investigation and Lopata's study. Part of the variation can be explained by comparing the different methods of data collection in the two studies, as cultural imperatives
can have a predictive effect in a forced-choice format. That is, given a choice of role imperatives, the respondent will usually reflect the de jure, not the de facto normative order. Moreover, as the percentages quoted from Lopata are not normalized, the straightforward comparison of her data with that of the present study is somewhat difficult.

The research of Weiss and Samuelson concerning the social roles of American women also warrants consideration in relation to the present investigation. In attempting to interrelate the two studies, however, a major obstacle is presented by the appearance of the roles of wife and mother under the collective term "family role," whereas the present study has demonstrated the necessity of considering these task areas as distinct and separate, having differing correlations with other variables utilized in the study. A second difficulty arises in Weiss and Samuelsons' presentation of their findings in terms of the concept of particular roles giving women a sense of usefulness and importance. On the surface, and at first reading, this point does not appear to be of substantial importance; however, the intervening variable not utilized in their study is that of self-esteem, which when superimposed upon

their findings, points out a methodological weakness not previously apparent.

Because of these difficulties it would not seem useful to attempt to repeat here the findings of Weiss and Samuelson, and we shall content ourselves with two comparisons with the present study, one of consonance and one of dissonance. They find that "a rather substantial proportion of women in the older age groups said that nothing made them feel useful and important." This would appear to be in direct agreement with the findings of the present study as given in Table 20, where it was shown that a significant decrease in self-esteem could be expected for women all of whose children had left home. On the other hand, Weiss and Samuelson found that "with marriage, housework remains a source of feeling of social worth throughout life." This is in direct contradiction to the findings of the present study as shown in Table 28, where low self-esteem was significantly associated with high house role performance.

Finally, we mention that in accordance with Podell, role strain/role conflict was, for the present sample, not intense or widespread. That is, the women in the current

---

6Ibid., p. 359.
7Ibid., p. 362.
8Chapter 1, p. 8.
investigation evinced a relatively small amount of conscious awareness of conflicting behavioral expectations. This finding also accords with the work of Soysa, discussed previously.

\[9\] Chapter 1, pp. 8-9.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSIONS

In the academic tradition, the final stage of a research investigation should be the development of a viable theoretical framework concordant with the empirically manifested associations of the study. Moreover, the empirical findings and the attendant specific, synthesizing theory must merge with one or more of the general, broad theoretical contexts basic to the area under investigation.

As an area of scholarly endeavor from both the vantage points of theory and empirical research, the sociology of marriage and the family has, for the most part, not attained this requisite synthesis. Indeed, most of the theory building has been concerned with the establishment of models yet to be tested (i.e., Parsons' structural-functional approach to the nuclear family,\textsuperscript{1} the pattern variables of Parsons and Bales,\textsuperscript{2} and the approach of the


symbolic interactionists\(^3\). Much empirical investigation, on the other hand, has lacked a sound linkage to a theoretical base and/or has produced results of little scholarly import (i.e., the salient questions have not been asked—the crucial variable has gone wanting). Among the exceptions to this general trend are the work of LeMasters\(^4\) and of Pineo.\(^5\)

The present study is so structured that an articulation of the empirically revealed associations occurs at several levels of theoretical analysis. The findings admit a theory specific to the data at hand, which may in turn be related to the larger context of sociological thought, embracing both symbolic interactionism and the developmental theoretical points of view. In this regard, we shall now propose a series of postulates consistent with the associations presented in Chapter III. The propositions to be set forth represent, in the opinion of the author, that framework in closest accord with the data.

Based on the findings in Chapter III, we are able to establish the socio-psychological variable of self-esteem as a possible causal determinant of the level of performance in


social roles and of marriage configuration patterns. Although sociology has long acknowledged the importance of personality components (e.g., ego structure), the linkage found in the present study between a married woman's self-esteem and her articulation of this self-esteem via specific roles in her situational nexus has apparently escaped previous discovery.

Addressing ourselves to the demonstrated relationship between self-esteem and the pattern of marital configuration, and taking into account the above-mentioned associational relationship between self-esteem and role performance, we postulate the following causal pattern for women who have never had children:

SELF-ESTEEM $\rightarrow$ CUBER SCALE SCORE $\rightarrow$ OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE

That is, high self-esteem is linked to a high score on the Cuber Scale (Intrinsic marriage), which in turn is associated with high other role performance. Conversely speaking, low self-esteem is related to a low score on the Cuber Scale (Utilitarian marriage) and, in turn, this low Cuber Scale score is linked to a low other role performance. A causal direction is further inferred by the fact that no linkage was found between self-esteem and other role performance for these women.
For the women who had children at home, a disparate model is consonant with the empirical findings:

![Diagram](SELF-ESTEEM \[\rightarrow\] CUBER SCALE SCORE \[\rightarrow\] OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE)

that is, high self-esteem is linked both to a low Cuber Scale score (Utilitarian marriage) and a high other role performance. On the other hand, low self-esteem was associated both with a high Cuber Scale score (Intrinsic marriage) and a low other role performance. The self-esteem may be considered as a possible determinant of both variables, as no association was found between the Cuber Scale score and other role performance for these women.

We will not repeat here the many significant associations established in this study and delineated in Chapter III. All are supportive to the point of view expressed in this chapter. Two additional relationships, however, are particularly salient to the discussion at hand: first, the significant inverse association between self-esteem and house role performance; second, for those women who have had children, the significant relationship between the presence of children in the home and self-esteem.

The findings of the present study touch at several points upon the theoretical viewpoint of symbolic
interactionism. Waller\(^6\) posited the family as a "partially closed causal system." The association demonstrated in the present study between the self-esteem of the woman and the performance level of her other role is consistent with Waller's viewpoint, in that although the family as an interactional system provides the fundamental definition of the social roles of its members, the personality component (self-esteem) of the woman is, nevertheless, a major force in the interrelationship between marital, familial, and extra-familial roles. A further justification of this point of view is found in the work of Hoffman.\(^7\) She established a significant relationship between the extent of the wife's employment outside the home and her level of influence in decision-making in the family context. The author further posited that it is the wife who is influential in decision-making who will be prone to seek outside employment, thus indicating the existence of a single personality component governing both aspects of her behavior. The present study identifies this personality component as self-esteem.

Another point of agreement between the present study and the theoretical framework developed by Waller is the


relationship found between self-esteem and whether or not children still remain in the home. The very significant difference in level of self-esteem (high self-esteem for women with at least one child still at home; low self-esteem for women whose children have all left the parental home) cannot escape identification as a crucial aspect of the "stage of the empty nest."\(^8\)

In his further development of Waller's five stages of the "natural history" of the family,\(^9\) Hill has expanded this point of view into what has become known as the developmental approach.\(^10\) This linkage of theoretical viewpoints demonstrates the desirability of a longitudinal life-cycle study of married women's self-esteem and its articulation in the selection of social roles. The present investigation was limited to the study of the situational aspects of the married lives of a large sample of women, at a particular point in time for each. Because the various respondents in this sample represent a spectrum of the stages in the family life cycle, and due to the class homogeneity of this group of women, a longitudinal theory will be superimposed on the data in this investigation, with the hope of furthering our

\(^8\)Wall, The Family, p. 31.

\(^9\)Ibid.

understanding of the relation between self-esteem and social roles.

With this in mind, we consider Maslow's work concerning the principle of homogamous self-esteem in mate selection, merging it with the above-mentioned sociological concepts in order to develop an encompassing theory. As stated by Maslow, the principle of homogamy in mate selection holds for self-esteem; that is, high self-esteem women marry high self-esteem men, and low self-esteem women marry low self-esteem men.

Given these sociological and psychological premises, we posit that the present investigation demonstrates two variants of the Intrinsic marriage configuration. One type is most commonly found in marriages where there are no children; the second type in marriages where children are living at home. The first type is characterized by the high self-esteem of the woman (and, concomitantly, the high self-esteem of the man); the second type is characterized by the low self-esteem of the woman (and, concomitantly of the man).

For women who have not had children, those with high self-esteem are most likely to have Intrinsic marriages; with the subsequent presence of children in the home, these

---

high self-esteem women gravitate to a Utilitarian type of marriage configuration. The explanation of this phenomenon, in light of Maslow's theory, is that a high self-esteem, married woman, without any children, can operationally allocate her time and psychic energy to a high outside role performance (necessary to her by virtue of her high self-esteem) and to a vital, Intrinsic relationship with her husband. With the onset of children in the home, however, given the condition of limited time and psychic energy, the present study has shown that the high self-esteem woman will usually distribute this time and energy into the mother role (which must be performed, irrespective of choice) and into the other role (demanded by her high self-esteem). Not all of the high self-esteem women succumb by default to the statistical inevitability of a Utilitarian marriage. This was demonstrated in the present study by the significant association between a low Cuber Scale score (Utilitarian marriage) and high role strain. The most prevalent situation, however, seems to be that exemplified by a woman with high self-esteem, high other role performance, and children living at home, interviewed in the pre-test. After priority rank listing the role of wife as fourth, she commented:

He would kill me if he knew I said this, but after all, a husband can take care of himself. And to be honest, he really does come fourth.

For women of low self-esteem, a reversal of the previously discussed findings occurs. More involved in house-
work than her high self-esteem counterpart, the woman with low self-esteem (who, according to Maslow, tends to marry similarly) usually was found to have a Utilitarian marriage before and/or excluding the advent of children. A plausible explanation for this finding originates in the traditional viewpoint. The low self-esteem woman has a very low other role performance; she is concerned exclusively with the husband, the home, and the children. This woman views her marriage as not complete (i.e., "the best thing that ever happened" to her) until the coming of children. With this event, and with the (assumed) concomitant variable of low self-esteem of her husband, the marriage configuration becomes Intrinsic, i.e., their desires for personal fulfillment have been met. Lest the reader misconstrue the above type of marriage as not having, by definition, the salient characteristics of an Intrinsic marriage, it is important to note that the low self-esteem of the woman frees her from commitments outside the home. Thus this woman can, in fact, take care of the children and also be available to spend with her husband whatever leisure time he may have--and at the times he has it. As an illustration of what must surely be a woman of low self-esteem involved in an Intrinsic marriage, we reproduce a quotation found in Cuber and Harroff, which they assessed as descriptive of a total relationship. The wife's comment regarding her relationship with her husband is:
It seems to me that Bert exaggerates my help. It's not so much that I only want to help him; it's more that I want to do those things anyway. We do them together, even though we may not be in each other's presence at the time. I don't really know what I do for him and what I do for me.\textsuperscript{12}

In addition to noting the existence of two distinct types of Intrinsic marriage, the present study presents a second analytical insight not apparent in the work of Cuber and Harroff. The current investigation has demonstrated that a woman's self-esteem is linked to her specific types of role enactment and marriage configuration; on this basis we postulate that the self-esteem of the woman determines her level of other role performance and her marriage configuration. We must, thus, conclude that the majority of women with high other role performance have not, as suggested by Cuber and Harroff,\textsuperscript{13} gone into a career, job, or community leadership position in order to escape a stultifying relationship between husband and wife. On the other hand, it can be posited that if high self-esteem women marry high self-esteem men, the subsequent movement of these husbands into occupational success career patterns and the concomitant need of the wife for a high other role performance leads, when there are children at home, to the occurrence of a Utilitarian marriage configurational pattern.

\textsuperscript{12}Cuber and Harroff, \textit{The Significant Americans}, p. 59.

\textsuperscript{13}\textit{Ibid.}, Chapter 6, pp. 106-131.
When considering those women who had children all of whom had left the parental home, the almost total absence even of associational tendencies is, in itself, noteworthy. At least two possible sociological explanations can be posited. The first possible interpretation, based on the verification of the "empty nest" syndrome, is a general psychological disorientation, met by each woman in her own way, and thus defying group associational tendencies. A second possible interpretation is that, when the children have left home, the role demands on a woman become sufficiently lessened that she can essentially meet all of them, regardless of intervening variables.

In utilizing the preceding theoretical explanations, emphasis must be made that the present study is not longitudinal in character. The data cannot, therefore, be used directly to document this theory except as to posit certain hypothetical linkages. A longitudinal study of the role performances of married women and their patterns of marital configuration should ultimately be made, as the plausibility of the above described phenomena occurring has exciting possibilities for sociological investigation.

Also, in amplification of Maslow's theory of self-esteem in husbands and wives, a typology of marriages may be projected as an impetus to further research and inquiry. Four possible types can be posited: (1) both husband and wife having high self-esteem, (2) husband with high self-
esteem and the wife with low self-esteem, (3) husband with low self-esteem and the wife high self-esteem, and (4) both husband and wife having low self-esteem. Although various studies mentioned in our discussions have hinted at this projected typology, it has not yet been consciously empirically assessed in the literature. It could, however, have much veracity and linkage to other associational variables already studied, such as power structure and decision-making between husbands and wives, as documented by Blood and Wolfe.¹⁴

In conclusion, this empirical investigation of role-related variables, marriage configuration patterns, and the self-esteem of upper-middle class married women has led to empirical documentation of structural linkages between them. In addition, self-esteem, a socio-psychological construct, has been postulated as a precipitant of specific types and performance levels of role enactment, as well as a major factor involved in marital configuration patterns.

¹⁴Blood and Wolfe, Husbands and Wives.
APPENDIX A

THE RESEARCH INSTRUMENT
Women and Their Roles

Women play a great many roles and perform many varied tasks, both within their homes and in the community. In studying these roles, we would like to know what you, as a woman, think is the relative importance of some of these tasks.

After looking at the groups of tasks and duties below, place a "1" in front of the group that you believe is most important; a "2" in front of the group that you believe is next in importance; and a "3" and a "4" in front of the two remaining groups to indicate their relative order of importance.

____ Group A - being a companion to your husband, spending time with him and his interests, buying his clothing, and providing for his personal care.
   (if you are not married, check here ____).

____ Group B - community and civic interests (PTA, Junior League, etc.), a professional career and/or work involving economic remuneration, and social activities (bridge clubs, alumae groups, professional auxiliaries).

____ Group C - personal daily care of your children, spending time with them and their interests, and providing for their other needs such as buying clothing and celebrating birthdays.
   (if you have no children, check here ____).

____ Group D - general household tasks such as cleaning, redecorating, grocery shopping, preparation of food, care of the family's clothing, and occasional work in the garden and/or yard.
WOMEN AND THEIR ROLES

The following questions are part of a research study being conducted on women and their roles. The results of this study are to be presented as part of the required work for a Ph.D. degree in Family Sociology at The Ohio State University.

This study is completely anonymous. I have no idea who has this particular questionnaire.

Note that questions are printed on both sides of each page. Please use an X or a ✓ to indicate your answer to each. Please be as accurate as possible, and remember that your questionnaire can be used in this study only if all the appropriate questions are answered. Attached to the last page is a self-addressed, stamped envelope. When you have completed all of the questions, please place the questionnaire in the envelope and put it in the mail.

The completion of this Ph.D. dissertation depends on your assistance and concern in returning this to me. Thank you very much for your time and interest.

I. General Information

The following questions concern some factual information about women and their roles. Please be as accurate as possible, and remember to answer every question.

1. What is your present marital status?
   — A. Married, living with husband
   — B. Divorced
   — C. Separated
   — D. Widowed
   — E. Single (never married)

2. Do you and your husband have children, either by this marriage and/or by a previous marriage of you or your husband? Yes No

3. Do you and your husband have children living in your home? Yes No

   If so, how many children in the following age groups are living in your home? (Please list the exact number (1, 2, 3, etc.) in each of the appropriate categories.)
   — A. Pre-school (including infants)
   — B. Grade school
   — C. Junior high school
   — D. Senior high school
   — E. College (including graduate school)
   — F. Working (not in school)

4. Do you and your husband have children who do not live at home? Yes No

   If so, please put the number of children not living at home in each of the following categories:
   — A. In private school
   — B. In college
   — C. Living with your or your husband’s former spouse
   — D. Working and/or living in own home or apartment

5. Do you drive? Yes No

   If so, do you usually have access to a car for your daily use? Yes No

NOW, GO TO THE BACK OF THIS PAGE (TO PAGE 2)
6. Please check which of the following housing conditions apply to you and your husband.
   ___ A. Live in own home (single family dwelling)
   ___ B. Live in an apartment which you own (for example: duplex, condominium, etc.)
   ___ C. Live in a rented home (single dwelling unit)
   ___ D. Live in a rented apartment and/or other multiple-dwelling unit

7. If you rent your home or apartment, please check which of the following types of repairs the landlord has done for you. (If you own your home, please disregard this question.)
   ___ Major repairs (plumbing, furnace, painting, etc.)
   ___ Minor repairs (putting in storm windows, replacing light switches, etc.)

8. Of the following categories, please check the occupational group into which your husband's job most appropriately falls.
   ___ Category A - truck driver, factory worker, building construction worker, pipeline fitter, highway construction worker, auto mechanic.
   ___ Category B - owner of a small business, school teacher (elementary or secondary), foreman in a plant, skilled craftsman (carpenter, cabinetmaker, electrician, etc.), skilled medical technician, salesman for a middle-sized firm, minister of a church, office manager for a company or firm, filing clerk, barber, hair dresser, shoe salesman, manager of a service station, accountant.
   ___ Category C - physician, college professor, professional engineer, architect, chemist, research scientist, lawyer, dentist, banker, manager or owner of a business, high-level executive for a company or firm (Vice President, Assistant to Vice President, Manager), stockbroker, Certified Public Accountant, university administrator (President, Vice President, Dean, Chancellor), head of a research foundation, biochemist, pharmacist, public school superintendent.
   ___ Category D - member of the board of directors of a very large company, firm, or university; owner or president of a very large firm, corporation, or company (such as IBM, RCA); executive position in a company, firm, or business which has been "in his family" for generations.

   NOTE: If your husband's occupation does not seem to fit into any of the above categories, would you please state what he does for a living. _______________________________

9. Which of the following categories best indicates your highest level of formal education?
   ___ A. Attended senior high school
   ___ B. Graduated from senior high school
   ___ C. Attended college and/or business or technical school
   ___ D. Graduated from college
   ___ E. Attended graduate or professional school
   ___ F. Received graduate and/or professional degree (Ph.D., M.A., M.D., etc.)

10. Please check the category that best describes your own age.
    ___ A. Under 30
    ___ B. 30 - 40
    ___ C. 40 - 50
    ___ D. 50 - 60
    ___ E. 60 - 70
    ___ F. 70 and above
11. Which of the following is your religious preference?
   ___ A. Protestant  ___ C. Jewish
   ___ B. Catholic       ___ D. Other (please specify)  
   ___ E. None

12. Of the following income levels, please check the category within which your total yearly family income falls. If not sure, please give your best estimate.
   ___ A. Under $10,000  ___ D. $30,000 - $40,000  
   ___ B. $10,000 - $20,000  ___ E. $40,000 - $50,000
   ___ C. $20,000 - $30,000  ___ F. Above $50,000

II. Activities Related to the Home, the Family, and the Community

This set of questions involves factual information about how you, as a woman, manage the myriad demands on your time as a wife, mother, civic leader, etc. Please read each question carefully, respond as accurately as possible, and answer every question.

NOTE: If you have never had any children, please disregard any of the questions in this section (Part II) dealing with children. If you are a grandmother, please read the word "children" as "children and grandchildren”.

1. Household duties - Of the following list of tasks, for which are you responsible; that is, which do you (the wife) usually do yourself? (Please check)
   __ a. Light household cleaning (sweeping, dusting, straightening)
   __ b. Heavy household cleaning (waxing floors, washing windows, polishing wood floors)
   __ c. Regular yard maintenance (lawn mowing, leaf raking, weeding, snow shoveling)
   __ d. Occasional yard maintenance (tree and bush trimming, flower planting)
   __ e. Grocery-shopping
   __ f. Laundry
   __ g. Interior house maintenance (plumbing repairs, major appliance repairs, furnace repairs, inside painting, cleaning of drapes and upholstery)
   __ h. Repairs of small appliances (toasters, irons, mixers, etc.)
   __ i. Exterior house maintenance (house and trim painting, cleaning out of house eave gutters, driveway repair)
   __ j. Meal planning
   __ k. Cooking meals
   __ l. Dish washing
   __ m. Paper and trash removal (burning, using an incinerator, or preparing it for trash pick-up)
   __ n. Interior decorating and furniture arrangement
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2. Please indicate, by checking one of the following, the average time per week spent on the household duties listed on the previous page:
   (If not sure, please give your best estimate.)
   Less than 10 hours per week __
   10 - 15 hours per week __
   15 - 20 hours per week __
   20 - 25 hours per week __
   25 - 30 hours per week __
   More than 30 hours per week __

3. Do you usually prepare your husband's breakfast? __ Yes __ No __

4. Do you usually get up and prepare your children's breakfasts and/or get them ready for school? __ Yes __ No __

5. Do you usually drive your children to school or supply transportation in some way (driving them to a friend's who will take them the rest of the way or to the school bus stop)? __ Yes __ No __

6. Do any of your children usually eat lunch at your home? __ Yes __ No __

7. Do you usually "make it a point" to be at home when your children come home from school and/or work? __ Yes __ No __

8. Does your husband usually eat his evening meal at home? __ Yes __ No __

9. Do you frequently "eat alone" with your husband, that is, specifically excluding the children and/or other relatives and friends? __ Yes __ No __

10. When your husband arrives home after the usual dinner hour:
    a. Does he usually eat before he comes home? __ Yes __ No __
    b. If he waits to eat until he gets home, do you usually prepare his meal? __ Yes __ No __
    c. When he comes home late, and waits to eat until he comes home, do you usually sit with him while he eats? __ Yes __ No __

11. Does your husband have a profession or job that demands that he usually keep late hours? __ Yes __ No __

12. If your response to the previous question is "Yes", do you usually go to bed before he comes home? __ Yes __ No __

13. Do you usually agree with your husband in matters such as the children's clothing styles, their teachers, the size of their allowances, their dates, or if they are adults, how they manage their lives in general? __ Yes __ No __

14. Have you and the children ever gone on holidays, vacations, and/or visiting friends and relatives without your husband? (for example, to visit distant relatives, to the shore or lake in the summer when your husband can't leave his job except on weekends, etc.) __ Yes __ No __

15. Would you usually go ahead and go on business trips with your husband even if it means leaving the children for at least 2-3 days or longer? __ Yes __ No __
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16. Do you usually make a "big thing" out of your husband's birthday, Christmas presents, etc.? Yes__ No__

17. Do you and your husband usually celebrate your wedding anniversaries? (gifts, a night "on the town", going out for dinner, etc.) Yes__ No__

18. If so, do other members of the family (children and other relatives) and/or friends usually join with you and your husband to celebrate your wedding anniversaries? Yes__ No__

19. Do you regularly visit the art gallery and/or attend the theatre or symphony orchestra concerts? Yes__ No__

20. In recent months, has your child (children) become upset when you and your husband were leaving for a party or other social occasion? Yes__ No__

21. If your answer to the previous question is "Yes", did you go out anyway? Yes__ No__

22. Do your children take "special lessons", such as art, music, voice, swimming, golf or dancing (any instruction which you pay for)? Yes__ No__

23. Do your children regularly participate in group activities such as Little League, Boy or Girl Scouts, a church choir, sports events at school, etc.? Yes__ No__

24. If your answer to either of the two previous questions was "Yes", do you usually drive them to these activities? Yes__ No__

25. Do you have any commitments outside your home which occupy a portion of your time? (Examples: social organizations or clubs, such as a bridge club; civic organizations, such as PTA; professional or educational organizations, such as The National Education Association; career or employment, such as secretary, social worker, M.D., nurse, teacher; specialized interest, such as art classes, playing in the Columbus Symphony Orchestra, taking courses at a university, sports such as golf and tennis, church activities. Other possible types of outside commitments: volunteer guide for the Museum of Science and Industry, Gray Lady at a hospital, etc.) Yes__ No__

If so, please indicate, by checking one of the following, the average time spent on all these commitments: Less than ten (10) hours a week ____ At least ten (10) hours a week ____ At least twenty (20) hours a week ____ At least thirty (30) hours a week ____ At least forty (40) hours a week ____ More than forty (40) hours a week ____

26. Does your schedule prevent you from being "Johnny on the spot" when your husband has a break in his work (for example, a day off from the office, a "stopping place" in his research and study, etc.) -- so that you cannot be with him? Yes__ No__

27. Are all of your endeavors, interests, etc. outside the home done without benefit of monetary compensation? Yes__ No__

28. If you do receive some monetary income, do you feel that this additional money is needed to maintain your family's present standard of living? Yes__ No__
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29. Do your recreational activities with your husband usually involve you and your husband alone, instead of a group of friends (including your husband)?  Yes  No

30. Do you usually help your husband purchase his clothing?  Yes  No

31. Do you find that buying clothing for your children usually turns out to be a boring, tiring job?  Yes  No

32. When you and your husband have discussions, how frequently does the conversation center on each of the following topics? Please indicate the most frequent topic of conversation with a "1", the least frequent topic with a "6", and use the numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 to indicate the relative frequencies of the remaining topics.

   ________ Your children and their welfare, interests
   ________ Your husband's job
   ________ Financial problems
   ________ Common interests (books, plays, sports, world affairs, etc.)
   ________ Your relationship to each other
   ________ Friends and their problems

33. Does your husband feel that you spend too much time with the children's interests?  Yes  No

34. Are you now in or have you recently (in the last year) been elected or appointed to a leadership position in any of the "outside commitments", (clubs, professional groups, etc.) of which you are a member?  Yes  No

35. Do you and your husband ever go on vacations or business trips which do not include the children?  Yes  No

36. If your answer to the previous question is "Yes", is this a common practice for you?  Yes  No

37. Do your outside commitments in general fail to give you a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment?  Yes  No

38. When you and your husband have discussions, do either of you usually mind if someone else participates or "listens in"?  Yes  No

39. Do you usually make a "big thing" of the children's birthdays, Christmas gifts, etc.?  Yes  No

40. Do you sometimes help the children with their hobbies, projects, and other interests?  Yes  No

41. If your answer to the previous question is "Yes", do you help them often?  Yes  No

42. Do your friends ever criticize you for spending too much time and emotional energy on your children?  Yes  No

43. On the average, how many hours per week do you usually spend on the physical care and/or sharing the interests of your children? (If unsure, please give your best estimate.)  ________ hours per week
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III. Opinions About Married Women's Roles

The purpose of this section is to find out what wives think about their various roles as wife, mother, and housekeeper and their community involvement and/or professional commitment.

Twelve statements have been selected for your evaluation. Please circle the one response for each statement that most closely expresses your feeling or belief regarding that statement. -- SA means Strongly Agree, A=Agree, U=Undecided, D=Disagree, and SD=Strongly Disagree.

1. I have found that housework really cuts into my time for my children. SA A U D SD
2. Many times my children and my husband both demand attention from me at the same time—and for different needs. SA A U D SD
3. I do not regret having missed some interesting community activities (club speakers, benefit dinners, etc.) due to the fact that I've had to stay home with the children. SA A U D SD
4. I do not mind doing housework when my husband is home and not involved in his work. SA A U D SD
5. Housework certainly "ties me down"—there are so many worthwhile activities and groups in the community where I could better spend my time. SA A U D SD
6. I have never found it difficult to keep the house in "presentable condition" even with the children around to mess it up. SA A U D SD
7. I find that housework leaves me with little or no time to help my husband in his work (helping him grade papers, being a "Girl Friday" secretary, helping him develop ideas, etc.) SA A U D SD
8. Sometimes I think that all of my community and/or professional activities hinder my relationship with my husband because I have no time for him as a person. SA A U D SD
9. It is never difficult to be both a good mother to my children and a close companion to my husband—their needs do not conflict. SA A U D SD
10. Even though my interest in community, work and/or professional activities takes me away from the house, I still can always find ample time and energy for companionship and recreation with my husband whenever he is free from his work and has the time. SA A U D SD
11. It doesn't bother me that I have to do housework even though I could be out of the house and involved in interesting activities with my friends and/or professional colleagues. SA A U D SD
12. I sometimes have regretted that I have become so involved with community groups and/or professional activities—the children will grow up, leave home, and I will never have given them the attention they really needed. SA A U D SD
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IV. The purpose of the following statements is to find out what women think of their personal relationships with others and how they feel about themselves and their daily lives.

The information will be used to classify large numbers of women into various groups, as will, of course, all of the responses obtained in this study. As is true of the entire questionnaire, your responses will be completely anonymous.

Part A. Answer these questions by writing X before the word or phrase that is nearest true for you and that most closely expresses your attitudes or feelings.

1. Do you think girls are catty and petty?
   _____ most are _____ many are _____ some are
   _____ a few are _____ rare exceptions are

2. Do you feel that you have a "stronger personality" than your girl associates?
   _____ than almost all _____ than most _____ than many
   _____ than some _____ than a few or none

3. What is your attitude toward women who often disregard the usual social, moral, or ethical conventions?
   _____ dislike very much _____ dislike somewhat _____ neither like nor dislike
   _____ like somewhat _____ like very much

4. Are you repelled by the sight of physical cruelty?
   _____ always _____ usually _____ sometimes
   _____ seldom _____ never

5. How do you prefer a man to be dressed?
   _____ very carefully _____ carefully _____ casually
   _____ somewhat carelessly _____ carelessly

6. How many of the men that you know of about your own age do you dominate?
   _____ most _____ many _____ some
   _____ a few _____ none

7. What is your attitude toward men who look as if they could be brutal?
   _____ very much repelled _____ somewhat repelled _____ neither repelled nor attracted
   _____ somewhat attracted _____ very much attracted

8. Have you broken or inwardly rebelled against rules (sorority, college, club, etc.)?
   _____ very often _____ often _____ sometimes
   _____ seldom _____ never

9. How do you regard a man who is frequently blunt in his speech?
   _____ like very much _____ like somewhat _____ neither like nor dislike
   _____ dislike somewhat _____ dislike very much

10. How would you feel about accidentally going to a formal party in street clothes?
    _____ dislike very much _____ dislike somewhat _____ neither like nor dislike
        _____ like somewhat _____ like very much
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11. How many girls that you know, of about your own age, do you dominate?
   ______ most ______ many ______ some
   ______ a few ______ none

12. How do you react to the shy, timid, bashful kind of man?
   ______ like very much ______ like somewhat ______ neither like nor dislike
   ______ dislike somewhat ______ dislike very much

13. Which do you prefer for company, men or women? (In sports, intellectual activities,
     hiking, theatres, conversation, etc.) Strike a rough average of your preferences
     in all these activities.
   ______ always prefer women ______ usually prefer women ______ no preference
   ______ usually prefer men ______ always prefer men

14. Do you consider yourself more or less sympathetic to the woes and troubles of your
     friends and acquaintances than the average?
   ______ very much more than the average woman ______ somewhat more
   ______ average ______ somewhat less ______ very much less

15. Do your friends and acquaintances come to you for advice concerning their personal
     problems?
   ______ very frequently ______ frequently ______ sometimes
   ______ rarely ______ never

16. How often are you apt to be the leader in such activities as organizing and running
     clubs, discussion groups, committees, etc.?
   ______ much more frequently than the average woman ______ somewhat more frequently
   ______ about average ______ somewhat less frequently than average
   ______ much less than average

17. How quickly do you make the ordinary decisions of everyday life?
   ______ very quickly ______ rather quickly ______ average
   ______ rather slowly ______ very slowly

18. Are you troubled with feelings of inferiority?
   ______ much more than the average woman ______ somewhat more than the average woman
   ______ about average ______ somewhat less than the average woman
   ______ much less than the average woman

19. Do you tend to ignore the feelings of others when accomplishing some end that is
     important for you?
   ______ usually ______ often ______ sometimes
   ______ seldom ______ never

20. How often are people successful in taking advantage of you?
   ______ usually ______ often ______ sometimes
   ______ seldom ______ never

21. How important is it for your feeling of security that the people about you like
     you?
   ______ very important ______ fairly important ______ very slightly important
   ______ completely unimportant
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22. How do you feel about being a housewife and mother as a life job?
    ___ completely satisfying ___ would also like some outside work or activities
    ___ would also like much outside work or activities ___ would also like a career or job of my own at the same time ___ would prefer a career

23. How often do you tell people what you think of them when they do something you dislike?
    ___ very frequently ___ often ___ sometimes ___ rarely ___ never

24. Must your ideal man, in your private life, observe the customary niceties of behavior (politeness, etiquette, manners, etc.)?
    ___ always or almost always ___ most of the time ___ often ___ sometimes ___ rarely or never

25. How do you feel about men who always follow the usual social conventions (manners, customs, etiquette)?
    ___ like very much ___ like somewhat ___ neither like nor dislike ___ dislike somewhat ___ dislike very much

26. How often do you blush?
    ___ very frequently ___ frequently ___ sometimes ___ rarely ___ almost never or never

27. How frequently are you embarrassed?
    ___ very frequently ___ frequently ___ sometimes ___ rarely ___ almost never or never
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Part B. In the following list of statements, each phrase is followed by the series of numbers -2, -1, 0, +1, +2. For each phrase, encircle -2 if you dislike it very much; encircle -1 if you dislike, or tend to dislike it moderately or somewhat; encircle 0 if you neither like nor dislike it; encircle +1 if you like or tend to like it moderately or somewhat; encircle +2 if you like it very much. If you have the slightest feeling of like or dislike, answer +1 or -1. Reserve 0 as an answer for only those cases where you have absolutely no feelings of like or dislike.

1. Aloofness in a person you have just met  
2. Worldliness (rather than pseudo-sophistication)  
3. A career (for you)  
4. Men who antagonize you somewhat  
5. Making up your own mind  
6. Fame (not mere notoriety)  
7. Men of whom you are a bit afraid  
8. Unconventional language  
9. To be an executive  
10. Strong-willed people  
11. Risque stories  
12. Very dominant men  
13. Very dominant women  
14. Being a leader  
15. Sweet, "feminine" type of girl as your friend  
16. Playing cards for money  
17. Driving an automobile at great speed  
18. Being popular with men  
19. Men who are never profane  
20. Being hypnotized  
21. Sewing  
22. Discussing politics  
23. Discussing people's personalities  
24. Betting on horse-races  
25. Justifiable conceit in a man
V. The following 20 questions complete the questionnaire. Of the first two questions (#1 and #2), complete one (which question you answer will depend upon whether you have or have not had children).

The remaining 18 questions do not involve children. Please answer all of them (#3-#20).

1. If you have had children, in psychological and emotional terms, how important have they been to your relationship to your husband?

   __very important  ____important  ____undecided

   ____unimportant  ____very unimportant

2. If you have not had any children, do you feel that not having children has been detrimental to your marriage?

   ____very much so  ____probably  ____undecided

   ____probably not  ____definitely not

3. Of your husband's leisure time that he spends with you, what fraction of this time involves activities with other people (friends and/or relatives and children)?

   ___all  ____more than half  ____about half

   ____less than half  ____none

4. How important is "psychological closeness" in a husband-wife relationship?

   __very important  ____important  ____undecided

   ____unimportant  ____very unimportant

5. If you and/or your husband could neglect business/professional obligations, would you and your husband entertain less in your home?

   ___definitely  ____probably  ____probably the same, with the same people

   ____probably the same, but with different people  ____definitely not

6. To what extent is your marriage characterized by the statement, "his responsibility is his job, her responsibility is the house, the kids, and her club work"?

   ___definitely  ____probably  ____perhaps

   ____probably not  ____definitely not

7. In your opinion, does your husband regard his marriage as "the best thing that ever happened to him"?

   ___definitely  ____probably  ____perhaps

   ____probably not  ____definitely not

8. Is "romance" (sweet music, moonlight) a vital and important part of the relationship between you and your husband?

   __not at all  ____seldom  ____occasionally, such as anniversaries

   ____most of the time  ____all of the time

9. How often do you go to bed at night at the same time as your husband?

   __almost all the time  ____very often  ____often

   ____not very often  ____seldom

10. When your husband travels to business and/or professional meetings, do you usually remain at home?

    ___always  ____seldom  ____most of the time  ____occasionally

    ____never
11. Do you regard your marriage as "the best thing that ever happened to you"?
   __definitely __probably __perhaps
   __probably not __definitely not

12. If your husband was offered a large promotion that involved a great deal of traveling and a salary increase, would you want him to take it, even if it meant that you and he would be separated a great deal?
   __very much so __probably
   __probably not __undecided (depends on the particulars)
   __definitely not

13. How involved are you and/or your husband with community leadership, civic and religious activities, etc.?
   __very deeply involved __somewhat deeply involved
   __slightly involved __not involved at all

14. In terms of communication and mutual rapport, how close is your psychological relationship with your husband?
   __very close __close __somewhat close (depends on the situation)
   __not very close __not at all

15. If asked, would it be impossible for you to describe your husband's responsibilities in his job?
   __definitely __probably __perhaps
   __probably not __definitely not

16. How "contented" are you with your marriage as it is today?
   __very contented __contented __reasonably contented
   __uncontented __very uncontented

17. What fraction of your husband's leisure time is spent in activities in which you do not participate?
   __almost all __more than half __about half
   __less than half __almost none

18. In comparison to the marriages of your friends, how do you regard your marriage?
   __very similar __similar
   __dissimilar __very dissimilar

19. Considering your husband and your other relatives in the same category as your non-related friends, is anyone other than your husband your "best friend"?
   __very much so __probably __undecided
   __probably not __definitely not

20. Psychologically speaking, how important to you is your sexual relationship with your husband?
   __very important __important __of average importance
   __rather unimportant __of no importance
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Now that you have completed the questionnaire, please check back and make sure that you have responded to each appropriate question. Remember that there are questions on both sides of each page. If you have failed to respond to any appropriate questions or skipped a page by accident, your responses cannot be used in this study.

Please mail back the entire list of questions in the attached, self-addressed, stamped envelope.

This study is completely anonymous—I have no idea who has this particular questionnaire. I thus have no way of contacting you if you should forget to return it.

The completion of this Ph.D. dissertation depends on your assistance and concern in returning this completed questionnaire to me.

Thank you again for your time and interest—it is gratefully appreciated.

If you have any questions concerning this study, I will be more than glad to discuss them with you. My office phone number in the Sociology Department at The Ohio State University is 293-7543; my home phone number is 268-2485.

If there are any comments you would like to make about the questionnaire, please feel free to do so. Space for your written comments is provided on this page when you have removed the envelope.
APPENDIX B

GENERAL INFORMATION ITEMS, AS CODED
FOR COMPUTER ANALYSIS
The following material was punched onto the first of the two IBM cards per respondent used in the role behavior analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Column Number</th>
<th>IBM Card Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Respondent Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7</td>
<td>Name of Organization (#1-16) (these will not be delineated here, in order to protect the anonymity of the participating organizations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>What is your present marital status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Married, living with husband</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Widowed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Single (never married)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Do you and your husband have children, either by this marriage and/or by a previous marriage of you or your husband?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes_4 No_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Do you and your husband have children living in your home?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes_4 No_3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If so, how many children in the following age groups are living in your home? (Please list the exact number (1, 2, 5, etc.) in each of the appropriate categories.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A. Pre-school (including infants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>B. Grade school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C. Junior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>D. Senior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>E. College (including graduate school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>F. Working (not in school)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>IBM Card Column Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4           | 28                      | Do you and your husband have children who do not live at home? Yes 4 No 3 

If so, please put the number of children not living at home in each of the following categories:

- 30 A. In private school
- 32 B. In college
- 34 C. Living with your or your husband's former spouse
- 36 D. Working and/or living in own home or apartment
- 38 E. Other (specify)

| 5 | 40 | Do you drive? Yes 4 No 3 |

| 42 | If so, do you usually have access to a car for your daily use? Yes 4 No 3 |

| 6 | 45 | Please check which of the following housing conditions apply to you and your husband. |
|   |   | 1 A. Live in own home (single family dwelling) |
|   |   | 2 B. Live in an apartment which you own (for example: duplex, condominium, etc.) |
|   |   | 3 C. Live in a rented home (single dwelling unit) |
|   |   | 4 D. Live in a rented apartment and/or other multiple-dwelling unit |

<p>| 7 |   | If you rent your home or apartment, please check which of the following types of repairs the landlord has done for you. (If you own your home, please disregard this question.) |
|   | 47 | Major repairs (plumbing, furnace, painting, etc.) Yes 4 No 3 |
|   | 49 | Minor repairs (putting in storm windows, replacing light switches, etc.) Yes 4 No 3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IBM Card</th>
<th>Column</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>Category A--truck driver, factory worker, building construction worker, pipeline fitter, highway construction worker, auto mechanic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td>Category B--owner of a small business, school teacher (elementary or secondary), foreman in a plant, skilled craftsman (carpenter, cabinetmaker, electrician, etc.), skilled medical technician, salesman for a middle-sized firm, minister of a church, office manager for a company or firm, filing clerk, barber, hairdresser, shoe salesman, manager of a service station, accountant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>Category C--physician, college professor, professional engineer, architect, chemist, research scientist, lawyer, dentist, banker, manager or owner of a business, high-level executive for a company or firm (Vice President, Assistant to Vice President, Manager), stockbroker, Certified Public Accountant, university administrator (President, Vice President, Dean, Chancellor), head of a research foundation, biochemist, pharmacist, public school superintendent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Category D—member of the board of directors of a very large company, firm, or university; owner or president of a very large firm, corporation, or company (such as IBM, RCA); executive position in a company, firm, or business which has been "in his family" for generations.

Which of the following categories best indicates your highest level of formal education?

A. Attended senior high school
B. Graduated from senior high school
C. Attended college and/or business or technical school
D. Graduated from college
E. Attended graduate or professional school
F. Received graduate and/or professional degree (Ph.D., M.A., M.D., etc.)

Please check the category that best describes your own age.

A. Under 30
B. 30 - 40
C. 40 - 50
D. 50 - 60
E. 60 - 70
F. 70 and above

Which of the following is your religious preference?

A. Protestant
B. Catholic
C. Jewish
D. Other (please specify)
E. None
Of the following income levels, please check the category within which your total yearly family income falls. If not sure, please give your best estimate.

1. A. Under $10,000
2. B. $10,000 - $20,000
3. C. $20,000 - $30,000
4. D. $30,000 - $40,000
5. E. $40,000 - $50,000
6. F. Above $50,000
APPENDIX C
THE ROLE BEHAVIOR SCALE, AS CODED
FOR COMPUTER ANALYSIS
The following material was punched onto the second of the IBM cards per respondent used in this role behavior analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IBM Item Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Respondent Number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mother Role Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Other Role Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>House Role Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Wife Role Priority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**House Role Behavior Questions**

1. **Household duties**—of the following list of tasks, for which are you responsible; that is, which do you (the wife) usually do yourself?

12. a. Light household cleaning (sweeping, dusting, straightening) Yes _1_ No _0_

13. b. Heavy household cleaning (waxing floors, washing windows, polishing wood floors) Yes _1_ No _0_

14. c. Regular yard maintenance (lawn mowing, leaf raking, weeding, snow shoveling) Yes _1_ No _0_

15. d. Occasional yard maintenance (tree and brush trimming, flower planting) Yes _1_ No _0_

16. e. Grocery-shopping Yes _1_ No _0_

17. f. Laundry Yes _1_ No _0_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>IBM Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>g. Interior house maintenance (plumbing repairs, major appliance repairs, furnace repairs, inside painting, cleaning of drapes and upholstery) Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>h. Repairs of small appliances (toasters, irons, mixers, etc.) Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Exterior house maintenance (house and trim painting, cleaning out of house eave gutters, driveway repair) Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>j. Meal planning Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>k. Cooking meals Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>l. Dish washing Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>m. Paper and trash removal (burning, using an incinerator, or preparing it for trash pick-up) Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>n. Interior decorating and furniture arrangement Yes 1 No 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 Please indicate, by checking one of the following, the average time per week spent on the household duties listed on the previous page: (If not sure, please give your best estimate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Per Week</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 10 hours</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 15 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 20 hours</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 25 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30 hours</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 30 hours</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wife Role Behavior Questions

3 28 Do you usually prepare your husband's breakfast? Yes 1 No 0
8 33 Does your husband usually eat his evening meal at home? Yes 1 No 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>IBM Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9           | 34                 | **Do you frequently "eat alone" with your husband, that is, specifically excluding children and/or other relatives and friends?**
|             |                    | Yes: 1 No: 0      |
| 10          |                    | **When your husband arrives home after the usual dinner hour:**
| 35          |                    | a. **Does he usually eat before he comes home?**
|             |                    | Yes: 4 No: 3      |
| 36          |                    | b. **If he waits to eat until he gets home, do you usually prepare his meal?**
|             |                    | Yes: 1 No: 0      |
| 37          |                    | c. **When he comes home late, and waits to eat until he comes home, do you usually sit with him while he eats?**
|             |                    | Yes: 1 No: 0      |
| 11          | 38                 | **Does your husband have a profession or job that demands that he usually keep late hours?**
|             |                    | Yes: 4 No: 3      |
| 12          | 39                 | **If your response to the previous question is "Yes," do you usually go to bed before he comes home?**
|             |                    | Yes: 0 No: 1      |
| 16          | 44                 | **Do you usually make a"big thing" out of your husband's birthday, Christmas presents, etc.?**
|             |                    | Yes: 1 No: 0      |
| 17          | 45                 | **Do you and your husband usually celebrate your wedding anniversaries? (gifts, a night "on the town," going out for dinner, etc.)**
|             |                    | Yes: 1 No: 0      |
| 18          | 46                 | **If so, do other members of the family (children and other relatives) and/or friends usually join with you and your husband to celebrate your wedding anniversaries?**
|             |                    | Yes: 0 No: 1      |
| 26          | 55                 | **Does your schedule prevent you from being "Johnny on the spot" when your husband has a break in his work (for example, a day off from the office, a "stopping place" in his research and study, etc.)--so that you cannot be with him?**
<p>|             |                    | Yes: 0 No: 1      |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>IBM Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Do your recreational activities with your husband usually involve you and your husband alone, instead of a group of friends (including your husband)? Yes_  No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Do you usually help your husband purchase his clothing? Yes_  No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>When you and your husband have discussions, how frequently does the conversation center on each of the following topics? Please indicate the most frequent topic of conversation with a &quot;1&quot;, the least frequent topic with a &quot;6&quot;, and use the numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 to indicate the relative frequencies of the remaining topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your children and their welfare, interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your husband's job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td>Common interests (books, plays, sports, world affairs, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td>Your relationship to each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td>Friends and their problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Do you and your husband ever go on vacations or business trips which do not include the children? Yes_  No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>If your answer to the previous question is &quot;Yes,&quot; is this a common practice for you? Yes_  No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>When you and your husband have discussions, do either of you usually mind if someone else participates or &quot;listens in&quot;? Yes_  No_</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>Column Numbers</td>
<td>Information Coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mother Role Behavior Questions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4 | 29 | Do you usually get up and prepare your children's breakfasts and/or get them ready for school?  
Yes_1 No_0 |
| 5 | 30 | Do you usually drive your children to school or supply transportation in some way (driving them to a friend's who will take them the rest of the way or to the school bus stop)?  
Yes_1 No_0 |
| 6 | 31 | Do any of your children usually eat lunch at your home?  
Yes_1 No_0 |
| 7 | 32 | Do you usually "make it a point" to be at home when your children come home from school and/or work?  
Yes_1 No_0 |
| 13 | 40 | Do you usually agree with your husband in matters such as the children's clothing styles, their teachers, the size of their allowances, their dates, or if they are adults, how they manage their lives in general?  
Yes_0 No_1 |
| 14 | 41 | Have you and the children ever gone on holidays, vacations, and/or visiting friends and relatives without your husband? (for example, to visit distant relatives, to the shore or lake in the summer when your husband can't leave his job except on weekends, etc.)  
Yes_1 No_0 |
| 15 | 42 | Would you usually go ahead and go on business trips with your husband even if it means leaving the children for at least 2-3 days or longer?  
Yes_0 No_1 |
| 20 | 48 | In recent months, has your child (children) become upset when you and your husband were leaving for a party or other social occasion?  
Yes_4 No_3 |
| 21 | 49 | If your answer to the previous question is "Yes," did you go out anyway?  
Yes_0 No_1 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>IBM Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Do your children take &quot;special lessons,&quot; such as art, music, voice, swimming, golf or dancing (any instruction which you pay for)? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Do your children regularly participate in group activities such as Little League, Boy or Girl Scouts, a church choir, sports events at school, etc.? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>If your answer to either of the two previous questions was &quot;Yes,&quot; do you usually drive them to these activities? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Do you find that buying clothing for your children usually turns out to be a boring, tiring job? Yes₀ No₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Does your husband feel that you spend too much time with the children's interests? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Do you usually make a &quot;big thing&quot; of the children's birthdays, Christmas gifts, etc.? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Do you sometimes help the children with their hobbies, projects, and other interests? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>If your answer to the previous question is &quot;Yes,&quot; do you help them often? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Do your friends ever criticize you for spending too much time and emotional energy on your children? Yes₁ No₀</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>78-80</td>
<td>On the average, how many hours per week do you usually spend on the physical care and/or sharing the interests of your children? (If unsure, please give your best estimate.) ____ hours per week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IBM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Column Numbers</th>
<th>Information Coded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Other Role Behavior Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Do you regularly visit the art gallery and/or attend the theatre or symphony orchestra concerts? Yes_1 No_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Do you have any commitments outside your home which occupy a portion of your time? (Examples: social organizations or clubs, such as a bridge club; civic organizations, such as PTA; professional or educational organizations, such as The National Education Association; career or employment, such as secretary, social worker, M.D., nurse, teacher; specialized interest, such as art classes, playing in the Columbus Symphony Orchestra, taking courses at a university, sports such as golf and tennis, church activities. Other possible types of outside commitments: volunteer guide for the Museum of Science and Industry, Gray Lady at a hospital, etc.) Yes_1 No_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>If so, please indicate, by checking one of the following, the average time spent on all these commitments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than ten (10) hours a week 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least ten (10) hours a week 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least twenty (20) hours a week 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least thirty (30) hours a week 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At least forty (40) hours a week 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More than forty (40) hours a week 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Are all of your endeavors, interests, etc. outside the home done without benefit of monetary compensation? Yes_0 No_1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>If you do receive some monetary income, do you feel that this additional money is needed to maintain your family's present standard of living? Yes_1 No_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Number</td>
<td>IBM Column Numbers</td>
<td>Information Coded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Are you now in or have you recently (in the last year) been elected or appointed to a leadership position in any of the &quot;outside commitments,&quot; (clubs, professional groups, etc.) of which you are a member? Yes_1  No_0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Do your outside commitments in general fail to give you a sense of satisfaction and fulfillment? Yes_0  No_1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

THE COMPUTER PROGRAM FOR THE
ROLE BEHAVIOR ANALYSIS
CONTINUE
99 CONTINUE
101 FORMAT (13*2X,I2,1X,17I2,1X,6I2,1X,2I2)
READ (15,101) NRES, NCLUR, (INFO(I), I = 1, 25)
C THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT ENDS THE PROGRAM WHEN ALL THE CARDS HAVE
C BEEN READ. THE PROGRAM IS LIMITED TO 700 CARDS.
IF (NRES.EQ.700) GO TO 40
100 FORMAT(13*2X,I2,1X,15I1,1X,15I1,1X,14I1,1X,19I1,13)
READ (15,100) NOR,(NRLPK(I),I = 1,66),(INPUT(JJ),JJ = 1,64)
C FOR A GIVEN RESPONDENT, THE GENERAL INFORMATION CARD MUST PRECEDE
C THE ROLE BEHAVIOR DATA CARD.
IF (NRES.EQ.NOR) GO TO 20
WRITE (6,102)
102 FORMAT (1H1,46H PROGRAM HALTED BECAUSE CARDS IMPROPERLY PAIRED)
STOP
20 CONTINUE
JJ = JJ+1
NOR(JJ) = NOR
IGEN(1) = INFO(1)
IGEN(2) = INFO(18)
IGEN(3) = INFO(21)
IGEN(4) = INFO(22)
IGEN(5) = INFO(23)
IGEN(6) = INFO(24)
IGEN(7) = INFO(25)
IHOUSE(1) = INFO(18)
IHOUSE(2) = INFO(19)
IHOUSE(3) = INFO(20)
HOUSE(1) = INPUT(1)
123
HOUSE(2) = INPUT(2)
HOUSE(3) = INPUT(3)
HOUSE(4) = INPUT(4)
HOUSE(5) = INPUT(5)
HOUSE(6) = INPUT(6)
HOUSE(7) = INPUT(7)
HOUSE(8) = INPUT(8)
HOUSE(9) = INPUT(9)
HOUSE(10) = INPUT(10)
HOUSE(11) = INPUT(11)
HOUSE(12) = INPUT(12)
HOUSE(13) = INPUT(13)
HOUSE(14) = INPUT(14)
HOUSE(15) = INPUT(15)
IWIFE(1) = INPUT(21)
IWIFE(2) = INPUT(23)
IWIFE(3) = INPUT(26)
IWIFE(4) = INPUT(49)
IWIFE(5) = INPUT(51)
IWIFE(6) = INPUT(52)
IWIFE(7) = INPUT(56)
WIFE(1) = INPUT(16)
WIFE(2) = INPUT(22)
WIFE(3) = INPUT(24)
WIFE(4) = INPUT(25)
WIFE(5) = INPUT(27)
WIFE(6) = INPUT(31)
WIFE(7) = INPUT(32)
WIFE(8) = INPUT(33)
WIFE(9) = INPUT(42)
WIFE(10) = INPUT(45)
WIFE(11) = INPUT(46)
WIFE(12) = INPUT(56)
WIFE(13) = INPUT(57)
WIFE(14) = INPUT(59)
WIFE(15) = 0
WIFE(16) = 0
WIFE(17) = 0
ICHILD(1) = INFO(2)
ICHILD(2) = INFO(3)
ICHILD(3) = INFO(4)
ICHILD(4) = INFO(5)
ICHILD(5) = INFO(6)
ICHILD(6) = INFO(7)
ICHILD(7) = INFO(8)
ICHILD(8) = INFO(9)
ICHILD(9) = INFO(10)
ICHILD(10) = INFO(11)
ICHILD(11) = INFO(12)
ICHILD(12) = INFO(13)
ICHILD(13) = INFO(14)
ICHILD(14) = INFO(15)
ICHILD(15) = INFO(16)
ICHILD(16) = INFO(17)
ICHILD(17) = INPUT(35)
ICHILD(18) = INPUT(37)
ICHILD(19) = INPUT(38)
ICHILD(20) = INPUT(61)
CHILD(1) = INPUT(17)
THE STATEMENTS THROUGH 21 ELIMINATE THE YARD WORK QUESTIONS FOR THOSE LIVING IN APARTMENTS.

IF (IHOUSE(1)) LT. 4) GO TO 21
HOUSE(3) = 9.0
HOUSE(4) = 9.0
CONTINUE

THE STATEMENTS THROUGH 22 ELIMINATE THE REPAIR QUESTIONS FOR THOSE WHO RENT AND FOR WHOM THE LANDLORD TAKES CARES OF REPAIRS.

IF (IHOUSE(1)) LT. 4) GO TO 22
IF (IHOUSE(2)) LT. 4) GO TO 22
HOUSE(7) = 9.0
HOUSE(9) = 9.0
CONTINUE

IHOUSE(3) HAS BEEN IGNORED AS A CONTROL VARIABLE.

THOUS = 0.0
DHOUSE = 19.0
DO 23 I = 1, 14
THE FOLLOWING TWO CARDS ELIMINATE QUESTIONS WHICH SHOULD NOT APPLY.
IF (IHOUSE(1)) GT. 8.0) DHOUSE = DHOUSE - 1.0
IF (IHOUSE(1)) GT. 8.0) GO TO 23
THOUS = THOUS + HOUSE(1)
CONTINUE

IF (IHOUSE(15)) GT. 8.0) DHOUSE = DHOUSE - 5.0
IF (IHOUSE(15)) LT. 8.0) THOUS = THOUS + HOUSE(15)
THOUS = THOUS + 0.5
DHOUSE = DHOUSE + 0.5
NHQUTJ = DHOUSE
C NHQUTJ IS THE NUMBER OF HOUSE QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY THE CURRENT RESPONDENT.

IF (IWIFE(1)) AND (IWIFE(2)) IGNORED IN THIS PROGRAM.
IF (IWIFE(3)) LT. 4) WIFE(5) = 9.0
IF (IWIFE(3)) EQ. 9) WIFE(5) = 9.0
IF (IWFIE(4) .LT. 4) WIFE(15) = 1.0
IF (IWFIE(4) .EQ. 9) WIFE(15) = 9.0
IF (IWFIE(5) .LT. 4) WIFE(16) = 1.0
IF (IWFIE(5) .EQ. 9) WIFE(16) = 9.0
IF (IWFIE(6) .LT. 4) WIFE(17) = 1.0
IF (IWFIE(6) .EQ. 9) WIFE(17) = 9.0
IF (IWFIE(7) .EQ. 0) WIFE(18) = 0.0
WIFE = 0.0
DWIFE = 17.0
DO 25 I = 1, 17
IF (IWFIE(I) .GT. 8.0) DWIFE = DWIFE - 1.0
IF (IWFIE(I) .GT. 8.0) GO TO 25
TWIFE = TWIFE + WIFE(I)
25 CONTINUE
WISCRSRIJ = TWIFE/DWIFE
C WISCRSRIJ IS THE WIFE SCALE SCORE FOR THE CURRENT RESPONDENT.
DWIFE = DWIFE + .5
NWQUIJ = DWIFE
C NWQUIJ IS THE NUMBER OF WIFE QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY THE
C CURRENT RESPONDENT.
C THE 4 IFS FOLLOWING REFER TO RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE HAD NO CHILDREN.
IF (ICHILD(1) .EQ. 9) ICHILD(1) = 3
IF (ICHILD(1) .EQ. 3) CHSRSRIJ = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(1) .EQ. 3) ICHILD = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(1) .EQ. 3) GO TO 26
C FOLLOWING 6 IFS = NO CHILDREN AT HOME, REPLACE NINES WITH ZEROS.
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(3) = 0
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(4) = 0
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(5) = 0
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(6) = 0
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(7) = 0
IF (ICHILD(2) .LT. 4) ICHILD(8) = 0
C THIS DO LOOP REFERS TO NO CHILDREN AT HOME AND IN SCHOOL, SO CANT
C DRIVE THEM TO SCHOOL ON A REGULAR BASIS.
NCAM = 0
DO 30 I = 1, 8
NCAM = NCAM + ICHILD(I)
30 CONTINUE
C NCAM IS THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME.
IF NCAM .LT. 1) ICHIL0(1) = 9.0
C FOLLOWING 5 IFS = NO CHILDREN LIVING AWAY FROM HOME, REPLACE
C 9 NINES WITH ZEROS.
IF (ICHILD(9) .LT. 4) ICHILD(10) = 0
IF (ICHILD(9) .LT. 4) ICHILD(11) = 0
IF (ICHILD(9) .LT. 4) ICHILD(12) = 0
IF (ICHILD(9) .LT. 4) ICHILD(13) = 0
IF (ICHILD(9) .LT. 4) ICHILD(14) = 0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 4) OR NCAM .EQ. 0) ICHILD(9) = 5
C ICHILD(9) = 3 IF ALL CHILDREN ARE AT HOME, ICHILD(9) = 4 IF SOME
C 2 CHILDREN ARE AT HOME AND SOME AWAY FROM HOME; ICHILD(9) = 5 IF ALL
C 3 CHILDREN ARE AWAY FROM HOME.
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(9) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(5) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 9) AND CHILD(9) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(9) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(10) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(12) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(11) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(13) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(12) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(14) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(13) .GT. 8.0) CHILD(15) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(9) .EQ. 5) AND CHILD(14) .GT. 8.0) ICHILD(20) = 0.0
IF (ICHILD(10) .EQ. 3) OR ICHILD(11) .EQ. 3) ICHILD(12) = 0.0

126
IF (ICHILD(15),EQ,3.OR,ICHILD(16),EQ,3) CHILD(11) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(17),LT,4) CHILD(18) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(18),EQ,0.AND,ICHILD(19),EQ,0) CHILD(11) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(20),EQ,0) CHILD(16) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(9),EQ,5) CHILD(11) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(19),EQ,5) CHILD(14) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(9),EQ,5) CHILD(18) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(9),EQ,5) CHILD(15) = 9.0
IF (ICHILD(9),EQ,5) CHILD(11) = 9.0

C THE FOLLOWING TWO STATEMENTS ELIMINATE QUESTIONS 13 AND 33 FROM
C THE QUESTIONNAIRE BECAUSE THEY DID NOT SCALE
CHILD(9) = 9.0
CHILD(13) = 9.0
TCHILD = 0.0
DCHILD = 21.0
DO 31 I = 1,17
IF (CHILD(I),GT,8.0) DCHILD = DCHILD - 1.0
IF (CHILD(I),GT,8.0) GO TO 31
TCHILD = TCHILD + CHILD(I)
CONTINUE
IF (CHILD(18),EQ,0.0) DCHILD = DCHILD - 1.0
IF (CHILD(18),GT,10.0,AND,CHILD(18),LT,(150,51)) CHILD(18) = 1.0
IF (CHILD(18),GT,(150,5),AND,CHILD(18),LT,(100,51)) CHILD(18) = 2.0
IF (CHILD(18),GT,(100,5),AND,CHILD(18),LT,(150,51)) CHILD(18) = 3.0
IF (CHILD(18),GT,(150,51)) CHILD(18) = 4.0
TCHILD = TCHILD + CHILD(18)
CHSCSR(JJ) = TCHILD/DCHILD
26 CONTINUE
CHSCSR(JJ) IS THE CHILD SCALE SCORE FOR THE CURRENT RESPONDENT
DCHILD = DCHILD + 0.3
C NOQU(JJ) IS THE NUMBER OF CHILD QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY THE RESPONDENT
NOQU(JJ) = DCHILD
IF (OTHER(1),EQ,0) OTHER(3) = 0.0
IF (OTHER(2),EQ,0) OTHER(5) = 9.0
TOTHER = 9.0
DOTHER = 11.0
DO 32 I = 1,11
IF (OTHER(I),GT,8.0) DOTHER = DOTHER - 1.0
IF (OTHER(I),GT,8.0) GO TO 32
TOTHER = TOTHER + OTHER(I)
CONTINUE
OTSCSR(JJ) = TOTHER/DOTHER
C OTSCSR(JJ) IS THE OTHER SCALE SCORE FOR THE CURRENT RESPONDENT.
DOTHER = DOTHER + 0.5
NOQU(JJ) = DOTHER
C NOQU(JJ) IS THE NUMBER OF OTHER QUESTIONS ANSWERED BY THE CURRENT
C RESPONDENT.
C NRPl, NRPl, NRPl, AND NRPl ARE THE ROLE PREFERENCES FOR THE
C CATEGORIES CHILD, OTHER, HOUSE, AND WIFE, RESPECTIVELY.
DIMENSION NRPl(700), NRPl(700), NRPl(700), NRPl(700)
NRPl(JJ) = NRPRI(1)
NRPl(JJ) = NRPRI(2)
NRPl(JJ) = NRPRI(3)
NRPl(JJ) = NRPRI(4)
C THE SCORES FOR THE CURRENT RESPONDENT HAVE NOW BEEN COMPLETED.
C THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT RETURNS CONTROL TO THE NEXT CARD TO BE
C READ.
GO TO 99
CONTINUE

C JJ IS THE TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS.

103 FORMAT(11J1,J10HRESPONDENT,11X,HCHILD,17X,HOTHER,17X,HHOUSE,17X,
4HJWIFE/3X,HNUMBER,8X,HSCORE/2X,HHPREF,2X,2HJWA,7X,HSCORE/2X,HHPREF,2X,
3EF/2X,2HQA,7X,HSCORE/2X,HHPREF,2X,2HQA,7X,HSCORE/2X,HHPREF,2X,
4HQA)

WRITE(6,103)
AVWIFE = 0.0
AVHSE = 0.0
AVCHILD = 0.0
AVOTHER = 0.0
WMAX = 0.0
HMAX = 0.0
CMAX = 0.0
OMAX = 0.0
WMIN = 1.0
HMIN = 1.0
CMIN = 1.0
OMIN = 1.0
K = 0
JCHILD = JJ
NPUNCH = 1
DO 41 I = 1, JJ
K = K + 1
ITEMP = 0
THOUSE = HSCSR(I)
TWIFE = WISCRI(I)
TCCHILD = CHCSR(I)
TOOTHER = OTCSR(I)
NOR = NQO(I)
IF(TCHILD.GT.8.0) ITEMP = 9
IF(TCHILD.GT.8.0) JCHILD = JCHILD - 1
IF(TCHILD.GE.8.0) TCHILD = 0.0
AVWIFE = AVWIFE + TWIFE
AVHSE = AVHSE + THOUSE
AVCHILD = AVCHILD + TCHILD
AVOTHER = AVOTHER + TOOTHER
IF(TWIFE.GE.WMAX) WMAX = TWIFE
IF(THOUSE.GE.HMAX) HMAX = THOUSE
IF(TCHILD.GE.CMAX) CMAX = TCHILD
IF(TOTHER.GE.OMAX) OMAX = TOTHER
IF(ITEMP.EQ.9) TCHILD = 9.0
IF(TWIFE.LE.WMIN) WMIN = TWIFE
IF(THOUSE.LE.HMIN) HMIN = THOUSE
IF(TCHILD.LE.CMIN) CMIN = TCHILD
IF(TOTHER.LE.OMIN) OMIN = TOOTHER

104 FORMAT(1H0,3X,13.9X,F6.4,3X,12,3(6X,F6.4,3X,12,3X,12))
NP1 = NRP1(1)
NP2 = NRP2(1)
NP3 = NRP3(1)
NP4 = NRP4(1)
NCOA = NCOU(1)
NOOA = NOOU(1)
NHQA = NHOU(1)
NWQA = NWOU(1)
IF(NPUNCH.GE.2) GO TO 701
LI = NOR
P2 = TCCHILD
L3 = NP1


L4 = NCOA
P5 = TOTHER
L6 = NP2
L7 = NOOA
P8 = THOUSE
L9 = NP3
L10 = NHOA
P11 = TWIFE
L12 = NP4
L13 = NWQA
GO TO 702

701 CONTINUE
L1 = NOR
PP2 = TCHILD
L3 = NP1
LL6 = NP4
PP5 = TOTHER
L6 = NP2
L7 = NOOA
PP8 = THOUSE
L9 = NP3
L10 = NHOA
PP11 = TWIFE
L12 = NP4
L13 = NWQA
GO TO 703

702 CONTINUE
IF(INPUNCH.NE.2) GO TO 703
INPUNCH = 0
PUNCH 3LC, L1,P2,L3,L4,P5,L6,L7,P8,L9,L10,P11,L12,L13,L14,P2,L13

703 CONTINUE
NCALL = 0
IF(IJJ + 1)/2.NC,JJ/2.AND.1.EQ.JJ) NCALL = 1
IF(NCALL.NE.1) GO TO 704
PUNCH 3LC, L1,P2,L3,L4,P5,L6,L7,P8,L9,L10,P11,L12,L13

704 CONTINUE
NPUNCH = NPUNCH + 1

300 FORMAT(13',4(F6.4,I12),2X,I13,4(F6.4,I12))
WRITE(6,104) NOR, TCHILO, NP1, NCOA, TOTHER, NP2, NOOA, THOUSE,
2NP3, NHOA, TWIFE, NP4, NWQA
IF (K.EQ.31) WRITE(6,103)
IF (K.EQ.31) K = 0

41 CONTINUE
FJCHLD = JCHILD
C FJCHLD = TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS WHO HAD CHILDREN.
RESUM = JJ
C RESUM = TOTAL RESPONDENT NUMBER
AVWIFE = AVWIFE/RESUM
AVHSE = AVHSE/RESUM
AVCHLD = AVCHLD/FJCHLD
AVOTHR = AVOTHR/RESUM
C THE FOLLOWING DO LOOP WILL CALCULATE THE STANDARD DEVIATION OF
C EACH OF THE SCORES.
SIGMAC = 0.
SIGMAW = 0.
SIGMAH = 0.
SIGMAO = 0.
DO 42 I = 1, JJ
NOR = NOQ(I)

THOUSE = HOSCSR(I)
TWISE = WISCRI(I)
TCCHILD = CHSCSR(I)
TOTHER = OTSCSR(I)
DEVH = THOUSE-AVHSE
DEVW = TWISE-AVWIFE
IF(TCHILD_LT_8) DEVC = TCHILD-AVCHILD
IF(TCHILD_GT_8) DEVC = 0.0
DEVO = TOTHER-AVOTH
DEVH = DEVH*DEVH/RESUM
DEVW = DEVW*DEVW/RESUM
SIGMAH = SIGMAH + DEVH
SIGMAW = SIGMAW + DEVW
SIGMAC = SIGMAC + DEVC
SIGMAO = SIGMAO + DEVO
CONTINUE
SIGMAH = SORT(SIGMAH)
SIGMAW = SORT(SIGMAW)
SIGMAC = SORT(SIGMAC)
SIGMAO = SORT(SIGMA0)
112 FORMAT(I1*10X,17H SUMMARY STATEMENT//1)
WRITE(6*112)
WRITE(6*107)
WRITE(6*113) HMIN, HMAX, AVHSE, SIGMAH, JJ
WRITE(6*113) WMIN, WMAX, AVWIFE, SIGMAW, JJ
WRITE(6*109)
WRITE(6*113) UMIN, UMAX, AVOTH, SIGMAO, JJ
WRITE(6*110)
WRITE(6*113) CMIN, CMAX, AVCHILD, SIGMAC, JCHILD
113 FORMAT(I1*10X, 17H TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDANTS = 14//1)
111 FORMAT(I1*1)
107 FORMAT(I1*10X,11MHOSCSRE SCALE)
WRITE(6*111)
WRITE(6*107)
WRITE(6*115)
105 FORMAT(I1*10X,17H NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS, 10X, 11H RANK NUMBER, 12X, 11H TOTAL)
2 SCORE)
DIMENSION NROH(700), NROW(700), NROC(700), NROO(700)
C
NRO IS THE SCORE RANK ORDER NUMBER FOR EACH RESPONDENT.
J = 1
TEMP = HMAX
CONTINUE
43 CONTINUE
HISCR = TEMP
TEMP = -1.0
DO 44 I = 1, JJ
NOR = NOO(I)
THOUSE = HOSCSR(I)
IF(TEMP_LT_THOUSE AND HISCR_LT_HISCR) TEMP = THouse
IF(THOUSE NE HISCR) GO TO 44
NROH(I) = J
WRITE(6*116) NOR, J, THOUSE
J = J + 1
44 CONTINUE
IF(HISCR_GT_HMIN) GO TO 43
106 FORMAT(I1*11*125, F25.4)
108 FORMAT(1H *1Gx,10H Scale)
WRITE(6*111)
WRITE(6*108)
WRITE(6*105)
J = 1
TEMP = WMAX
45 CONTINUE
HISCR = TEMP
TEMP = -1.0
DO 46 I = 1, JJ
NOR = NOO(I)
TWIFE = WISCR(I)
 IF (TEMP .LT. TWIFE .AND. TWIFE .LT. HISCR) TEMP = TWIFE
 IF (TWIFE .NE. HISCR) GO TO 46
NROW(I) = J
WRITE(6*106) NOR, J, TWIFE
J = J + 1
46 CONTINUE
IF (HISCR .GT. WMIN) GO TO 45
109 FORMAT(1H *1Gx,11OTH Scale)
WRITE(6*111)
WRITE(6*109)
WRITE(6*105)
J = 1
TEMP = CMAX
47 CONTINUE
HISCR = TEMP
TEMP = -1.0
DO 48 I = 1, JJ
NOR = NOO(I)
TOTHER = OTSCSR(I)
 IF (TEMP .LT. TOTHER .AND. TOTHER .LT. HISCR) TEMP = TOTHER
 IF (TOTHER .NE. HISCR) GO TO 48
NROO(I) = J
WRITE(6*106) NOR, J, TOTHER
J = J + 1
48 CONTINUE
IF (HISCR .GT. CMIN) GO TO 47
110 FORMAT(1H *1Gx,11CH Child Score)
WRITE(6*111)
WRITE(6*110)
WRITE(6*105)
J = 1
TEMP = CMAX
49 CONTINUE
HISCR = TEMP
TEMP = -1.0
DO 49 I = 1, JJ
NOR = NOO(I)
TCHILD = CHSCSR(I)
 IF (TCHILD .GT. 0.0) NROC(I) = 0
 IF (TEMP .LT. TCHILD .AND. TCHILD .LT. HISCR) TEMP = TCHILD
 IF (TCHILD .NE. HISCR) GO TO 50
NROC(I) = J
WRITE(6*106) NOR, J, TCHILD
J = J + 1
450 CONTINUE
IF (HISCR .GT. CMIN) GO TO 49
STOP
END
APPENDIX E

THE CUBER INTRINSIC-UTILITARIAN MARRIAGE SCALE
6. To what extent is your marriage characterized by the statement, "his responsibility is his job, her responsibility is the house, the kids, and her club work"?

   __0 definitely __0 probably __0 perhaps
   __0 probably not / __1 definitely not

7. In your opinion, does your husband regard his marriage as "the best thing that ever happened to him"?

   __1 definitely __1 probably / __0 perhaps
   __0 probably not / __0 definitely not

8. Is "romance" (sweet music, moonlight) a vital and important part of the relationship between you and your husband?

   __0 not at all __0 seldom __0 occasionally, such as anniversaries /
   __1 most of the time __1 all of the time

11. Do you regard your marriage as "the best thing that ever happened to you"?

   __1 definitely / __0 probably __0 perhaps
   __0 probably not / __0 definitely not

12. If your husband was offered a large promotion that involved a great deal of traveling and a salary increase, would you want him to take it, even if it meant that you and he would be separated a great deal?

   __0 very much so __0 probably
   __0 undecided (depends on the particulars) /
   __1 probably not / __1 definitely not

14. In terms of communication and mutual rapport, how close is your psychological relationship with your husband?

   __1 very close / __0 close
   __0 somewhat close (depends on the situation)
   __0 not very close / __0 not close at all

15. If asked, would it be impossible for you to describe your husband's responsibilities in his job?

   __0 definitely __0 probably __0 perhaps
   / __1 probably not / __1 definitely not

16. How "contented" are you with your marriage as it is today?

   __1 very contented / __0 contented
   __0 reasonably contented
   __0 uncontented / __0 very uncontented

133
17. What fraction of your husband's leisure time is spent in activities in which you do not participate?
   0 almost all  0 more than half  0 about half
   0 less than half  /  1 almost none

19. Considering your husband and your other relatives in the same category as your non-related friends, is anyone other than your husband your "best friend"?
   0 very much so  0 probably  0 undecided
   /  1 probably not  1 definitely not
APPENDIX F

ADDITIONAL TABLES
### TABLE 31

**OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>196</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.70; d.f. = 1; N.S. \]

### TABLE 32

**WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>164</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = .06; d.f. = 1; N.S. \]

### TABLE 33

**MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 2.72; d.f. = 1; N.S. \]
TABLE 34

HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .59; d.f. = 1; N.S.\]

TABLE 35

MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 1.58; d.f. = 1, N.S.\]

TABLE 36

ROLE STRAIN AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = .78; d.f. = 1; N.S.\]
**TABLE 37**

ROLE PRESSURE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WITH CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .09; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$

**TABLE 38**

NEVER HAVING HAD CHILDREN—CHILDREN PRESENT IN THE HOME AND SELF-ESTEEM, ALL RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never having had children</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children present in home</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .14; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$

**TABLE 39**

OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (above .6000)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (.6000 and below)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .25; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$
### TABLE 40

**HIGHEST ROLE PRIORITY AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Role Priority</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-wife</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Numbers in cells too small to apply $X^2$.

### TABLE 41

**WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (above .7000)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (.7000 and below)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.93; \ d.f. = 1; \ N.S.$

### TABLE 42

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .17; \ d.f. = 1; \ N.S.$
### TABLE 43
ROLE STRAIN AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .12; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.} \]

### TABLE 44
ROLE PRESSURE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 1.50; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.} \]

### TABLE 45
WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (above .7000)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low (.7000 and below)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = .17; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.} \]
### TABLE 46

**ROLE STRAIN AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .05; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$

### TABLE 47

**ROLE PRESSURE AND SELF-ESTEEM, WOMEN WHO HAVE NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .83; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$

### TABLE 48

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE, WOMEN WHO HAD NEVER HAD CHILDREN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.50; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}$
## Table 49

**WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .90; \text{d.f.} = 1; \text{N.S.} \]

## Table 50

**MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .58; \text{d.f.} = 1; \text{N.S.} \]

## Table 51

**HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND SELF-ESTEEM; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = .22; \text{d.f.} = 1; \text{N.S.} \]
### Table 52

**Other Role Performance and Self-Esteem; Women with Children, But No Children at Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .81; \ d.f. = 1; \ N.S.$

### Table 53

**Role Strain and Self-Esteem; Women with Children, But No Children at Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.07; \ d.f. = 1; \ N.S.$

### Table 54

**Role Pressure and Self-Esteem; Women with Children, But No Children at Home**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.89; \ d.f. = 1; \ N.S.$
### TABLE 55

CUBER SCALE AND SELF-ESTEEM; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = .12; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}\)

### TABLE 56

WIFE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wife Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = .59; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}\)

### TABLE 57

MOTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mother Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>80</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(X^2 = .25; \text{ d.f.} = 1; \text{ N.S.}\)
TABLE 58

HOUSE ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .03; d.f. = 1; N.S.$

TABLE 59

OTHER ROLE PERFORMANCE AND CUBER SCALE; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Role Performance</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .18; d.f. = 1; N.S.$

TABLE 60

ROLE PRESSURE AND CUBER SCALE; WOMEN WITH CHILDREN, BUT NO CHILDREN AT HOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Pressure</th>
<th>Cuber Scale</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = .12; d.f. = 1; N.S.$
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