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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

Need for Study

Although the typical organization of home economics subject matter separates the area of family and child development or family relationships and home management, there is recognition that the areas are interrelated. There is less agreement on the patterns of the interrelations. A better understanding would be useful for the application of knowledge from the two areas in actual family living experiences. An examination of the interrelationships between the two areas is needed and is the purpose of this study.

A number of individuals in the area of home management and family economics have indicated this need. For example, influence of family variables in addition to money price on consumer choice was the focus of Magrabi’s presentation at a recent family economics conference.¹

Gross and Crandall pointed out in a discussion entitled, "Interweaving of Management and Group Relations," that, except for possibly the area of decision-making, the interweaving had, at the time of writing, received little attention in research.²


Gross, in a later speech summarizing issues in home management, referred to the need to decide how much emphasis to place on family relationships in the management framework without creating confusion in the identity of the two areas. Deacon spoke of the need for a conceptualization of home management which would be "consistent with the relationships and developmental aspects of home and family living." 

Bardwell, also, more recently mentioned a concern for clarifying the interrelationships of the two areas.

Assuming the existence of the two areas, the need is to better understand the effects of one upon the other. Research that can help identify interrelationships will provide a base for a clearer development of the understanding of the human behavior which each area attempts to explain, including how it is affected by the other. The research would improve the understanding of home management activity and could increase the effectiveness of home management teaching.

The value of information from such research would not be limited to the home management area. As indicated by McGrath and others, there

---


4Ruth E. Deacon, "Toward a Philosophy of Home Management" (speech given at Oregon State University, January 24, 1966), emphasis by the writer.

is a need for better clarification of the unity of the field of home economics. Research focusing on some interrelationships of even two of the major areas could contribute to this need for better theoretical conceptualization of the field as a whole.

Clarification and Determination of Problem

The contribution of an individual research project increases in value to the extent that it adds to and can be integrated with other research in the field. Conceptual frameworks are currently used as a research tool to facilitate this process. As Stryker indicates, they refer to a set of concepts which can be connected in propositional form in a theory. By making them explicit in some degree of formalized statements, communication among researchers of various orientations and disciplines is facilitated. Overlap and confusion due to the use of similar terms but with different assumptions, can be more easily avoided when the frameworks are identified.

Frameworks give direction to research in a field by suggesting concepts already recognized as well as sometimes indicating interrelationships between concepts. Part of the determination of the research problem of this study was, then, to review frameworks in both fields of home management and family relationships. The purpose of the review was to locate concepts or hypotheses which could suggest

---


possibilities of interrelationships.

Since the existence of frameworks is closely related to the stage of development of the field of study, another concern was the extent of development which might be found in the two areas. The relatively early stage of both fields was an indication of the limitations that could be expected.

Although a conceptual framework implies the existence of concepts, the extent of meaning which has been established for each concept cannot be assumed. Whether the concept is more than notational depends upon the empirical study associated with the concept.\(^8\)

As Brodbeck and others have discussed, operational definitions are needed before research procedures can be carried out, among a variety of populations, to test the validity of the concept.\(^9\) The process of validating the existence of the concept then becomes a part of the process of generalizing toward laws and theories in the field. A further concern in determining the research problem was to locate concepts which had indications of more empirical development.

The literature related to both fields was then reviewed for (1) the existence of conceptual frameworks summarizing the family behavior relevant to the two areas; (2) the existence of bridging types of hypotheses of interrelatedness or concepts from which such hypotheses might be developed; and (3) the existence of research establishing some degree of empirical meaning to the concepts used to suggest interrelatedness.

Theoretical considerations for measuring family behavior was an additional concern in the investigation of the literature.

The research problem which was evolved from the review is presented in Chapter III.


CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

Family Relationships

The area of family relationships in home economics, (and sometimes, home management) draws from the rather loosely organized interdisciplinary area of "the family" as well as other basic disciplines. A number of conceptual frameworks have been proposed in recent years in this area which give direction to studies of the family by researchers from a variety of disciplines.

A review of the various frameworks indicates approaches for considering the relationship concept. The study of relationships is perhaps most clearly the focus of the interactional framework in its conception of the family as a unity of interacting personalities. The family is viewed not as a legal unit but as an interaction of members. Personal relationships in the framework are distinguished from those relationships derived from a legal or structural basis.

According to Schvaneveldt, although a major portion of family research has been related to the interactionist framework, there is still an "undue lack of unification of theoretical findings and methods."
Though the scope of the structure-functional framework differs from that of the interactionist, recognition has been given to relationships among family members, particularly in the division of labor between sexes. The interest in relationships from the viewpoint of the social-psychological framework as well as the psychiatric framework is primarily as an explanation of personality, and in the latter framework, how relationships are affected by the unconscious. The developmental framework is also concerned with relationships but the emphasis is on the developmental tasks to be met over a period of a family’s lifetime.4

The major emphasis of the Presidential Address at the 1967 National Council of Family Relations was the need for the clarification of the concept of "family relationships" or "family relations." Although used extensively in the literature, according to Smith, the meanings range widely and should be more consistently defined for use in various frameworks.5

Definitions of the relationship concept

Further review of the literature indicates relationships to be a broad concept, encompassing many other variables of family interaction. A review of the various meanings gives some indication of the structure of the concept as well as indicating some components.

A clarification between relationship concepts and individual-oriented concepts was pointed out by Smith in the presidential address.


He noted that terms in common usage frequently refer to individual behavior rather than to relationships although relationships may be the point of reference. Individual-oriented concepts that were suggested as a contrast included needs, behavior patterns, adjustment process, motivation, attitude, etc.⁶

The relationship concept was discussed by Smith as the structuring of situations and the common meanings that are shared by individuals. Perception and communication were noted as processes important to the development of relationships. While the primary emphasis was on the expression and conveying of meaning through verbal and nonverbal processes, attention was also directed to the commitment of time in the development of relationships.⁷

Some of the relationships suggested by Burgess and Wallin in their early development of the interactionist view included love and affection, sex, emotional interaction, compatibility, interaction of cultural backgrounds, common interests, expectations, decision-making and adaptability.⁸

Although a distinction can be made between family and interpersonal relationships in general, the literature on both adds meaning to the concept. A general law of interpersonal relationship has been proposed by Rodgers and is developed around the component concepts of congruence, experiencing, awareness and communication.⁹

⁶Ibid., p. 22. ⁷Ibid., p. 17.


Relationship concepts also refer to more than single interactions between individuals. As explained by Broom and Selznick, patterns develop when "interpretations placed on an individual's gestures in specific situations become generalized expectations for future situations."\(^{10}\)

Role theory has also described relationships. Role concepts represent guidelines for what behavior is expected of persons in a relationship. It has been pointed out that roles do not constitute a requirement but that choices must be made regarding when to follow the role expectation and when to deviate.\(^{11}\)

Shibutani has discussed interpersonal roles as a framework of claims and obligations which develop among those who engage in joint action. He also suggests that frameworks or orientations stabilize over time. Relationships, from his view, are understood to have either unilateral, bilateral or reciprocal properties although for a relationship to have continuance, some reciprocal gratification is required.\(^{12}\)

The association between growth-facilitating aspects of a relationship as discussed by Rodgers and the accomplishment of a task has not


\(^{11}\)Anthony Athos and Robert E. Coffey, ed., *Behavior in Organizations*, p. 155.

been considered simple or direct. According to Spear, an interaction which becomes growth-facilitating may even involve a diversion of immediate attention from the task directly to the persons themselves, though it may also allow for an improved task situation at some later point in time.\textsuperscript{13}

A behavioral definition of family relationships was used in a study by Herbst. Changes in one field of family activity that lead to changes in another field are considered as interdependent and define relationships while changes which do not lead to other changes are considered as independent activities.\textsuperscript{14}

In summary, the concept has the following general characteristics:

a. two or more things (persons) taken together;

b. a product of the interactional structure of the family group;

c. abstraction of meaning from behavior rather than the behavior itself;

d. a summing of interaction over time.

In addition, a research problem would need to be narrowed to some aspect of the relationship rather than testing the broad and indefinite concept.

Other sources of relationship concepts

Since the family is one type of a small group of individuals, small group research could be considered as a source of frameworks or theories.

\textsuperscript{13}Harold S. Spear, "Notes on Carl Rodger's Concept of Congruence and His General Law of Interpersonal Relationships," in \textit{Behavior in Organizations}, ed. by Athos and Coffey, pp. 190-196.

According to Tallman and others, such efforts have not proved as fruitful as expected. The majority of research with small groups has been done with experimental groups differing in numerous ways from a family-structure group. Attempts by Leik, Udry and Strodbeck to apply hypotheses to families have been reported. Their findings tend to support the differences between families and other small groups.

One framework frequently appearing in small group research which could have relevance to a study relating home management activity and family relationship activity is that of the task v.s. social-emotional categorization of behavior. As discussed by Hare, task behavior is referred to as "interaction directed primarily towards the completion of group or individual tasks. The minimum number of categories would include observing, hypothesizing and formulating action." Social-emotional behavior is referred to as "interaction directed primarily towards the relationships between group members that form the basis for problem-solving. The minimum number of categories would include control and affection."
This framework also corresponds to the widely used instrumental-expressive categorization first attributed to Slater and then Bales and Slater. It is most often applied to explain the differences between male and female roles. When thus applied, it is assumed that the male role encompasses the tasks of the "outside" and the female role encompasses the "inside" or social-emotional specialization of the home environment. It does not appear to explain the tasks occurring within the home setting. Research directed by Levinger and others has furthermore led them to question this concept of role specialization. Levinger's research gave indication that the social-emotional role was equally divided between husbands and wives.

Home Management

Extent of framework development

In the home management area, the recognition of need for frameworks and some development of suggested concepts was given impetus by the French Lick Home Management Committee, followed by the Home Management Conference on Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management. Various frameworks have been proposed. They vary in the amount of formalization.


of concepts, operational definition and extent of concept testing. Though the concepts included in the frameworks vary, all include some aspects of planning and controlling of resources in relation to goals. They vary also in the implications for relationships between managerial behavior and family relationship activity.

Paolucci's managerial framework, in its broad focus, appears to include qualities of family relationships. It has been suggested that managerial decisions are concerned either with "appraisal and reorganization or adjusted control of activities involved in the use of resources, or...may center upon one or more forms of interactions among family members, i.e., conflicts between actual and desired effectiveness of communication networks, role patterns, or ways of performing certain types of activities."\(^{21}\) The focus of the framework on the major family goals of growth and development of individual members would be expected to encompass both types of decisions.

The human-centered emphasis as contrasted to a former task-centered emphasis is important to Schlater's conceptualization of home management. It is suggested, though not discussed extensively, that some affective aspects of the family's life are to be taken as "given" or outside the realm of home management activity. The need for home management concepts which will clarify the differences between management by one person and management when more persons are involved is also pointed out by Schlater.\(^{22}\)


Knoll's suggestion for a managerial framework includes locating the managerial processes in a broader economic and social environment. Family relationships are not emphasized although it is pointed out that factors relating to decision alternatives are probably both economic and noneconomic in nature.\textsuperscript{23} This might imply some concern for relationship factors.

Interrelatedness with family relationships has been suggested by Maloch and Deacon. Home management is viewed as one of two subsystems of the family. The personal system is proposed as a second subsystem in the family system. Although not developed as fully as the managerial framework, Deacon has proposed several types of inputs and outputs of the personal system which suggest interrelationships.\textsuperscript{24}

Bardwell has used this approach to study some of the input-output relationships. The research operationalized inputs and outputs of both systems; personal and managerial. The two systems were distinguished by the difference in demands which each was organized to meet: social and affectional care of family members—personal subsystem; physical care and maintenance of family members—managerial subsystem.

It was assumed that the distinction was related to the broader and more general subject matter areas of home management and family relationships.\textsuperscript{25}


\textsuperscript{24}Ruth E. Deacon, "Toward a Philosophy of Home Management" (paper presented at Oregon State University, January 24, 1966).

The research was primarily concerned with input-output differences between a test and control group rather than between the two subsystems. Some between-system relationships were tested though no interpretations were made. The study suggested the operational definition of the management subsystem include the physical care and maintenance of family members. The need for discrete categorization in order to use available measures of met demands (output) of the two systems meant that child care tasks including physical care were a measure or part of the personal subsystem's met demands. This conceptualization resulted in a recognized inconsistency in the managerial system's function of physical care and maintenance of the family.\textsuperscript{26}

Halliday's research on rationality of homemaking decisions tested the association between rationality and other variables including amount of emotion involved, amount of family interaction and amount of readily available empirical evidence that is used rather than "folklore" or "conventional wisdom." The hypotheses relating rational decisions to these variables was not supported and evidence seemed to indicate that the importance of the decision has more influence on the amount of reasoning done than the variables named.\textsuperscript{27}

Difficulty with the hypotheses might be expected due to the way specific family activities were categorized. The influence of the variables on family activities was not tested separately for each

\textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 21-22.

variable but as a group of variables. This would tend to confound the analysis for the effect of each variable. Halliday assumed that empirical evidence was not as readily available in areas of greater emotion or greater family interaction and that these variables increase from food buying to household organization to child discipline decisions. The hypotheses that were confirmed, indicating that an individual's decision-making procedure tended to be consistent in a variety of situations, might suggest that relationships, defined as interaction, would not affect decisions.28

Although Fite's research showed some significant relationships between home management competencies and competencies for solving interpersonal relationships, it is the investigator's opinion that the two instruments used to measure competencies did not clearly distinguish between the two. Both were, in fact, heavily weighted towards management competencies.29

Business management as a source of hypotheses

The problem of relating managerial activity and relationships also occurs in business settings. A review of theories in this area should suggest approaches that could be tested in family situations.

The human aspects of management are probably most clearly presented in the writing and work of McGregor and Likert. According to McGregor's

28 Ibid.

basic thesis, relationship aspects of behavior are viewed as human
resources in an organizational enterprise with an economic objective.
The relationships are best influenced and controlled in the enterprise
by an integration of individual and organizational goals. Later
writing by McGregor replaced the idea of integration with the trans­
actional concepts of power and influence. He proposed that all gain
when certain social elements such as trust and mutual support are pre­
sent.

Likert's work emphasizes the possibilities of measuring and
accounting for the human resources in the overall balance sheet of an
organization. It is expected that work by social scientists can event­
ually develop measures which can determine values of cooperative working
relationships to the firm.

In order to apply these frameworks in a family setting, it would
be necessary to assume the economic objective of a family managerial
system and to recognize that the individual makes contributions to the
management but is not totally encompassed by the system.

The systems approach as discussed by Johnson, Kast and Rosenzweig
considers the human as a component in the man-machine system. Principal

30Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise. (New York:

31McGregor, The Professional Manager, ed. by Caroline McGregor

human inputs include goals of the individual, his motivation, task orientation and his reward structures. The emphasis again is on aspects of the individual rather than the individual as a total component.

**Standards as a Managerial Component**

**Definitions of concept**

The practical necessity to limit the study of interrelatedness led to the decision to select one component of management for testing rather than several from a framework. Although management may not consistently operate in the cycle suggested by most frameworks, it was decided to choose a component which tended to occur early in a managerial process. Standards and standard setting were identified in the Maloch-Deacon framework as occurring before controlling activities. In situations involving more than one family member, the setting of standards or use of standards as a part of plans might also be situations where relationship qualities and managerial activity would be associated. As Johnson, Kast and Rosenzweig have indicated in their discussion of managerial system, standards need to be communicated and they also need to be understood. Paolucci also discussed the need for understanding in family goal defining. Sensitivity and feelings of others and awareness of needs of self and others were expected to enter into such discussions. Since standards, like goals, are value-related concepts, it was felt that this interrelatedness

---


34 Johnson, Kast and Rosenzweig, *Theory and Management of Systems*, p. 89.

might be associated with standards and standard setting also.

A review of the literature on the concept of standards was made to further specify possible hypotheses for the study.

Although descriptions of standards vary in both writing and research efforts, there is support for the basic interpretation and function of standards as a basis or criteria for evaluation and/or measurement in a managerial setting. According to the definition used in Walker's research, standards are "criteria supporting evaluation to determine the extent of goal attainment." She suggests that standards are frequently implied when reasons for satisfaction with the outcome of a task are stated.\(^{36}\)

Maloch and Deacon define standards in their research as a measure of quality and/or quantity.\(^ {37} \) The measures reflect an adjustment or reconciliation in relation to resources and demands. It is also suggested that standards are situation related. Within a given resource-demand situation, the requirements of the goal are related to the potentialities or attributes of the resources, and standards for the managerial activity are evolved. These standard setting decisions concern which or what amount of resources are required to achieve the desired standard. A certain level of quality for food items, for example, requires skill, attention, knowledge and materials.


\(^{37}\) Francille Maloch and Ruth E. Deacon, *Managerial Components and Their Relationship to Selected Variables for Urban, Suburban and Rural Homemakers* (tentative title, research bulletin, manuscript in process, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center).
Decisions made to establish the criteria (quality/quantity) are seen in the Maloch-Deacon framework as a part of the planning function of the managerial system. The resulting standards are a part of the plan subject to the controlling components. The planning as part of the internal working of the system acts in relation to the demand inputs arising from events and the goals and values of the family system. The standards then are guides to action carried out in the managerial situation.

It can also be pointed out that if a previously determined standard is considered to be unattainable at least two alternatives are possible; (1) it may be agreed to accept less than the desired, that is, not to meet the standard, or (2) it may be decided that the standard (quality/quantity measures) can be changed to a more attainable level of satisfaction.

Nickell and Dorsey, in their writing, also view standards as a "set of measures of values," serving as a criterion for measurement of objects, ways of doing things and ways of living. Nickell and Dorsey distinguish standards from customs or habitual courses of action which have been passed down from the past as regulators of social behavior.38 This distinction appears to be explained by the fact that standards are more closely associated with values than are customs.

Gross and Crandall, likewise, in their writing, relate standards to values and define them as mental pictures used as a comparison to

what exists and as a limitation to action.  

Taylor, from the viewpoint of philosophy, has explained standards in a value context and as a measure or criteria in the process of making a value judgment. They are considered in the category of the norm or set of norms according to which the object or event being evaluated is graded or ranked. The evaluation process divides itself into two basic types depending on whether standards or rules are being used as norms. If standards are used, the process consists of either grading or ranking something as superior, inferior or equal to something else. The course of reasoning is entered for the purpose of coming to a decision about the value of something.

Walker's research was primarily concerned with the development of a classification of standards in the area of housekeeping as contrasted to attributes of standards studied in the Maloch-Deacon research. Walker attempted to identify commonality of tasks along the dimensions of their purposes and then to classify standards according to the various purposes. Empirical study was done and evidence found for three classes of performance standards for cleaning a living room.

---


41 Walker, "Self-Imposed Standards."
A basic concept in the Walker framework was the idea that housekeeping standards are self-imposed, that is, that the importance of the classes of standards and degree to which the individual strives to achieve them is independently established by the individual and is not subject to some outside scientific standards.\(^{42}\)

A related view of standards is used by David in a social work research project which defines them as part of the concept of role expectations. Role expectations are explained as behavioral standards directed by significant individuals in the social field to another member. They are further categorized as (1) self-standards—what the individual subscribes to; (2) the behavior prescribed by others; (3) the extent of actual behavior observed to conform to the standard; (4) what the individual prescribes for others; and (5) what the individual perceives others expect.\(^{43}\) Such a view refers more to collection of behavioral expectations rather than relating directly to a value hierarchy.

The major effort of David's project was concerned with a way to discover family problems through determining discrepancies between the various categories of standards. It is suggested that discrepancies between standards might also exist in a managerial situation.

Aspects of standards

Although some agreement on the basic meaning of standards has been noted, agreement on their characteristics is less common. Various

\(^{42}\)Ibid.

attributes of standards were tested in research conducted by Maloch and Deacon. These included flexibility, reality and complexity. Beyring's research extended the concept of situationality as another aspect of standards not fully developed by Maloch and Deacon.

Some differences occur in the interpretation of flexibility in writings and research. Gross and Crandall use flexible and conventional as terms describing categories of standards. Their definitions of flexible standards as "consciously adopted to suit a given situation" corresponds to the understanding of situationality used by Beyring as relationship of the standard to an existing situation. The definition of flexible standards given by Nickell and Dorsey appears to be in agreement with the Gross and Crandall categorization. Flexible standards are contrasted to rigid standards and are less defined by social groups outside the family. Flexibility of standard as defined by Maloch and Deacon refer to a range of acceptable quality and/or quantity of the specific standards in either a one-time or occurring situation. It appears that two conceptions of flexibility may exist;

44 Maloch and Deacon, Managerial Components.
46 Gross and Crandall, Management of Modern Homes, p. 39.
48 Nickell and Dorsey, Management in Family Living, p. 47-49.
(1) the flexibility of the standard (whether it has a range or not) and
(2) the flexibility of the situation including the people in it, that
is, whether they can accept a change in a standard or possibly a change
in its range.

The Maloch-Deacon definition of flexibility appears to agree with
Walker's description of the range of acceptability of the performance
standard. The range of acceptability is seen as a continuum, both ends
of which are unacceptable or limit further action of the individual.\textsuperscript{49}

It is suggested that clarification between flexibility and situa­
tionality may be needed to determine when a standard is adapted to a
situation, regardless of whether it is flexible or not. In Beyring's
study a relationship was found between situationality and flexibility
of standards under market conditions.\textsuperscript{50} Market conditions may re­
represent situations where the homemaker has less control and where there
may be both a greater range of flexibility and more willingness to make
changes in what will be accepted as good. It is also possible that more
occasions exist in market situations when the standard is not met.

A question about the situationality concept is also raised in
relation to the adapting or changing of standards. Beyring's study
gave evidence that as adapting increases so also does the use of single­
use standards which appear to support the position that standards are
changed rather than adapted.\textsuperscript{51} One possible clarification is to
distinguish between situationality as an attribute of a standard or as


\textsuperscript{50}Beyring, "Situationality," p. 23.

\textsuperscript{51}Ibid., p. 24.
an attribute of standard-setting.

In a discussion of the complexity of the standard defined by Maloch and Deacon, as relationship of persons and standards, it seems necessary to describe the kind of interaction between individuals that occurs. According to Walker, there is an attribute of self-determination which produces the voluntary enforcement for adherence to a standard. As Schlater has suggested, it is not always clear who is managing whom in a situation involving more than one person.

The Context of Household Tasks

Since task behavior is referred to in several viewpoints, a further review of the literature seemed necessary. Household tasks are part of the content of the setting for both home management and family relationship activity. The viewpoint of household tasks varies among disciplines. Research occurs most commonly in the field of home economics. Home management has traditionally been expected to be responsible for housekeeping and financial tasks. The family relationship area has also been responsible for content on care of family members. The concept appears as a generic term in various sociological frameworks. According though, to Tallman, attention to basic family tasks is usually ignored in research on family behavior.

Bell and Vogel have described task performance in the family as


54 Tallman, "The Family as a Small Problem-Solving Group."
one of the four subsystems of the family's internal activities. Duvall includes physical maintenance as one of the developmental tasks of families. The value-laden significance of family participation and performance of tasks has been discussed by anthropologists such as Dorothy Lee and Margaret Mead, as well as by sociologists. According to Bell and Vogel, task performance is related to the standard of living; interpersonal relationships may develop as a result of the nature of the task activity. They suggest that the bonds of the family may increase if there is close interaction.

Streib and Thompson have suggested that any activity can have particular significance to the family and that the significance of the activity may not be predictable from a general analysis of the family since meaning is acquired from the family context in which the activities are found. Halliday's research indicated a general orientation of decisions regardless of the task, according to beliefs about fate.

---


59 Halliday, *Relationship Among Characteristics*. 
Dickerscheid found that the task was the significant factor affecting the heart rate changes of the mother in a study of the mother-child relationship.\textsuperscript{60}

A distinction among tasks was used by Maloch and Deacon based on market and non-market characteristics.\textsuperscript{61} Market situations were defined as activities involving money transaction or exchange and activities not involving money transactions were considered as non-market task situations. In their research, components were analyzed on the basis of whether they could be identified in both types of task situations.

It seems necessary to consider the task as a variable in a research study. It might be suggested from the above review that the extent of management and relationship activity would vary (1) within each family, (2) on each task and (3) with some general orientations to situations as well.

**Research methods for family study**

Research methods useful in the social sciences are also applicable in family research with perhaps the additional problem of the intimacy and privacy of the family setting.\textsuperscript{62} Measurement of social phenomena is no easier in the specific area of family phenomena.

\textsuperscript{60}Jean D. Dickerscheid, "Development of a Method of Measuring the Effects of a Preschool Child on the Mother's Heart Rate" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University, 1967), p. 93.

\textsuperscript{61}Francille Maloch and Ruth E. Deacon, "Managerial Components."

The problem of choosing valid and reliable measures of research concepts is indicated by Bonjean, Hill and McLemore. The difficulty of locating measures without extensive research efforts led to their compilation of measures reported in four of the major sociological journals of the years from 1954 - 1965. The problem of validity and reliability was illustrated by the evidence that of the 2,080 measures reported, only 589 or 28.3 percent had been used more than one time and only 2.6 percent more than 5 times.63

According to Sussman, who to interview in a family for best representation is also a difficulty in research. Studies, in his judgment, do not usually conceptually differentiate the bases and processes of relationships particularly between marital partners and those of parent and child. As Sussman points out, synthesis of behavior to represent the family as a social system should consider all possible combinations of interaction patterns, in addition to references to a particular dyadic unit.64

Summary of research review

The problem of interest for the study has included a broad area for review. Specific hypotheses of interrelatedness have not been found in the literature. Some possible overlapping of concepts in several frameworks has been indicated. Examples include decision-making


and influencing and control of behavior. The most specific development of interrelatedness occurs in the personal-managerial subsystem framework suggested by Deacon and Maloch. More general theories have also been considered. As Nye has pointed out, broad (general) theories usually have few connections with family phenomena which makes specific explanation difficult to achieve. Yet, as he further suggests, they can be helpful in reducing fragmentation and discontinuity in research. Theoretical work on task and social-emotional categorization is one which has been reviewed.

The study of interrelatedness is limited by the extent of conceptual development in areas of relationship and management as well as by development of valid and reliable measures for the concepts.

The problem for study has been narrowed to a possible relationship between standards or standard setting and some measure of family interaction as they relate to specific family task behavior.

---

65 Deacon, "Toward a Philosophy."

66 Nye, "Field Research."
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Statement of the Problem

The major problem of this study was the investigation of the interrelatedness of certain family relationship behaviors and the standards component of planning in non-market situations. Secondary interests included the investigation of the association between managerial components and a determination of variance in the behaviors measured. The problem investigated was in part, supported by, and is a supplement to a larger project, "Components Related to Effectiveness and Satisfaction with the Managerial Role of Rural and Urban Homemakers."

Aspects of managerial behavior that were studied included awareness of standards, agreement on standards and the attributes of complexity, reality, flexibility and situationality of standards. The number of children, years of marriage, age of the oldest child in the home, age of the wife, education of the wife and the Index of Social Position were investigated as factors which might contribute to the variance of the measurement variables. The relationship of the wife's satisfaction with various managerial accomplishments to selected managerial components was also investigated as a part of the larger Maloch-Deacon research project.

1Francille Maloch and Ruth E. Deacon, Co-leaders, Hatch 278, Department of Home Economics, Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center.

Assumptions

Certain assumptions were inherent in the formulation of this investigation. They are stated below:

1. That the family is characterized as a group of primary relations, that is, relationships are valued as an end in themselves, not for some instrumental objective.

2. That the family is characterized by certain goal-directed activity arising within and bounded by the activities occurring in the setting of the family dwelling.

3. Behavior within the family environment will have both goal-achievement and relationship interpretations. Behavior directed to the accomplishment of goals, may contribute to the building or breaking down of understanding between individuals as well as the relationship interpretations being a factor in goal accomplishment behavior.

4. That both relationship and managerial aspects of behavior can be identified in the responses of individuals.

5. Expression of satisfactions represent an outcome of evaluation.

Hypotheses

Based on the above assumptions, the following hypotheses were developed and tested. They are stated in the null form.

1. There is no association between the wife's perception of the amount of marital role agreement or the wife's perception of social-emotional activity and
   a. her awareness of standards
   b. her perception of agreement on standards
2. There is no association among the managerial characteristics of
   a. the wife’s awareness of standards
   b. the wife’s perception of agreement on standards
   c. complexity of standards
   d. flexibility of standards
   e. reality of standards
   f. situationality of standards

3. There is no association among the satisfactions with meals, income, organization of household work, overall managerial ability, and amount of help received from family members, or the managerial characteristics of
   a. the wife’s awareness of standards
   b. the wife’s perception of agreement on standards
   c. complexity of standards
   d. flexibility of standards
   e. reality of standards
   f. situationality of standards

Analysis was also made of the variation accounted for by the independent variables on family relationship qualities, managerial components and satisfaction with goals.
Definitions of Variables

Following the investigation of the literature and related research, the following definitions were stated. Managerial definitions were used on the concepts identified in the research study conducted by Maloch and Deacon.\(^3\) The concept of situationality was developed by Beyring from the Maloch and Deacon framework.\(^4\) Relationship definitions were developed from the review of literature on relationships. The definition of satisfaction was developed from Taylor's presentation of the process of evaluation.\(^5\) Both theoretical and operational definitions are included.

**COMPLEXITY OF STANDARDS**

- **Theoretical definition:** interrelationship of persons and standards
- **Operational definition:** number of persons and tasks involved in a standard

**FLEXIBILITY OF STANDARDS**

- **Theoretical definition:** range of acceptable quality and/or quantity for a given situation
- **Operational definition:** indication of willingness to change quality or quantity

**REALITY OF STANDARDS**

- **Theoretical definition:** feasible quantity or quality
- **Operational definition:** qualities or quantities that are considered good or worthwhile are actually achieved or are possible with given resource potential

**SITUATIONALITY OF STANDARDS**

- **Theoretical definition:** relationship of standard to existing

---

\(^3\) Maloch and Deacon, *Managerial Components*.

\(^4\) Beyring, "Situationality," p.14

conditions
Operational definition: indication of adapting the standard to existing conditions.

MARITAL ROLE AGREEMENT

Theoretical definition: ability to function as a two-person family (social) group implies some degree of consensus between the two persons on topics related to family issues.
Operational definition: amount of agreement perceived by wife between herself and husband on marital role related topics.

SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ACTIVITY

Theoretical definition: expressive behavior between husband and wife, associated with maintenance of social relationships within the context of the marriage relationship, in the long run, depends on a degree of reciprocation.
Operational definition: frequency of wife's sharing of feelings and opinions.

SATISFACTION

Theoretical definition: result of a process of judging or evaluating an object, person, place, etc., against a certain standard and finding a degree of value or fulfillment of the standard.
Operational definition: degrees of satisfaction responses to objects which represent values and goals.

Selection of Sample

The sample was limited to husband-wife families, living in middle-income housing areas with at least one child of school age. The families were randomly selected from four previously designated middle-income housing areas in a medium-sized southern Ohio city of 28,000 population (Chillicothe).

The criterion of at least one child in school was established to provide an amount and type of experience families would have in managerial activity involving standards. By including a child of at least five years of age, the family would have had at least that many years of managerial experience with children as a common concern.
As Levinger discussed, studies indicate that as there is more assurance of economic security and occupational stability, it is more likely that the husband will share the wife's concern for expressive or social-emotional behavior. By limiting the sample to a middle-income rather than including a low-income range, it was felt that there would be better opportunity to measure the relationship aspects of social-emotional activity.

Wide differences in standards were also controlled by eliminating extremes of the high and low socio-economic groups. It was felt that a clear identification at one level could facilitate later investigations at other levels.

The following criteria were used for identifying middle-income housing areas since census tract information was not available for this area.

a. an estimated income range of $6,000 to $10,000 or approximately $2,000 of the 1966 national median of $7,500 as reported by the Bureau of Census;

b. occupations as classified by Hollingshead as skilled, semi-skilled, small business owners, clerical and sales workers and technicians.

---

6Levinger, Task and Social Behavior, pp. 441-442.
8Hollingshead, The Factor Index, pp. 3-8.
c. property valuations of $15,000 to $25,000 or approximately
two and one-half times the middle-income range.

The above criteria along with a map of the city was given to three
city officials who were asked to identify such areas based on their
knowledge of the community. The officials included the superintendent
of schools, the County Extension agent who had lived in the city
approximately ten years, and an assistant to the city engineer des-
ignated by the city engineer as being familiar with housing areas in
the city.

Three areas were identified by all three individuals and one area
was identified by two of the three. This consensus between judges
seemed adequate so it was decided to use the four areas. A city map
indicating consecutive lot numbering was used for selection of houses
in the four identified areas. The house numbers were later matched with
the lot number for ease in contacting families. A sample was drawn to
obtain at least 100 families which was considered a sufficient number
for the various statistical procedures to be used. The percent of
interviews that might be expected to be obtained in proportion to the
population was estimated. The actual proportion that was obtained
from the sample was 42.4 (Table 1).

Interview Method

Since data on family activity may be considered private, hesitancy
to respond might be expected, particularly on relationship qualities,
it was decided that the interview method would be more appropriate
than a mailed questionnaire. Rapport could be established by the
interviewer and accuracy of reporting would be promoted. It was also
decided that the interview method would be more appropriate due to the limited development of the concepts being tested. Helpful insights related to the concepts might be gained during the interview process.

Table 1. Estimated and Actual Percent of Interviews Obtained from Sample
(4 subdivisions, Chillicothe, Ohio, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Percentage</th>
<th>Actual Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not eligible</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at home, vacant house or empty lot</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.8&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total percentage</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>6.8 percent not at home, 8.0 percent vacant house or empty lot.

The practical difficulties of interviewing both husband and wife was the primary factor in deciding to construct a schedule to be used with wives only.

Development of Interview Schedule

A search of the relationship measures that had been used at least once before and which might be expected to measure some aspect of understanding between husbands and wives was conducted. The limitations of selection have been discussed in the literature review. Two measures were selected. The Marital Role Agreement measure was adapted from the work initiated by Kirkpatrick and Hobart and repeated by Hobart and by
Hobart and Klausner. A group of 28 items were selected from a total list of 70 items used by Hobart. Item correlations by test-retest after 13 days, N = 73 ranged from .60 to .93. The statements ranged over a variety of topics related to marital role behavior.

Although in the previous studies, opinions on the statements were obtained from both husband and wife, it was decided to use only the wife's estimate of disagreement. This was obtained by asking the wife to check her own opinion on each statement and then to check what her husband's opinion would be. The difference between the responses on each statement was computed and summed for a score of the extent of marital disagreement on the selected statements. The lower the score, the lower the disagreements perceived by the wife between herself and her husband on marital role expectations.

Questions used by Levinger in a larger study of tasks and social behavior of husbands and wives were used for a second measure of relationship qualities. The questions in Levinger's study were constructed to determine the amount of social-emotional performance of the husband and wife. As used in the study, there were consistent


10 Personal correspondence, Charles Hobart.
positive correlations between the husband and wife on each question with N = 60. The positive correlations were contrasted to the negative correlations between the husband and wives on questions related to task performance. The same questions were used for the wives in the present study and were answered by frequency of the activity. The higher the score the higher the amount of social-emotional activity reported by the wife.

Questions used to elicit responses which would measure managerial activity related to standards were devised from the operational definitions. Questions measuring awareness of standards were related to a family meal and a household repair. Because of the existence of more explicit standards in the foods area, than in other family areas, it was decided to use family meals as a task situation. It was also felt that there was a possibility of more interaction between family members in this area. The household repair situation was chosen as an area which is not a traditional task for the wife.

Flexibility and situationality measures were also related to the same meal situation. Since the meal task situation was being used, data were also obtained on meal types as used by Walker, for analysis. Agreement on standards, reality and complexity were measured by responses to several task situations occurring in the family.

---


12 Appendix A.

13 Kathryn E. Walker, Homemaking Work Units for New York State Households, Memoir 353, December, 1957 (Ithaca, New York: Agricultural Experiment Station).
Data regarding the time, type, approximate cost and persons doing the repair were obtained for the question regarding the household repair.

Pretest

In order to pretest the questions on a sample similar to the one used for the study, a census tract in a Columbus, Ohio suburb was chosen which had a high proportion of children of school age and an income range within $500 of the median income of Franklin County. Pretest interviews were conducted with 16 homemakers and responses were analyzed. Difficulty of answering as well as the approximation of a normal curve in the responses were considered in the revisions. Revisions were made and the schedule was again pretested with 10 additional homemakers in the same census tract. The revised interview schedule is included in the Appendix.14

Interviewing

One hundred and four interviews were completed during the month of April, 1969 by the investigator and an experienced interviewer employed by the Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center. The interviewer had participated in the earlier Maloch-Deacon survey. Instructions for interviewing were developed.15

The interviews lasted approximately one-half hour (mean 36.6 min., s.d. 8.16, s.e. .80). Since the study was not designed to eliminate employed homemakers, the plan for return included one call

14Appendix D.

15Appendix C.
to be made after 5:00 p.m. A total of three calls were made, one in the morning, one in the afternoon and one after five o'clock before dropping the number from the sample.

Preparation for interviewing in the housing areas included contacting school officials of the districts where the housing areas were located as well as the Chamber of Commerce and County Extension office to inform them of the purpose and plans for the study. A brief explanation of the purpose and procedures of the study, including interviewers' names and association with the university, was published in the city newspaper.

The population of the total area was represented in each subdivision. (Table 2). One interview schedule was eliminated from the study due to the unwillingness of the homemaker to complete the section of the schedule related to the wife's estimate of the husband's opinion on the marital role statements.

Table 2. Interviews Held in Relation to the Population
(4 subdivisions, Chillicothe, Ohio, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subdivisions</th>
<th>Lot Number</th>
<th>Population Percent</th>
<th>Interviews Held Number</th>
<th>percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Coding

Following the interviews the data were coded for statistical manipulation by the Ohio Research and Development Statistics Laboratory. Coding was done by the investigator and checked by an experienced research assistant employed by the Ohio Research and Development Center. Disagreements were resolved by discussion between the coders or with a faculty member in home management research. Coding was done in relation to the operational definitions determined previous to the study.

Limitations

The study was limited in the following ways:

1. data were gathered from a selected middle-income area of an Ohio city and generalizations from the study are thus limited to that population;

2. only the wife's perception of family relationship qualities and managerial aspects were tested.
CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Method of Analysis

Correlation coefficients were determined for the degree of association between the variables. A least squares method of regression analysis was used for the determination of variance accounted for by the independent variables. Following a statistical description of the sample, the significant results will be presented. The analysis will be presented in three parts. The first part is a presentation and discussion of the correlations with family relationship variables, the second part is a presentation and discussion of the intercorrelations of the managerial components. A third part presents the analysis and discussion of correlation among satisfaction components. The factors that accounted for variance will be discussed at points where they relate. Significant sources of variance are summarized in Table 3. A list of all values and a correlation matrix are included in the Appendix. Each section of the analysis is summarized in relation to the hypotheses of the study.

Description of Sample

The 104 families interviewed are described by the number of children living at home, the age of the oldest child, the homemaker's age, the number of years married, the education of the husband and the

1Appendix B, Tables 14 and 15
Table 3. Regression Coefficients for Dependent Variables with Significant F Values

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>F Values</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Standards</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>8.951**</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Years of marriage</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>6.839*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>4.563*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>4.012*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Index of Social Position</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>4.785*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situationality</td>
<td>Meal-type</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>4.107*</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>4.883*</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td>Index of Social Position</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>4.212*</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with Amount of Help Received</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Family Members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05

**p ≤ .01
wife, the computed Index of Social Position of the husband (Table 4),\textsuperscript{2} the employment status of the husband and wife (Table 5) and the occupation of husband and employed wives (Table 6).

As indicated in Table 4 there was a broad range in the ages in the children, extending over the school life of the child. Likewise, there was a wide range in the ages of the homemakers. Upper educational levels of the husbands and wives were similar, although the deviation for the husbands was greater than for the wives. The mean for the Social Position was just below the middle level of Hollingshead's Classes.

The number of employed homemakers in the sample (Table 5) is comparable to that of the total population. Recent statistics have shown that between the ages of twenty-five and forty-five, at least one third of all married women were working. The percentage increased somewhat as the age increased.\textsuperscript{3} About one-third (34.6\%) of all mothers were working.\textsuperscript{4} Five homemakers in the study who were employed at the time of the interview were not employed in 1968 as determined from the responses to the number of weeks employed in 1968. The mean number of weeks the 25 homemakers were employed in 1968 was 37.4 weeks. Although two husbands were currently employed,

\textsuperscript{2}Hollingshead, \textit{Two Factor Index}


\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 38.
Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of Family-related Characteristics  
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of children living at home</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaker's age</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years married</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of husband(^a)</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of wife(^a)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index of Social Position(^b)</td>
<td>45.62</td>
<td>12.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Hollingshead's Educational Scale  
Graduate professional training \(1\)  
Standard college or university graduation \(2\)  
Partial college training \(3\)  
High school graduate \(4\)  
Partial high school \(5\)  
Junior high school \(6\)

\(^b\)Hollingshead's Index of Social Position  
Social Class I (high) \(11-17\)  
Social Class II \(18-27\)  
Social Class III \(28-43\)  
Social Class IV \(44-60\)  
Social Class V \(61-77\)

The wives reported their husband’s usual occupations which accounted for the total of 104 occupations.

The occupational status of both husbands and wives is indicated in Table 6. Both husbands' and wives' occupations were classified by
Table 5. Employment Status of Wives and Husbands
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wives employed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husbands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unemployed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hollingshead's Occupational Scale. Occupational status of the husbands corresponded to the criteria used for the sample selection with a mean of 4.3, s.d., 1.0 on the Occupational Scale. The most frequent occupations of the husbands were classified as skilled, manual employees, clerical workers, technicians and owners of little businesses.

Table 6. Distribution of Occupation of Wives and Husbands
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Occupational Category</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) Unskilled employee</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Machine operators and semi-skilled employee</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Skilled manual employee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Clerical and sales workers, technicians, and owners of little businesses</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Business managers, proprietors of medium sized businesses, and lesser professionals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Administrative personnel, small independent businesses, and minor professionals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Higher executives, proprietors of large concerns and major professionals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aHollingshead's Occupational Scale.
Family Analysis

Family relationship qualities were measured by two variables, social-emotional activity and marital role agreement (estimate). There was a significant inverse association between the two measures ($r = -0.260, p < .01$). Since a higher score on marital role agreement reflected higher disagreement, the inverse correlation indicated that the wife's report of higher social-emotional activity was associated with her estimate of lower disagreement. There was a greater range in the responses of marital role agreement than for the social-emotional activity. The mean of the marital role agreement score was 12.72 with a standard deviation of 6.95. The mean for social-emotional activity was 24.93, with a standard deviation of 3.52.

Correlation with standard variables

There was a significant inverse correlation between the situationality measure and the marital agreement score ($r = -0.193, p < .05$). Situationality was identified as the number of situations out of a possible six in which the homemaker would not serve the same main dish she had served the last time the family had eaten together (Table 7). As the number of situations increased the amount of marital role agreement also increased. The correlation would seem to indicate that the interpersonal relationships are indicated by the wife's estimate of agreement is associated in some way with the planning involved in family meals. No other significant relationships were indicated with either of the two family relationship variables.
Table 7. Means and Standard Deviations for Conditions of Situationality Related to Serving the Same Main Dish

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Husband not at home</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult relative present</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer to or further from payday</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less time in the day</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time in the day</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different mood of homemaker</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total-Situationality</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Range of response was yes, would still serve (0) to no, would not serve same dish (1).

The meal type accounted for some of the difference in situationality ($F = 4.107$, d.f. 1, 95, $p < .05$). As the meal type increased by one unit the amount of situationality (adapting of standards) decreased by 0.374. An increase in meal types indicated an increase in the amount and time of preparation involved in the meal. The majority of the families served type III meals (Table 8). The variance in this factor suggests that adapting is more difficult as there are more factors in the situation. It also suggests that complex meals are satisfactory for more situations.
Table 8. Distribution of Meal Types
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meal Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type I</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type III</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type IV</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Meal types increase in amount of time and complexity of preparation from I to IV (highest) (mean 2.94, s.d. .60).*

The questions about the meals referred to the last meal when all the family was present and the homemaker had done the major preparation. For the majority of the families this meal occurred the day before the interview (mean 1.30, s.d. .52) (Table 9).

Table 9. Distribution of Time of Meal
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Meal</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yesterday</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within the week</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over a week</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses ranged from (1) yesterday to (3) over a week ago.*
Correlation with satisfaction variables

Satisfaction was defined in the study as the result of a process of evaluating certain goals in which standards were the criteria for evaluation. The responses of the homemakers were to four general managerial-related goals, to results of one specific meal, and as a sum of responses to results of specific aspects of the same meal (Table 10).

Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations of Homemakers' Satisfactions

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Satisfactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income received</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of household work</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of help received from family members</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall managerial ability</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Meal Satisfaction</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Meal Satisfaction</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family likes</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount served</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavor</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aDegrees of satisfaction ranged from dissatisfied (1) to satisfied (5).

Some significant correlations between satisfactions and the family relationship variables occurred. The satisfaction of the wife with the amount of help received from family members was significantly associated
with both the amount of social-emotional activity (r = .219, p ≤ .05) and the amount of agreement the wife perceived (r = -.224, p ≤ .05). The satisfaction increased as the social-emotional activity increased and as the amount of agreement increased.

The Index of Social Position accounted for some of the variance in the wife's satisfaction with the amount of help received from family members (F = 4.212, d.f. = 1,97, p ≤ .05). As there was a unit increase in the Index, the satisfaction increased by .021. Possibly there is a more positive orientation to family management evaluation as status increases.

Satisfaction of the wife with the way her household work is organized was also inversely associated with the marital agreement score (r = -.286, p < .01). As agreement increased, satisfaction also increased. The correlation with the social-emotional activity score was not significant although it did approach significance (r = .158).

The age of the oldest child accounted for some of the difference in the degree of satisfaction with the homemaker's organization of work (F = 4.883, d.f. = 1,97, p < .05). As there was a one unit change in the age of the oldest child, the satisfaction decreased by -.076. This could suggest that as the child matures, his demands may make organization more difficult. It is noted that this does not apply to families who have only small children since the sample included only those with children at least five years of age.

The correlations give some support to the conclusion that the evaluation associated with managerial ends is related to interpersonal relationships as they are measured in this study.
To summarize, there was indication that the null hypothesis that there is no association between family relationship qualities and managerial-related behavior could, in part, be rejected. Measures of situationality and of satisfaction with amount of help received from family members and with organization of household work were significantly associated with relationship variables.

Managerial Analysis

Agreement on Standards and Complexity

There was a significant inverse association between the agreement on standards and complexity of standards ($r = -0.312, p < .01$). Agreement on standards was measured by the frequency of difference of opinions or ideas between the husband and the wife as reported by the wife on the appearance of the house and the amount of help to expect from the children (Table 11). Complexity was measured by the frequency of involvement of other family members as reported by the wife, either by suggestions for food served, appearance of the house, household tasks or actual help from the husband (Table 11).

The correlation indicates that as there is more family involvement, there is less agreement between the husband and wife on standards. Perhaps as suggestions or help is increased, possible alternative qualities or quantities are increased. This could imply that more discussion is needed to arrive at standards for plans.

The number of children accounted significantly for variance in the agreement on standards ($F = 8.951, d.f. = 1, 97, p < .01$). As there was a one unit increase in the number of children, the agreement decreased by .388. This finding supports the above suggestion that increased involvement may mean increased need for discussion of standards.
Table 11. Means and Standard Deviations for Agreement on Standards, Complexity and Reality

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Standards</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of house</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help from children</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for food</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for house</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions for household tasks</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of husband's help</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent on repair</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of kitchen</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's care of their rooms</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Degrees of frequencies ranged from high (5) to low (1).

The complexity of standards varied significantly also with the years of marriage ($F = 6.839$, $d.f. = 1.97$, $p < .05$), the age of the oldest child ($F = 4.563$, $d.f. = 1.97$, $p < .05$), the age of the wife ($F = 4.012$, $d.f. = 1.97$, $p < .05$), and Index of Social Position ($F = 4.785$, $d.f. = 1.97$, $p < .05$). As there was a one unit increase in the years of marriage, the complexity of standards decreased by .235. This may suggest that as there is more experience with determining standards, the amount of suggestions from family members or help from the husband decreases because acceptable standards have
been satisfactorily determined and changes are not as frequently desired or made.

As there was a unit increase in the age of the oldest child, complexity increased by .161. This may give further insight to the standard situation by indicating that as children get older, they are more able to express ideas and opinions about the way resources might be managed in the home, thus involving more participation in the setting of standards for various plans.

As the age of the wife increased one unit, the complexity of the standard also increased by .154. This indicates more opportunity of the wife to acquire suggestions or help from other family members as her age increases.

As the Index of Social Position increased by one unit, the complexity of the standards increased by .046. A possible explanation for this correlation is that increase in status exposes the members to more ideas of alternative quality or quantity for standards.

Agreement on Standards and Reality

Agreement on standards was also significantly associated with reality of standards ($r = .321, p < .01$). As the agreement between husband and wife increased, the number of times the expectations were reached also increased. Extent of reality was indicated by the frequency with which the wife's expectations were met on the amount of time spent on household repair, the way the children cared for their rooms and the care of the kitchen (Table II).

Awareness of Meal Standards and Awareness of Repair Standards

Awareness of meal standards and awareness of repair standards
were also significantly associated ($r = .339, p < .01$). The awareness was determined by the responses to the questions asking for the reasons for satisfaction with parts of the meal and with a recent repair in the household. The mean number of reasons for repair satisfaction was 1.65, s.d. .77. The mean number of reasons for the satisfaction of the meal was 10.96, s.d. 3.28. The mean for the awareness of meal standards was determined from totaling responses to six questions. The awareness of repair standards was determined from one question. The correlation indicates some association between the standards for one task and those of another. It might be assumed that it partly is due to a general managerial ability to set standards though other factors may also be involved.

The awareness of repair standards was analyzed for any variance due to the type of repair, how long ago it had been done, who had done the repair and the approximate cost of the repair. None of these factors accounted for a significant amount of variance.

Awareness of meal standards was also analyzed for the time period of recall and meal type but neither factor accounted for a significant variance.

Significant correlations also existed between the total awareness score and the components of the score, meal awareness ($r = .979, p < .01$) and repair awareness ($r = .521, p < .01$). This is expected due to the method of combining scores on meal awareness and repair awareness to obtain the total score.

No significant correlations occurred between any other managerial variables. This suggests that the remaining variables of flexibility
and situationality were measures of independent activities. Flexibility was measured from the responses of the homemakers to her willingness to vary the temperature, cooking time, flavor, amount served and appearance of the main dish she had prepared for a previous family meal (Table 12). The skewness of the responses indicates the need for improving the measure.

Table 12. Means and Standard Deviations for Factors of Flexibility Variable

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors of Flexibility</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking Time</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flavor</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount served</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total flexibility</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Degree of flexibility on each item ranged from high (3) to low (1). The total possible score ranged from 0 to 15.

To summarize, there is some basis to reject the null hypothesis that there is no association between the management components measured in the study. Not all of the measures are independent of each other. Some dependence was indicated between agreement on standards and complexity and reality of standards. Some association between awareness of standards on two different tasks was noted. No association occurred
among flexibility, situationality, reality, complexity and awareness of standards.

The independent variable of number of children accounted for variance in agreement on standards. Years of marriage, age of oldest child, age of wife and Index of Social Position accounted for variance in the component of Complexity. Meal-types accounted for variance in situationality.

**Satisfaction Analysis**

**Satisfaction and standard variables**

Agreement on standards was significantly associated with the wife's satisfactions with the organization of household work ($r = .285, p < .01$) and her satisfaction with the amount of family help ($r = .232, p < .05$). These correlations suggest that evaluation processes, with standards as a criteria, are not independent of the consensus achieved between husband and wife.

Reality was significantly associated with the wife's satisfaction with income ($r = .200, p < .05$), her satisfaction with her organization of work ($r = .488, p < .01$), with the amount of family help received ($r = .283, p < .01$) and with her overall managerial ability ($r = .263, p < .01$). The data suggests a firm association between frequency of meeting expectations and positive evaluation.

Situationality or the adapting of the standard to existing conditions was inversely correlated with the score for overall meal satisfaction ($r = -.286, p < .01$). As more adapting occurred, there was less association with the overall meal satisfaction. Overall satisfaction was determined by the wife's response to degree of
satisfaction with the meal as a whole. The data suggest some complicating factors when adapting occurs that relate to the degree of satisfaction.

**Intercorrelations of satisfaction variables**

It was assumed that the end goals for which the degrees of satisfaction were reported were all related to managerial behavior. Correlations, as indicated in Table 13, show six significant associations representing almost one-half of the fifteen possible associations. This gives support to the assumption by indicating that the satisfactions measured have some factors in common.

The total satisfaction with the meal was obtained by summing degrees of satisfaction of various parts of the meal as indicated in Table 10. The satisfaction with the overall meal was obtained from responses to a general question about the same meal.

In summary, there is evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there is no association among satisfactions of various goals or between satisfaction with the various goals and the aspects of standards measured in this study.

The independent variable of Index of Social Position accounted for variance in the wife's satisfaction with the amount of help received from family members. The age of the oldest child accounted for variance in the amount of satisfaction with the homemaker's organization of work.
Table 13. Significant Correlations of Satisfaction Variables
(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Variables</th>
<th>r value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with organization of household work and amount of help received from family members</td>
<td>.488**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall managerial ability</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with amount of help received from family members and overall managerial ability</td>
<td>.255**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall meal</td>
<td>.204*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with overall managerial ability and total satisfaction with meal</td>
<td>.234*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with overall meal and total satisfaction with meal</td>
<td>.264**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 level of significance = .194
** .01 level of significance = .252
The major purpose of the study was to investigate the interrelatedness of certain qualities of family relationship behavior and the standards component of planning in nonmarket situations. Secondary interests were to investigate the association between various measures of managerial activity as well as association between certain of the wife's satisfactions and managerial and relationship behavior. The variables were also analyzed for the amount of variance due to the independent factors of number of children, years of marriage, age of the oldest child in the home, age of the wife, education of the wife and the Index of Social Position. Some of the components were further analyzed for variance due to meal types; time period of meal recall; time, cost, type and person(s) doing a household repair.

It was assumed that behavior of family members has meaning for both managerial and relationship aspects. It was also assumed that distinction between these behavior interpretations could be made in the responses of individuals to measures designated for that purpose.

---

1 Hollingshead, Two Factor Index.

2 Walker, Homemaking Work Units.
Two measures of relationship qualities were used. One represented the wife's estimate of the amount of agreement existing between herself and her husband on marital role topics as used by Hobart and others.\(^3\) The second was the amount of social-emotional activity between the wife and husband as scored by the wife. The social-emotional activity was defined as expressive behavior or instances of sharing of feelings and opinions. Questions from a study by Levinger were used to obtain these data.\(^4\)

The managerial measures were developed from the theoretical and operational definitions used by Maloch and Deacon in research at the Ohio Agricultural and Research Development Center.\(^5\) They included awareness of standards, agreement on standards and the attributes of standards identified as flexibility, reality, complexity and situationality. Indications of satisfaction with various managerial goals were also obtained.

The sample was composed of a group of 104 families randomly selected from four middle-income housing areas of a medium-sized Ohio city. All were intact families with a broad range in the age of children as well as age of homemakers and years of marriage. The average for the children's age was 11.9 years and for number of children living in the home, was 2.6. High school was the highest educational level achieved by the

\(^3\)Hobart, personal correspondence and Kirkpatrick and Hobart, "Disagreement and Disagreement Estimate."

\(^4\)Levinger, "Task and Social Behavior."

\(^5\)Maloch and Deacon, "Managerial Components".
majority of the husbands and wives. Husbands were most frequently on
the fourth and fifth level of the Occupational Scale which included
skilled, manual employees or clerical and sales workers, technicians
and owners of little businesses. Approximately one-third of the wives
were employed.

The measures were administered in an interview of approximately
one-half hour in the home of each homemaker. Correlation and the least
squares method of analysis were used to examine interaction among the
variables. Significant findings are summarized by the hypotheses stated
in the study followed by a summary of the effects of the independent
variables.

1. There was evidence that the hypothesis of no association be-
tween relationship qualities and managerial components could, in part,
be rejected. Significant association was found between the managerial
aspect of situationality and marital role agreement.

Although not indicated in the hypothesis, further significant
associations were found between satisfactions of the wife with the
amount of help she received from family members and both relationship
measures. Likewise, there was a significant association between the
wife's satisfaction with her organization of household work and marital
role agreement.

2. There was evidence that the hypothesis of no association among
managerial components could, in part, be rejected. The managerial com-
ponent of agreement on standards was significantly associated with
complexity and reality of standards. There was a lack of association
among the components of flexibility, situationality, reality and
complexity.

3. The hypothesis that satisfaction variables are not associated with each other or with other managerial components could be rejected. Six of the fifteen possible associations among satisfaction variables were significant. Agreement on standards was significantly associated with the wife's satisfaction with organization of household work and with the amount of family help. The managerial component of reality was significantly associated with all satisfaction components except for the two referring to satisfaction with meals.

The number of children accounted for some variance in the agreement on standards. The years of marriage, age of wife and age of oldest child accounted for variance in the complexity of the standards. The age of the oldest child also accounted for variance in the wife's satisfaction with her organization of household work. The Index of Social Position accounted for variance in the complexity of the standard and the wife's satisfaction with the amount of family help.

The type of the meal was the only factor accounting for differences in the meal-related factor of situationality.

Conclusions

From a summary of the findings the following conclusions have been made.

Some managerial and relationship behaviors are interrelated although support was not found for most of the associations tested. Whether lack of evidence is due to actual independence of behavior or to lack of adequate measures was not determined in this study.

There is some evidence for the independence of the attributes of
standards as identified and defined by Maloch and Deacon. The managerial components identified as agreement on standards was not independent of complexity and reality as measured.

Evidence was found for the interdependence of the satisfactions of the homemakers with managerial-related goals and with the managerial components of reality and agreement on standards.

The independent variables related to family composition, family life cycle and social status were also found to make some difference in the managerial and satisfaction variables.

Recommendations

Further validation and tests for reliability of measures is needed for managerial components and managerial-related satisfactions. Maloch and Deacon's identification and operationalizing of the components, which this study has helped to supplement, provides a base for further testing. Some clarification of definitions is also suggested for flexibility, situationality and complexity.

Agreement on standards was identified as a managerial component. Since agreement on standards would indicate the same qualities and/or quantities of standards were recognized by the husband or wife, the shared meaning might also be considered within the relationship context. Further study of the content of managerial-related agreement within family groups may be a way to promote identity of interrelationships of the two areas of home management and family relationships.

Interrelatedness of managerial and relationship behavior will be better tested as more reliable managerial measures are developed. Further development of measures of relationship qualities is also needed.
Such measures are dependent on more adequate defining of relationship qualities.

With improved measures for testing, study of different income levels and family types will further clarify the concepts and inter-relations and provide a base for theoretical development. Testing of concepts based on responses from other family members is also suggested.
AWARENESS OF STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: definition of standard includes its actual verbalization or capability of being verbalized

Operational definition: extent of indication of what makes a good, desirable, worthwhile product, action, or activity in the home

Operational test:

19. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the nutritional value of the meal?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

20. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the preparation of the meal?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

21. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the family likes and dislikes included in the meal?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

22. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the amounts of food served?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

23. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the flavors of the food served?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

24. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the cost range of the meal?
   b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

37. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the results of the repair?

38. Can you give me a number of reasons why you felt the repair was worth doing or not worth doing?

SCORE: Meal awareness - total of number of reasons for 19b - 24b.
Repair awareness - total number of reasons for 38. Total awareness - sum of reasons for meal awareness and repair awareness.

INTERPRETATION:* As scores increase, awareness of standards increase. Range not defined.
AGREEMENT ON STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: consensus on acceptable quality or quantity among individual family members

Operational definition: frequency of agreement among family members

Operational test:

29. How often do you and your husband have different opinions or ideas about how the house should look?

31. How often do you and your husband have different opinions or ideas on how much help to expect from the children?

Responses:

1) Very frequently
2) Frequently
3) Occasionally
4) Seldom
5) Never

SCORE: Weight response as indicated and total.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score, the higher the agreement.
Range from 2 to 10.
REALITY OF STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: feasible quantity or quality
Operational definition: qualities or quantities that are considered good or worthwhile are actually achieved or are possible with given resource potential

Operational test:

29. Was the time spent on the repair
   1) Very much more or very much less than you expected?
   2) A good deal more or less than you expected?
   3) Almost what you expected?
   4) Just what you expected?

40. How often does the kitchen area look as you like for it to look?

41. How often are you satisfied with the way your children take care of their rooms?

Response:
   5) Very frequently
   4) Frequently
   3) Occasionally
   2) Seldom
   1) Never

SCORE: Weight responses as indicated and total.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score, the higher the degree of reality of the standards. Range from 3 to 14.
COMPLEXITY OF STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: interrelationship of persons and standards
Operational definition: number of persons and tasks involved in a standard

Operational test:

27. How often do your husband or children make suggestions for what foods to serve at meals?

28. How often do your husband or children make suggestions for the appearance of the house?

30. How often do you have your husband's help with any of the household tasks?

32. How often do any of the family members make suggestions about any of the household tasks?

Responses:

5) Very frequently
4) Frequently
3) Occasionally
2) Seldom
1) Never

SCORE: Weight responses as indicated and total.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score, the higher the degree of complexity of the standards. Range from 4 to 20.
FLEXIBILITY OF STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: range of acceptable quality and/or quantity for a given situation
Operational definition: indication of willingness to change quality or quantity

Operational test:

1) very little 2) some 3) much

25. a. How much change could you make in: the serving temperature of yesterday's main dish and still be willing to serve it?
   b. the cooking time of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?
   c. the flavor of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?
   d. the amount prepared and still be willing to serve it?
   e. the appearance of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?

SCORE: Weight responses as indicated and total.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score, the higher the degree of flexibility of the standards. Range from 5 to 15.
SITUATIONALITY OF STANDARDS

Theoretical definition: relationship of standard to existing conditions
Operational definition: indication of adapting the standard to existing conditions

Operational test:

26. I am going to name several conditions that might occur to change your meal situation from the way it was yesterday. Would you tell me whether you would still be willing to serve the same dish as yesterday?

Would you serve it

0) Yes 1) No

a. if your husband were not at home?
b. if an adult relative were eating with you?
c. if it had been closer to or further from payday?
d. if you had less time in the day?
e. if you had had more time in the day?
f. if you had been in a different mood?

SCORE: Total the No column.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score the higher the degree of situationality of standards. Range from 0 to 6.
SATISFACTION

Theoretical definition: result of a process of judging or evaluating an object, person, place, etc., against a certain standard and finding a degree of value or fulfillment of the standard.

Operational definition: degrees of satisfaction responses to objects which represent end values.

Operational tests:

18. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the meal as a whole?

19. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the nutritional value of the meal?

20. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the preparation of the meal?

21. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the family likes and dislikes included in the meal?

22. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the amounts of food served?

23. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the flavors of the food served?

24. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the cost range of the meal?

37. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the results of the repair?

42. How well satisfied are you with:

   a. what your income will buy
   b. the way your work is organized
   c. the help you receive from family members
   d. your overall ability to manage your family's resources

(Give homemaker card indicating possible responses of satisfaction.)

Responses:

5) Quite Satisfied  4) Somewhat Satisfied  3) Neutral  2) Somewhat Dissatisfied  1) Quite Dissatisfied

SCORE: Weight items as indicated. Overall Meal satisfaction-score of no. 18. Total Meal satisfaction - total of weighted responses on items 19a - 24a. Repair satisfaction - score of no. 37. General satisfaction goals - score on each item 42a - 42d.

INTERPRETATION: Satisfaction increases as score increases. Range on Total Meal from 4 to 30. Range on others from 1 to 5.
SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL ACTIVITY

Theoretical definition: expressive behavior between husband and wife, associated with maintenance of social relationships within the context of the marriage relationship, in the long run, depends on a degree of reciprocation.

Operational definition: frequency of wife's sharing feelings and opinions

Operational test:

1. How often do you talk about your feelings with your husband when bothered or upset?

2. When there is a difference of opinion, how often do you find yourself making an effort to find out your husband's point of view?

3. How often do you ask your husband about what he has done during the day?

4. How often do you find yourself telling your husband about the things you have done during the day?

5. How often do you find yourself praising your husband when he has done something you like?

6. How often does your husband kiss you when he (or you) leaves for or returns from work?

Responses:

5) Very frequently
4) Frequently
3) Occasionally
2) Seldom
1) Never

SCORE: Weight as indicated and total.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score the higher the amount of social-emotional (expressive) behavior performed by the wife. Possible range from 0 to 30.

SOURCE: Questions used in study by Levinger, answered by both husband and wife. N = 60 couples.* Positive correlations between ratings of husband and wives on all items.

*(Sample: 4-22 years of marriage, mean 13.6 yrs., age - late 30's, 3 children, upper class III on Hollingshead.)
MARITAL ROLE AGREEMENT

Theoretical definition: ability to function as a two-person family (social) group implies some degree of consensus between the two persons on topics related to family issues.

Operational definition: amount of agreement perceived by wife between herself and husband on marital role related topics.

Operational test: wife's opinion on list of 28 statements compared to wife's estimate of what her husband's opinion would be on the same statements. (Statements listed on interview schedule.)

No. of statements for each topic:

- Personal Freedom - 3
- Affection Area - 1
- Relative Dominance Area - 4
- Economic Roles Area - 4
- Marital Role Area - 4
- Child-rearing Area - 4
- In-law Relationships - 3
- Recreation and Social Area - 1
- Values on Neatness - 2
- Values in Home - 1
- Mobility - 1

Responses:

- (5) Strongly Agree
- (4) Agree
- (3) Undecided
- (2) Disagree
- (1) Strongly Disagree

SCORE: Items weighted and totaled for Part I - wife's opinion and Part II - wife's estimate of husband's opinion. Score is the difference between total on wife's opinion and total on wife's estimate of husband's opinion.

INTERPRETATION: The higher the score the more disagreement the wife perceives between her husband and herself. Range from 0 to 112.

SOURCE: Statements used in at least 3 studies by Hobart and others, answered by both partners. Statements administered to college students in varying degrees of acquaintance from first date through marriage. Item correlation by test-retest, after 13 days, N = 73, ranged from .60 to .90.
APPENDIX B
Table 14. Correlation Matrix of Family, Managerial and Satisfaction Variables

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-Emotional Activity</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>056</td>
<td>072</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>-008</td>
<td>-004</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Awareness</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>979</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>-086</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-121</td>
<td>-140</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>-212</td>
<td>-155</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>083</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Awareness</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>-040</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>-015</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>-149</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awareness of Standards</td>
<td>-000</td>
<td>-033</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-076</td>
<td>-128</td>
<td>-003</td>
<td>-118</td>
<td>-102</td>
<td>-172</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Standards</td>
<td>-312</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>-043</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>039</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>-035</td>
<td>-057</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>-076</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>-059</td>
<td>-029</td>
<td>-018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>-148</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>037</td>
<td>-026</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>-074</td>
<td>-021</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>094</td>
<td>026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational Satisfaction with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Family Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Managerial Ability</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>166</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Mean</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* .05 level of significance = .194
  .01 level of significance = .252
  (decimals have been omitted)
Table 15. Least Squares Analysis of Variance for Dependent Variables

(104 Families, April, 1969)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Constant Estimate</th>
<th>Mean or Least Squares</th>
<th>F Value (^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Agreement</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>12.323</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>3.610</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.108</td>
<td>10.914</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.763</td>
<td>22.485</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>99.407</td>
<td>2.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social- Emotional</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>7.696</td>
<td>.635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>8.832</td>
<td>.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>4.242</td>
<td>.350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>1.038</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>12.481</td>
<td>1.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Awareness</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>8.069</td>
<td>.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>24.260</td>
<td>1.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>27.478</td>
<td>2.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>8.864</td>
<td>.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>9.631</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement on Standards</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.388</td>
<td>18.413</td>
<td>8.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.232</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>1.290</td>
<td>.627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.695</td>
<td>.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td>.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>37.712</td>
<td>6.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>25.160</td>
<td>4.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>22.126</td>
<td>4.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>26.386</td>
<td>4.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>2.415</td>
<td>1.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>1.611</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>1.381</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. -- Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Constant Estimate</th>
<th>Mean or Least Squares Value</th>
<th>F Valuea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>1.468</td>
<td>1.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>4.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>1.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.102</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.088</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>5.474</td>
<td>4.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Managerial</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td>1.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>2.218</td>
<td>3.362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>.898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal Awareness</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.317</td>
<td>12.184</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>35.157</td>
<td>3.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>12.322</td>
<td>1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>20.670</td>
<td>1.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>6.894</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>10.890</td>
<td>1.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of meal</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meal type</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>9.356</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.482</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>1.991</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of meal</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>.467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meal type</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. -- Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Constant Estimate</th>
<th>Mean or Least Squares</th>
<th>F Value$^a$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situational-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.680</td>
<td>1.495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.145</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>.689</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.576</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of meal</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>.932</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal type</td>
<td>-.374</td>
<td>4.615</td>
<td>4.107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of meal</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal type</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Meal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>7.695</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>2.737</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>.713</td>
<td>18.805</td>
<td>3.009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>6.979</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of meal</td>
<td>-.250</td>
<td>1.547</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meal type</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>2.603</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair Awareness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>1.019</td>
<td>1.977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>1.910</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of repair</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>1.404</td>
<td>2.753</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of repair</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of repair</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.470</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person doing repair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td>-.893</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husband</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>.900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wife</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>1.729</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. -- Continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Constant Estimate</th>
<th>Mean or Least Squares</th>
<th>F Value&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reality</td>
<td>No. of children</td>
<td>-.330</td>
<td>12.139</td>
<td>3.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Years married</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>7.399</td>
<td>2.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of oldest child</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>5.227</td>
<td>1.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age of wife</td>
<td>-.062</td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>1.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Education of wife</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social position</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1.190</td>
<td>.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Type of repair</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>3.003</td>
<td>.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of repair</td>
<td>-.526</td>
<td>10.769</td>
<td>3.314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of repair</td>
<td>.266</td>
<td>5.074</td>
<td>1.561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person doing repair</td>
<td>no one</td>
<td>-1.760</td>
<td>7.259</td>
<td>1.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>husband</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>9.832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wife</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>9.411</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>both</td>
<td>.556</td>
<td>9.575</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Significant F value = p<0.05 = 3.95, p <0.01 = 6.93, d.f. = 1,91
INSTRUCTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

I. AT HOMEMAKER'S DOOR

1) Introduce yourself as being from The Ohio State University, School of Home Economics and explain that we would like to interview her if her household, in addition to herself and her husband, includes at least one child in school.

2) If homemaker asks, explain that interview will take about 30 minutes.

3) If it is not convenient for homemaker to have interview then, ask for another time that day or next day.

4) If homemaker asks for credentials, show her letter, if she doesn't ask, there is no need to offer.

5) If homemaker asks why she is being contacted, explain that lot numbers were chosen randomly.

II. INTERVIEW QUESTIONS (numbers below refer to no. of question on schedule)

1) Children includes own or any other dependent children living in the home at that time. Over 18, count as adult. Grandchildren living in family, count as own children.

22) & 3) Round ages to nearest whole number, i.e., if 6 months and above, round to the next year; if under 6 months, do not raise the number of years.

5) & 12) If the person (wife or husband) has had special training such as business college for one year, this is included under partial-college training. For courses attended under a year (i.e., less than 9 months) check high school graduate.

10) If husband's occupation is owner of business, ask for approximate size or worth. Can ask them to estimate amount and can then code as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>over $100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>$35,000 - 100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>$6,000 - 35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>under $6,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If husband's occupation is administrative, ask for some idea of how many men are under his supervision.

If manual skill is involved, or if machine operator occupation is not clear, can ask how much training is needed for job.

18-26) All questions refer to the meal discussed in first questions.

43) If homemaker does not understand standards, explain as measures of what is good or worthwhile, or as a basis of comparison.

III. ADDITIONAL FORMS

Explain to homemaker that last there are three forms for her to check. Ask her to please check the column nearest to her opinion. There are no right or wrong answers and her frank and sincere answers are most helpful to the research. Give forms, one at a time to the homemaker.

IV. CLOSING THE INTERVIEW

1) Check to be sure all questions have been answered.

2) Thank homemaker for her cooperation.

V. AFTER INTERVIEW (not in presence of interviewee)

1) Note time taken for interview and record on front page of schedule.

2) Write down any comments that you think would be helpful in revising questions and which indicate your impressions of homemaker's responses.

3) Fill in contact form.

VI. GENERAL INTERVIEW PROCEDURES

1) We expect you to make no response to the answer given by the homemaker. Try to avoid facial expressions which might make the homemaker feel that she had given an especially good or poor response.

2) Avoid any suggestion to homemaker as to what we "hope to find" in the study when introducing Yourself and the study. Stick with the idea that "we are trying to find out how homemakers do their household activities--how things
work out for them."

3) If you don't understand what the homemaker says, do not hesitate to ask again, or if unsure, repeat her words as you have them and ask if this is what she said.

4) During the interview, record what the homemaker says, NOT how it would sound best, or how you would say it.

5) BE SURE TO GET AN ANSWER FOR EVERY QUESTION. CHECK TO SEE THAT EACH PAGE IS COMPLETE BEFORE GOING ON. If the homemaker can't remember, record that she cannot remember.

6) After the interview, make any additions or marks on the schedule in red.
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Family Name ________________________________
Address ________________________________

Date of interview __________________________

_________ Beginning interview time ___________

_________ Ending interview time ______________

Interviewer Signature ______________________
Information to obtain at beginning of interview:

1. How many children do you have living at home? (Circle) 1  2  3  4  5  6
2. What are the ages of the children? ______  ______  ______  ______  ______
3. What is your age?
4. How many years have you been married including any previous marriage?
5. What is your last grade of schooling?
   1) Graduate professional
   2) Standard college or university graduation
   3) Partial college training (at least 1 year)
   4) High school graduate
   5) Partial high school
   6) Junior high school
   7) Less than seven years
6. Are you working for pay now? 0) No  1) Yes
7. What is your occupation? ________________________________
8. How many weeks were you employed during 1968? ____
9. Is your husband currently employed? (0) No  1) Yes
10. What is your husband's work? ________________________________
11. CODER ONLY  Scale Score ____ x  Scale Factor 7
12. What is your husband's last grade of schooling?
   1) Graduate professional
   2) Standard college or university graduation
   3) Partial college training (at least 1 year)
   4) High school graduate
   5) Partial high school
   6) Junior high school
   7) Less than seven years
13. CODER ONLY  Scale score on education ____ x  Scale factor 4
14. CODER ONLY  Total: Occupation factor + Education factor
2.

In order to better understand family life as it actually occurs in homes, we would like to ask you a few questions which will help us. The information will be confidential and added to that obtained from many other families. Some questions are about family meals and some are about other family activities.

15. When was the last time you had a main meal together as a family when you did the major preparation? (main meal not to include breakfast or lunch)

1) yesterday
2) within the week but other than yesterday
3) over a week ago

16. Would you tell me what foods you served at the meal?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOODS SERVED</th>
<th>AMOUNT OF PREPARATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) no additional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3) more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. CODER ONLY: Meal Type - 1) I, 2) II, 3) III, 4) IV
(Give homemaker card indicating possible responses of satisfaction.)

18. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the meal as a whole?

5) Quite satisfied 2) Somewhat dissatisfied
4) Somewhat satisfied 1) Quite dissatisfied
3) Neutral
19. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the nutritional value of the meal?

5) Quite satisfied  2) Somewhat dissatisfied
4) Somewhat satisfied  1) Quite dissatisfied
3) Neutral

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

20. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the preparation of the meal?

5) Quite satisfied  2) Somewhat dissatisfied
4) Somewhat satisfied  1) Quite dissatisfied
3) Neutral

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

21. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the family likes and dislikes included in the meal?

5) Quite satisfied  2) Somewhat dissatisfied
4) Somewhat satisfied  1) Quite dissatisfied
3) Neutral

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

22. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the amounts of food served?

5) Quite satisfied  2) Somewhat dissatisfied
4) Somewhat satisfied  1) Quite dissatisfied
3) Neutral

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?
23. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the flavors of the food served?

5) Quite satisfied  
4) Somewhat satisfied  
3) Neutral

2) Somewhat dissatisfied  
1) Quite dissatisfied

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

24. a. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the cost range of the meal?

5) Quite satisfied  
4) Somewhat satisfied  
3) Neutral

2) Somewhat dissatisfied  
1) Quite dissatisfied

b. Can you give me a number of reasons why?

25. a. How much change could you make in: the serving temperature of yesterday's main dish and still be willing to serve it?

b. the cooking time of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?

c. the flavor of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?

d. the amount prepared and still be willing to serve it?

e. the appearance of the main dish and still be willing to serve it?

1) very little  
2) some  
3) much
26. I am going to name several conditions that might occur to change your meal situation from the way it was yesterday. Would you tell me whether you would still be willing to serve the same dish as yesterday?

Would you serve it

a. if your husband were not at home?

b. if an adult relative were eating with you?

c. if it had been closer to or further from payday?

d. if you had had less time in the day?

e. if you had had more time in the day?

f. if you had been in a different mood?

Using the answers on the card would you please tell me how often the following events occur in your family?

27. How often do your husband or children make suggestions for what foods to serve at meals?

5) Very frequently ________ 2) Seldom ________
4) Frequently ________ 1) Never ________
3) Occasionally ________

28. How often do your husband or children make suggestions for the appearance of the house.

5) Very frequently ________ 2) Seldom ________
4) Frequently ________ 1) Never ________
3) Occasionally ________

29. How often do you and your husband have different opinions or ideas about how the house should look?

1) Very frequently ________ 4) Seldom ________
2) Frequently ________ 5) Never ________
3) Occasionally ________

30. How often do you have your husband's help with any of the household tasks?

1) Very frequently ________ 4) Seldom ________
2) Frequently ________ 5) Never ________
3) Occasionally ________
31. How often do you and your husband have different opinions or ideas on how much help to expect from the children?

1) Very frequently ________
2) Frequently ________
3) Occasionally ________
4) Seldom ________
5) Never ________

32. How often do any of the family members make suggestions about any of the household tasks?

1) Never ________
2) Frequently ________
3) Occasionally ________
4) Seldom ________
5) Very frequently ________

33. What was the last household repair that you or your husband have made around the house? (Include appliances, furniture, etc., but not cars, or remodeling projects)

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

34. When was it made?

1) Within last month __________
2) Over 1 month but within last 6 months ________
3) Over 6 months but within the last year __________

35. What costs did you have?

0) No costs ________
1) Between $1 and $10 ________
2) Between $10 and $25 ________
3) Between $25 and $50 ________
4) Over $50 ________
5) Don't Know ________

36. Who made the repair?

1) Husband ________
2) Yourself ________

37. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with the results of the repair?

1) Somewhat dissatisfied ________
2) Quite dissatisfied ________
3) Neutral ________
4) Somewhat satisfied ________
5) Quite satisfied ________
38. Can you give me a number of reasons why you felt the repair was worth doing or not worth doing?

39. Was the time spent on the repair

1) Very much more or very much less than you expected? _______
2) A good deal more or less than you expected? _______
3) Almost what you expected? _______
4) Just what you expected? _______

40. How often does the kitchen area look as you like for it to look?

5) Very frequently _______
4) Frequently ______
3) Occasionally ______

41. How often are you satisfied with the way your children take care of their rooms?

5) Very frequently _______
4) Frequently ______
3) Occasionally ______

Will you please think about the following areas that I will name and tell me which answer best fits your opinion? (Refer to responses on card.)

42. How well satisfied are you with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. what your income will buy</th>
<th>Quite Satisfied</th>
<th>Some Satisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Some Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Quite Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the way your work is organized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the help you receive from family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. your overall ability to manage your family's resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43. Are you aware of any homemaking standards that you have changed within the last year? (0) No ____, (1) Yes ____. If yes, would you please explain?

Before finishing will you please complete the following 3 forms. (Forms attached.)
FAMILY ACTIVITY

Would you please check the columns which most accurately answer the questions listed below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How often do you talk about your feelings with your husband when bothered or upset?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. When there is a difference of opinion, how often do you find yourself making an effort to find out your husband's point of view?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How often do you ask your husband about what he has done during the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How often do you find yourself telling your husband about the things you have done during the day?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How often do you find yourself praising your husband when he has done something you like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How often does your husband kiss you when he (or you) leaves for or returns from work?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FAMILY OPINION SURVEY - Part I**

Would you please check the columns which most nearly represents your opinion on the statement. If none of the columns are exactly what you think, check the closest one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>YOUR OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I want the kind of marriage in which the husband confides completely in his wife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I want the kind of marriage in which the wife confides completely in her husband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my marriage I expect the wife to adopt the political and religious beliefs of her husband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I want the kind of marriage in which the wife shows wifely devotion to her husband's convenience and comfort in the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my marriage I want the husband alone to make the important decisions for his family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my marriage I want the husband and the wife to have an equal voice in making family decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In case of conflict of interests in marriage I want the husband to decide the place of family residence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In my marriage I want the husband and the wife to decide jointly where we will live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAMILY OPINION SURVEY - Part I (Cont'd)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the wife to share, in proportion to time and ability, in the financial support of the family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel that the employed husband should help his home making wife with housework in the evening.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the husband to provide the wife with an adequate personal allowance to spend as she wants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the wife to budget and supervise the spending of the family income.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the wife to be first of all a mother and homemaker.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the wife to be primarily a career woman.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>In my marriage I want the wife to be a strong, self sufficient person, able to comfort and support the husband when he is discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I want the husband in my marriage to be a strong willed, self sufficient person who needs no support in life but who can comfort and protect his wife.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In my marriage I want my children to be raised so that they will always be obedient to their parents.

18. In my marriage I want our children to be strictly trained with the aid of physical punishment as needed.

19. In my marriage I want the father to have his way when there is a difference of opinion regarding the disciplining of the children.

20. In my marriage I want the wife to be responsible for training our children so that the husband can devote himself to his career.

21. I object to long and frequent visits from the husband's or the wife's parents after marriage.

22. In my marriage I accept an obligation to support the wife's parents, when this is necessary.

23. In my marriage I accept an obligation to support the husband's parents when this is necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
24. In my marriage I want the husband and wife to participate together in outdoor sports, such as golf, hiking, or swimming.

25. In my marriage I want the wife to be neat and well-groomed at all times.

26. In my marriage I want the husband to be neat and well-groomed at all times.

27. In my marriage I want my home to be a place where I can get away from people.

28. In my marriage I prefer to settle down and remain in one community for life (except for vacations).
FAMILY OPINION SURVEY - Part II

Would you please check the columns which you feel most nearly represents your husband's opinion on the statement. Again, if none of the columns are exactly what you think is his opinion, check the closest one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YOU HUSBAND'S OPINION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I want the kind of marriage in which the husband confides completely in his wife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I want the kind of marriage in which the wife confides completely in her husband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In my marriage I expect the wife to adopt the political and religious beliefs of her husband.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I want the kind of marriage in which the wife shows wifely devotion to her husband’s convenience and comfort in the home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In my marriage I want the husband alone to make the important decisions for his family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my marriage I want the husband and the wife to have an equal voice in making family decisions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In case of conflict of interests in marriage I want the husband to decide the place of family residence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In my marriage I want the husband and the wife to decide jointly where we will live.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. In my marriage I want the wife to share, in proportion to time and ability, in the financial support of the family.

10. I feel that the employed husband should help his home making wife with housework in the evening.

11. In my marriage I want the husband to provide the wife with an adequate personal allowance to spend as she wants.

12. In my marriage I want the wife to budget and supervise the spending of the family income.

13. In my marriage I want the wife to be first of all a mother and homemaker.

14. In my marriage I want the wife to be primarily a career woman.

15. In my marriage I want the wife to be a strong, self sufficient person, able to comfort and support the husband when he is discouraged.

16. I want the husband in my marriage to be a strong willed, self sufficient person who needs no support in life but who can comfort and protect his wife.
17. In my marriage I want my children to be raised so that they will always be obedient to their parents.

18. In my marriage I want our children to be strictly trained with the aid of physical punishment as needed.

19. In my marriage I want the father to have his way when there is a difference of opinion regarding the disciplining of the children.

20. In my marriage I want the wife to be responsible for training our children so that the husband can devote himself to his career.

21. I object to long and frequent visits from the husband's or the wife's parents after marriage.

22. In my marriage I accept an obligation to support the wife's parents, when this is necessary.

23. In my marriage I accept an obligation to support the husband's parents when this is necessary.
24. In my marriage I want the husband and wife to participate together in outdoor sports, such as golf, hiking, or swimming.

25. In my marriage I want the wife to be neat and well groomed at all times.

26. In my marriage I want the husband to be neat and well groomed at all times.

27. In my marriage I want my home to be a place where I can get away from people.

28. In my marriage I prefer to settle down and remain in one community for life (except for vacations).
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