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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Puerto Rico, an island of the Caribbean, is located in the torrid zone of the earth. Spain discovered and colonized Puerto Rico, and the Island remained its colony during four centuries.

At the end of 400 years of Spanish domination, toward the end of the nineteenth century, Puerto Rico - the smallest of the Greater Antilles - was surrendered to the United States of America. The Jones Act gave Puerto Ricans the American citizenship in 1917 and later in 1947, the U.S. Congress granted them the right to elect their own governor. In 1952, through Law 600 the U.S. Congress authorized the Islanders to write their own constitution thus creating the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The people who today make up Puerto Rican society are biological and cultural descendants of: the Borinquen Indians who inhabited the Island when it was discovered by Spain in 1493, of the Spaniards who colonized it until 1898, and of the Blacks who were imported from Africa as slaves. From 1898 until the present, insular generations have received other cultural influences from the American continents, especially North America.

Puerto Rican culture preserves certain features primarily rooted in the Spanish-Roman-Catholic tradition in which the qualitative importance of family relationships predominates.

Toward 1940 a new era arose with the organization of a new political party, the Popular Democratic Party, which proposed an economic reform program. The government focused its efforts upon the development of industrialization as the most promising road to the improvement of economic and social conditions.
A. Description of the Area of Concern

The economic growth of Puerto Rico, after three decades since the beginning in 1940 of the Economic Development Program known as, "Operation Bootstrap," has had a great impact on the family. Within a span of twenty-five years (1950-1975) the gross income increased from $828.7 million to $3.43 billion. The average income of the family which in 1960 was $2,539 increased to $4,930 (at constant dollars, 1954=100) in 1979 (Planning Board, 1980:30).

The family in Puerto Rico has been characterized by the traditional patriarchal pattern; however, the participation of women in the labor force, their economic and intellectual independence, plus their changing social roles, have transformed the family to one where both partners share authority.

The change in social roles seems to be an important factor in the adaptation of the modern family to new demands, while also being a source of stress and conflict. The socialization process was formerly intended to foster submission and dependency of women. Nevertheless, today's females having greater educational and employment opportunities, are more able to compete with males both intellectually and economically. These changes have become an additional source of stress to family life (Planning Board, 1980:15).

The family as a social microcosm has been pinpointed to reflect social change. Different sectors of the Puerto Rican community have indicated that family relations "are commercialized" and that women's jobs have altered family life (Lastra, 1964:30-33). Others mention the change in roles and norms as symptomatic of family crisis. It is also mentioned that the high rate of divorce is an indication of crisis in marriage and family life (Planning Board, 1980:15).

Mrs. Luz E. López, former director of the Family Institute of Puerto Rico once expressed: "The family appears not to be the major concern of our country. However, to the family are
attributed all the "evils," being the scape-goat of our society" (Lopez, 1977).

On the other hand, others have expressed that changes in family functioning are not symptoms of disorganization but of re-organization, in other words, of creative adaptive patterns in family life to new socio-economic circumstances (Sánchez Hidalgo, 1964:50).

Changes in roles and functions of the married couple as well as the economic independence of the wife have raised women to an egalitarian position in the family. The higher position of the wife has brought a change of values towards marriage, now being perceived as the major cause of the increase in divorce rates (Planning Board, 1980:16). In 1932, 1,150 couples were divorced, a rate of 0.7 per thousand habitants. Eighteen years later, in 1950, total divorces were 3,591, a rate of 1.6. A decade later, in 1960, the rate increased to 2.3 for 5,386 divorces. A constant increase prevailed until 1972, peaking at a rate of 4.7, the highest registered in Puerto Rico. In 1977 a decrease was noted; the rate fluctuated around 4.0. In 1978 the rate was 4.4 (Department of Health, Vital Statistics, 1978).

According to the 1970 Census data, 78.8 percent of families were headed by both husband and wife, and 15.6 percent were headed by single females as compared to 5.6 percent being headed by a single male.

Different community sectors concerned by the above indicators of social change have led to the creation of The Commission for the Protection and Strengthening of the Family. These efforts have focused on preserving and reinforcing the Puerto Rican family.

The Council on Higher Education also being interested in the social problems of the Island, organized different committees composed of educators representing both public and private organizations to deal with current social issues. A committee
was organized to deal with family issues on the basis of assessment of research findings and through organized hearing by various scholars; as a result, a set of recommendations were submitted to the Governor's Office. This committee's analysis stated that frequently, authorities of different fields looked at the family as the cause of the existing problems of the Puerto Rican society. For them, the family has neglected or delegated most of its functions to the school, the church or the state (Consejo Educación Superior, 1980).

The Planning Board has emphasized the importance of understanding the problems of the family in Puerto Rico within the context of its structural and functional changes. Implicitly this means, "to compare the preindustrial family to the recent modern, urban family of an industrial society" (Planning Board, 1980).

Life Cycle, Mental Health and Quality of Life in Puerto Rico, a document prepared by the Commission of Mental Health in 1976 presents the following sources of additional tensions affecting the family:

1. Absence of a set of values or motivations shared by the members of the family. Rapid changes occurred in Puerto Rico which have brought together three generations with markedly different sets of values.

2. Tensions produced by unattainable goals or by lack of identification of the means to attain the ends.

3. Tensions produced by the extended family. There is a tendency in young people to avoid their responsibility toward relatives or kin.

The increased number of women in the labor force, changes in socialization and adaptation processes, technological innovations, and the influence of more industrialized societies are considered to be determinant factors to the new set of values within the family. Married women of all age groups are becoming employed in increasing numbers. Even the segment of mothers with preschool
age children, who are the least likely to work, are entering the labor force in substantial numbers.

In preindustrial times, the family was viewed as a pivotal political, religious and economic unit. Its members received their education and met their emotional needs within its boundaries, though the latter needs were then secondary concerns (Burgess and Locke, 1953; Aries, 1962; Goode, 1963). As societies became industrialized, many of the traditional family functions were transferred to external organizations. Although the contemporary family still shares responsibility for these functions, it alone is assigned responsibility for satisfying emotional-nurturant needs. Most people view the family primarily as an emotional unit, oriented to individual well-being, and as the group where to find stable and supportive interpersonal relationships, mutual sharing and intimate communication (Burgess and Locke, 1953).

The extent to which family life can satisfy personal needs depends on the control that family members exert over their mutual needs. Family functioning cannot be maintained without resources derived from external organizations. These resources are available according to managerial practices, business hours, and other operational demands and not often according to family members' choices of what would be best for them. The consequences of this dependence affect all family tasks, often interpreted as purely internal family matters, provoking tensions in the structure and function of the family.

Most working couples spend their days apart in different settings, doing work in response to different types of demands. In addition, whether working outside the home or not, women are looked upon as responsible for family harmony, stability and the emotional well-being of its members. Besides, the conventional division of labor creates different expectations based on sex role stereotypes. Family members therefore must adapt to external organizations which generally demand commitments. The impact on
the internal structure and function of the family is usually ignored.

B. Problem Studied

The problem studied in the research is the cohesion and adaptation of the working families in Puerto Rico and the extent to which they are adjusting to external and internal circumstances.

In light of environmental demands and rapid socioeconomic changes on the Island, the family as a group should develop incentives to retain its members which could include uplifting its own attractiveness and devising restraints against desertion.

Finch (1979:15) recognizes the importance of rewards for the participation in or withdrawal from a social system such as the family. The empirical problem presented in his work is conducive to the identification of particular rewards the family system generates. One of the possible rewards the family system could generate to sustain itself is the sense of support for its members, both in economic and emotional spheres.

Research done on the Island has supported the passive role of the family toward social change. These studies emphasize the predominant idea that changes in roles, norms and values are symptoms of family deterioration (Planning Board, 1980). However, it is the contention of this writer that the family in Puerto Rico is involved in a process of reorganization, thus making adaptations to cope with the existing social environment.

According to Olson, Sprenkle and Russell (1979), basically, the most viable family systems are those with balanced components of cohesion. It is hypothesized that when separateness and connectedness are balanced, there is a better functional basis for the identified issues and the family is able to deal more effectively with situational stress and developmental change. Because of cultural differences, it is possible for some families to operate at extreme points without problems.
Family adaptability is the second dimension necessary to its maintenance (Olson, Russell and Sprenkle, 1979). It is the ability of the family system to change its power structure, role relationships and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stresses.

Family cohesion and adaptability are two dimensions of family behavior which emerge from a conceptual clustering of concepts developed to describe marital and family dynamics (Russell, 1980). Cohesion has to do with the degree to which an individual is separated from or connected to his/her family system. Adaptability focuses on the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change.

In both processes a balanced level of moderate cohesion or a central level of adaptability is more conducive and practicable for family functioning.

C. Purpose of the Research

This research was to measure the cohesion and adaptation of two different types of families in Puerto Rico. Its primary objective was to determine the degree of family cohesion and adaptation looking for differences between them.

Two types of families were observed:
- two parent family - both working.
- two parent family- only the father working.

Major Research Question:
The major research question was: Is there a significant difference in the types of families in their degree of cohesion-adaptation?

Also implied is the level of cohesion and adaptation in relation to the parent's job and to the internal factors of family size, income, economic expenditures, family members' difficulties and problems with relatives.
Minor Research Questions:

1. Is there a relationship between the degree of cohesion-adaptation and internal constraints of the two-parent family?

   The internal constraints considered were: economic expenditures, difficulties or problems of family members and difficulties with relatives.

2. Is there a relationship between cohesion-adaptation and contingencies of the parent's job?

   The contingencies of parent's job considered were: flexibility of working schedule, job satisfaction and security.

D. Major Hypothesis

The degree of cohesion-adaptation is significantly different between the types of families compared.

E. Minor Hypotheses

1. The degree of cohesion-adaptation is significantly related to the size of the family.

2. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families varies significantly according to the income level of the family.

3. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of the families is significantly related to the economic expenditures of the family.

4. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families is significantly related to the existence of family members' difficulties.

5. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families is significantly related to the amount of problems with relatives.

6. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families is significantly related to a flexible schedule of parent's work.

7. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families is significantly different according to parent's job security.
8. The degree of cohesion-adaptation of families is significantly different according to parent's job satisfaction.

F. Definitions of Important Terms and Concepts

1. Accessibility of job - job location within community distance.

2. Internal constraints of the family - events that occur within the family which create uncertainty or discomfort to other family members. These occurrences may negatively affect family functioning.

3. Difficulties of family members - interpersonal difficulties, abnormal behavior or situations which are of concern to family members and the community.

4. Economic expenditures - money spent by the family for daily living needs of its members.

5. Economic stress - strain caused by the scarcity of adequate income which makes difficult the acquisition of resources to meet family needs.

6. Problems with relatives - interpersonal conflicts between family members and relatives who live outside the home and are not part of the system.

7. Flexibility of working schedule - extent to which arrangements of the worker's regular schedule can be modified to satisfy personal/family needs.

8. Security of the job - sense of assurance and stability derived from the job. Not working on a temporary basis. Freedom from fear of losing the job.

10. Adaptation - ability of the family system to change its power structure, role relationships and relationship rules in response to situational or developmental stress.

11. Cohesion - emotional bonding that family members have toward each other and the degree of experienced individual autonomy.
F. Significance of the Problem and Research Rationale

It is important to recognize that the family in Puerto Rico is adjusting to new situations, especially that of the active role of their members in the labor force. The present generation, having been raised in a family of traditional patterns finds itself living within a different family organization. Thus, the writer assumes that the family as a system is in a process of change, making the best of it in order to satisfy the needs of its members.

This research intends to examine family functioning, and perhaps point out that the family is functioning better than what several sectors of the community have claimed and that some of the criticisms are unfounded. Changes in relationships and the structure of the family rather than weakening traditional rewards to their members, are really coping mechanisms for adapting to external circumstances. Some of those external circumstances are the women working outside the home, who are heading a family and struggling to overcome the socioeconomic changes on the Island.

The findings of this study could be useful in understanding the current state of the cohesion and adaptation adjustments being made by different types of families. This study could also be useful in the development of a social policy oriented at making jobs or employment more responsive to family needs.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A. Historical Background of Family Cohesion-Adaptation Conceptualization

In the last decade, a considerable number of concepts have emerged describing family dynamics. These terms originated in various fields such as family therapy, family sociology, small group theory, social psychology and social anthropology. However, all these concepts must be interpreted within the cultural norms of the particular society where the family operates.

The extreme family togetherness has been described in psychiatry by Wynne, et. al. (1958) as "pseudo-mutuality," by Bowen (1960) as "undifferentiated family ego mass," by Stierlin (1974) as "binding," and by Reiss (1971) as "concensus-sensitive families."

Stierlin (1974) clarified the struggle to balance separateness and togetherness in families by identifying two opposite forces, centripetal and centrifugal. High family cohesion can be viewed as a centripetal force pulling family members toward each other into an intellectual and emotional "oneness." This cohesiveness is contrasted with the centrifugal force, which pulls family members away from the family system. According to Stierlin these forces become dysfunctional when they are inappropriately timed or excessively intense so that only one extreme predominates. He states that a family system operates most effectively when these two opposing forces operate in a more or less balanced manner.
Family sociologists have also identified a cohesion dimension in their work. Hill (1949) combined the variables "adaptability" and "integration" in his study of families under stress from war separation and reunion. Hess and Handel (1949) ranked "connectedness" as central to their theory of family behavior. Nye and Rushing (1969), identified six dimensions of family solidarity, which are conceptually similar to what is called family cohesiveness. The six dimensions are: associational integration, affectual integration, consensual integration, functional integration, normative integration and goal integration.

Calette Carisse (1975), a sociologist, developed a typology of styles and utilized cohesion as one dimension. For her, extreme togetherness was a "pathogenic pursuit of concensus" or total personal identification was "pathogenic pursuit of interpersonal distance."

Cartwright and Zander, small group theorists, have described cohesion as the resultant of all the forces acting on all the members to remain in the group (1962:74). Social psychologists interested in the family as a small group have also identified the cohesion dimension. They use the term solidarity, defining it as the member's attraction to the group (Festinger, Schachter, and Back, 1950; Thibaut and Kelly, 1967).

Rosenblatt, a social psychologist with an anthropological orientation, described the extremes as togetherness and apartness; he claimed that families need to find an optimal balance between time together and time apart. Along with Titus (1976), Rosenblatt described how family members can legitimate being away from home, but can also isolate themselves from each other while being at home.

Anthropologists have also discussed the significance of togetherness in one culture in contrast to others (Stephens, 1963). Some cultures maintain separateness in the family in a way that the husband and wife do not live, sleep, or even eat together. Western cultures mostly encourage individual freedom and autonomy,
and also emphasize the belief that couples and families should spend considerable time together as a unit.

In sum, concepts drawn from various fields demonstrate that the cohesion dimension is an important aspect of the family as a group. Its salience and significance are observed by the interest among different disciplines including the social work profession (Hartman, 1977; Seymour, 1976; Coyle, 1962).

Proponents of systems theory have contributed to the family field by elaborating systems adaptability concepts (Von Bertalanffy, 1968; Buckley, 1967; Anderson-Carter, 1978). Buckley identifies the importance of both positive and negative feedback. Positive feedback provides the family system with constructive, systems-enhancing behavior that enables it to grow, create, innovate and change-system morphogenesis. In contrast, negative feedback attempts to maintain the status quo or morphostasis.

Both change (morphogenesis) and stability (morphostasis) are hypothesized as necessary for a viable family system. Those systems which maintain a balance between change and stability are in a normal state (Olson, Sprenkle, Russell, 1979:12). In times of stress families may require greater morphogenesis (change) while still maintaining some degree or morphostasis (stability).

Without some optimal degree of morphostasis, the family system could not survive as a cohesive viable social unit. Extreme morphogenesis, tantamount to constant change would preclude building up of even a minimal set of common meaning, values and expectations, essential for communication and the survival of an intimate, face-to-face group (Wertheim, 1973:365).

The developmental approach to family analysis (Hill, 1971) views families as capable of change, of adapting to and reorganizing their structure. The family group is changing in relation to the age of its members, its composition and redefinition of rules. So, a family locked in a rigid pattern could be in trouble. Rappoport (1962) argued that a family must be able to adapt to normal crises, as transition to parenthood, placement of children
in school, the encouragement and acceptance of autonomy in adolescence, the launching of children, and adjustment to retirement.

Family adaptability has also been identified by other theorists as important. Clark Vincent (1966) points out that this function is vital to highly changing societies since it serves as the mediating function between individuals and other social structures. He states:

The rapid and pervasive social changes associated industrialization necessitate a family system that both structurally and functionally is highly adaptive externally to the demands of other social institutions and internally to the needs of its own members. (1966:29)

B. Theory Relevant to Research Hypothesis

Cohesion and adaptation, dimensions which describe family dynamics emerge from the analysis of concepts which describe marital and family dynamics (Olson et al., 1980). These authors, after reviewing the conceptual definition of numerous concepts of marital and family dynamics come to the conclusion that despite the creative terminology, family cohesion and adaptation are very similar and highly related ideas. The processes involved deal with the degree to which an individual is separated from or connected to his/her family system (choesion). Adaptability is related to the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change. It assumes a dynamic movement of the family in a given direction according to the situation, stage of the family cycle, or socialization of its members.

According to Olson, et. al. (1979), an open system is distinguished by the individuals' ability to experience and balance the extremes of being independent from and connected to each other as they wish. However, they seldom remain at either extremes for long periods of time.
Cohesion is conceived as the emotional bonding members have with one another and the degree of autonomy a person experiences in the family system (Olson, 1979). An extreme degree of cohesion may result in an overidentification by members in the family and thus in an extreme bonding and very limited individual autonomy. A low extreme is characterized by low bonding and high autonomy from the family. A balanced degree of family cohesion is most conducive to effective family functioning and optimum individual development.

In assessing the degree of family cohesion, the specific variables that Olson, et. al. used were: emotional bonding, independence, boundaries, coalitions, time space, relationship of the family with friends, decision making, and interests and recreation of the family as a group.

Adaptability is the ability of a family system to change its power structure, role relationships, and relationship rules in response to situational and developmental stress. It is assumed that an adaptive system requires balancing of both change (morphogenesis) and stability (morphostasis) (Olson, 1979). The specific variables of interest in terms of this dimension were: family power structure (assertiveness and control), negotiation styles, role relationships, and relationship rules and feedback (positive and negative).

A curvilinear relationship between effective family functioning and the cohesion-adaptation dimension has been hypothesized and applied to cultural contexts where normative expectations support both family togetherness and individual development (Olson, 1979). These double and conflicting expectations about family members in Western culture emphasize that there are things to do together as a family yet individuals are encouraged to "do their own things."

Most of the recent theorizing about family dynamics has been strongly influenced by the general system theory, as described by Von Bertalanffy (1968) and the family developmental view. Building on the family developmental approach as described by Hill and
and Rodgers (1969), it is asserted that families must change and adapt to their own normal transitions (Rapoport, 1962). Therefore, the stage of the family life cycle and composition of the family will have considerable impact on the type of family system. Although various families at the same stage will differ, it is expected that many of them will cluster at certain stages or transition points because they are dealing with similar developmental tasks.

Historically, the first major family study to include both family cohesion and adaptability and to combine them into family types was done in 1936 by Angell in his classic book on how families cope with depression. His two concepts were "family integration," which is very similar to cohesion, and "family adaptability." He defined integration as "the bonds of coherence and unity running through family life, of which common interests, affection, and a sense of economic interdependence are perhaps the most prominent" (Angell, 1936:15).

Family adaptability is related to how the family functions as a unit, its flexibility in meeting difficulties, its readiness to adjust to change, and its manner of making decisions. Dividing families into high, medium, and low categories on each dimension, Olson formed nine types of families, eight of which he empirically identified and described (Olson, 1979).

In two subsequent studies, Reuben Hill also used both integration and adaptability and combined them into a measure he called dynamic stability. In 1949, Hill's study, Families Under Stress, dealt with families undergoing separation and reunion. He devised family types by cross-classifying family integration and adaptability. He concluded that "taken as a whole, family integration is highly significant in predicting success both in separation and reunion, but... its relationship is higher with reunion adjustments than with separation adjustments" (Hill, 1949:132).
Moss and Moos (1976) utilized a Family Environment Scale (FES) with one hundred families and identified six typologies of families using cluster analysis of mean scores of family members. Of the ten concepts assessed by the FES, several relate directly to the cohesion and adaptability dimensions. The cohesion dimension was measured by two scales (cohesion and independence); adaptability was assessed by two scales (control and organization), and the communication dimension was measured by two scales (expressiveness and conflict). Although it was hoped that the FES could be used, a study made by Russell in 1978 revealed that the FES lacked construct validity for the cohesion and adaptability dimensions. As a result, a new self-report instrument, Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (FACES), was developed (Olson, Bell, and Portner, 1978), which is part of the data collection instrument used in this research.

In describing family adaptation, Minuchin (1974) indicated that stress often produces the need for family change. He believes that many families in treatment are simply going through transitions and need help in adapting to new situations. Stress could be produced by external or internal pressures in the family.

Richard Bell and Joyce Portner (1978) compared families with runaways and families in family therapy to a control group of about one hundred families without problems. It was predicted that families with runaways and those in family therapy would be more extreme on both the adaptability and cohesion dimension than the control group.

Russell (1979) hypothesized that moderate family cohesion and moderate adaptability would be more functional than either extreme. Thirty-one Catholic family triads with daughters ranging from age fourteen to seventeen years participated in a structured family interaction game (SIMFAM) and completed questionnaires that measured cohesion and adaptability and its relationship to creativity and support. High family functioning was associated with moderate family cohesion and adaptability, and low family functioning
was associated with extreme scores on these dimensions. As predicted, high family support and creativity were related to family functioning. It should be remembered that these families represent only one stage of the family life cycle - the family with adolescent children.

In conclusion, a growing number of studies have found the cohesion-adaptation dimensions important in understanding the family system, but most studies have relied on problem families that seek or are receiving treatment. Very little is known about those families that do not seek or are not receiving treatment.

C. Current Literature Relevant to Research Questions and Hypotheses

The picture of family adaptation to stress that emerges from Hill's (1949) framework and Burr's (1973) synthesis depicts the family as a reactor to stress and as a manager of resources within the family system. The active process of family adaptation involving coping strategies within the family as well as in transactions with the community have received limited attention in both research and theory building (McCubbin, 1979). However, there is a mounting belief among researchers and family clinical workers that understanding how families cope with stress is just as important as understanding the frequency and severity of life changes (McCubbin, et. al. 1980).

Family stress research has followed the course of examining the impact of social problems and has focused upon those life events and hardships which have gained prominence as a result of social interest and concern.

These investigations have revealed that family coping strategies are not created in a single instant, but are progressively modified over time (McCubbin, et. al. 1980). Because the family is a system, coping behavior involves the simultaneous management of various realms of family life: (1) maintaining satisfactory
internal conditions for communication and family organization,
(2) promoting member independence and self-esteem, (3) maintaining
family bonds of coherence and unity, (4) sustaining and developing
social supports in transactions with the community, and (5) supporting
some efforts to control the impact of stress and the amount of
change in the family unit. Coping then becomes a process for
achieving balance in the family system which facilitates organization
and unity and promotes individual growth and development.

One of the major thrusts of family stress research focuses
upon conflicts resulting from women participating in the labor
force (Rappoport and Rappoport, 1973). These studies of dual wage-
earner families have dealt with wives' emotional and social ad-
justment (Hoffman and Nye, 1974) and the effects of dual careers
on marital adjustment (Pleck, 1977). Studies which have emphasized
the effects of dual careers upon husbands' health and well-being
have been inconclusive. Burke and Weir (1977) found that husbands
of employed women were in poorer health and were less content with
their marriages than men whose spouses were not in the labor force.
In contrast, Booth (1979) has concluded that a wife's employment
does not contribute to marital discord and, in fact has beneficial
effects on the husband's well-being.

Joyce Portner (1978) describing the dual employment versus
the traditional breadwinner and housewife pattern summarizes:

One substantial review of research has concluded
that the difference between dual employment and
traditional couples, if it exists, at least in the
area of marital satisfaction, is really very small
(Nye, 1974). Studies of marital satisfaction,
according to Nye, have focused primarily on the
elements of stability, happiness, satisfaction,
level of stress and conflict, and general goal
fulfillment, which occur most commonly as definitions
of marital adjustments and success. He concluded
that studies between 1950 and 1965 often found that
married couples reflecting a traditional pattern of
employment and housework were just slightly more
satisfied with their marriages than those in non-
traditional situations. However, only in the lower
socioeconomic couples was the difference between traditional and dual employment couples substantial. Within the higher socioeconomic groups virtually no difference could be found (Nye, 1974).

Nye's review of more recent studies indicates that even this small negative difference within the middle class may have disappeared under the impact of the substantial numbers of women entering the labor force. This is more likely to be true for a family "if the number of children at home is small, the job she takes is one she enjoys, the husband's attitude is positive, and the husband and wife have advanced education" (Nye, 1974:206). Research by Orden and Bradburn (1969) indicates that both husbands and wives in dual employment families have higher marital satisfaction if the wife is working out of choice rather than out of economic necessity. One of the most recent studies on marital satisfaction, by Burke and Weir (1976), disclosed that although both husbands and wives experienced stress from dual employment, wives seemed to make a more satisfactory adjustment to this stress than husbands.

In contrast to the research findings on marital satisfaction, greater differences in the areas of power and decision-making between dual employment and traditional couples have been found. Power has been defined along dimensions such as perceived authority, success in conflict, acceptance of ideas, and control over spousal behavior (Bahr, 1974). One of the more comprehensive reviews which considered power and decision making dimensions in relation to dual partner employment was done by Bahr in 1974.

His general conclusion was that working women tend to gain power within the family when they become employed. This was particularly true in relation to financial matters. He suggested that this increase in financial power was sometimes accompanied, for the middle-class wife, by a decrease in power over household roles such as child care, housekeeping, and recreation. For the lower-class wife, the opposite was at times true. As Bahr (1974)
stated, "existing data indicate that the effects of her employment may be more pronounced in the lower class, in small families, and in families without preschool children" (Bahr, 1974:181). He further hypothesized that an increase in the woman's power occurs in cases where the value of the additional resources she provides the family through employment is greater than the value of the household services she no longer provides.

In terms of the division of household tasks, the husband's participation in household affairs is relatively small, even when the wife is employed (Walker, 1970; Quiñones, 1976). This works to the disadvantage of the wife when she is adding the hours of a job to her home schedule.

The number of hours spent on household work by a married woman has been estimated by some researchers to be as high as seventy-seven hours per week, while others indicate an estimate of forty hours per week (Kreps, 1971; Oakley, 1974; Walker, 1969, 1970). Walker, (1969) found that this amount of time was subject to significant variations depending upon the size of the family and the age of the children. The number of hours invested in housework also varied according to the number of hours the wife spent working outside the home. She found that full-time homemakers put in about eight hours per day, the same as the average full-time workday. Women working thirty or more hours outside the home still put in as many as five additional hours each day working on household activities. The investment of time by the husband in household activities began at a much lower level, averaging less than two hours a day, and did not substantially vary with the wife's employment (Walker, 1970).

Mortimer (1977) points out that this reality is somewhat in contrast to the way couples perceive the situation. She stresses that while both the husband and wife believe that there is greater sharing of household work when the wife is employed, the reality is that except when families have very young children there is no substantial difference in the amount of the husband's household assistance.
In contrast, single mothers live under constant time and energy pressures, and most of them have to contend with economic strains (Kamerman, 1980:128). Kamerman, who made a panel study of a group of mothers from different types of families and different socio-economic levels concluded that the major difference between the one and two parent family is economic. The single mother has less of almost everything except problems. She has less time, energy, and support both in and out of the home. These mothers often manage their homes, jobs and children in isolation.

Pleck, (et. al., 1980) in a survey made with working married men and women found that the conflicts most often related to family life were: excessive work time, schedule conflicts, and fatigue and irritability caused by work. Parents reported more conflict than other couples, but surprisingly women did not report more conflict than men, although the kinds of conflicts reported by the two sexes differed. Specific working conditions such as excessive hours at work, scheduling, and physically and psychologically demanding work were associated with experiencing work-family conflict, which in turn was related to diminished job satisfaction and contentment with life in general.

Ridley (1973) attempted to assess the relationship between job satisfaction, job involvement, and marital adjustment for married female teachers and their husbands. A major conclusion of this study was that there is a positive association between job satisfaction and marital adjustment. This interpretation was strengthened through the finding that job satisfaction and marital adjustment were significantly related when women viewed their work role as highly salient. When women perceive their work as relatively unimportant, it seems to make little difference in terms of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction derived from work and its impact on marital interaction.
D. Summary of Literature Review

The terminology used by theorists and researchers of family dynamics has been diverse, nevertheless their ideas appear to be highly related. The proponents have identified very similar conceptualizations as indicators of adequate or inadequate family functioning (Handle, 1949; Wynne, 1958; Bowen, 1960; Rappoport, 1962; Buckley, 1967; Nye and Rushing, 1969; Reiss, 1971; Hill, 1971; Stierlin, 1974; Calette Carisse, 1975; Rosenblatt, 1976).

Cohesion and adaptation have been recently introduced as concepts by Olson, Sprenkle, and Russell (1979, 1980). These researchers have integrated earlier conceptual formulations. This theoretical base has been used in this research to examine the level of family functioning in Puerto Rico. Cohesion is conceived as emotional bonding, and the degree to which an individual is separated from and connected to his/her family system. Adaptability is related to the extent to which the family system is flexible and able to change. It is assumed that dynamic movement on these dimensions takes place in the family in relation to circumstances, stages of the developmental cycle, and patterns of socialization. A balanced degree of family cohesion and adaptation is most conducive to effective family functioning and optimum individual development. This approach is applied to cultural contexts where normative expectations support family togetherness and individual development.

It is also hypothesized that the family as a system reacts, changes and transforms to stresses, life events and hardships (McCubbin, et. al, 1980). Coping strategies are developed by the family to manage various realms of family life. One of the stresses discussed in the literature is that of women participating in the labor force and the effects of women's employment in marital adjustment (Rappoport and Rappoport, 1973; Bahr, 1974; Hoffman and Nye, 1974; Pleck, 1977; Burke and Weir, 1977; Portner, 1978; Booth, 1979). Among the variables related to higher marital
satisfaction were: the wife working out of choice rather than out of economic necessity, a small number of children, the husband's positive attitude and the wife's advanced education (Nye, 1974). Higher power and decision making of the wife were found significant in lower rather than middle classes (Bahr, 1974). However the husband's participation in household tasks was relatively small even when the wife was employed (Walker, 1970; Quiñones, 1976).

Pleck (1980) demonstrated that married men and women perceived excessive work time schedules, work fatigue and irritability as sources of conflicts with family life. Job satisfaction and marital adjustment were significantly related when women viewed their work role as highly salient (Ridley, 1973).

Thus, utilizing the conceptualization of cohesion and adaptation of Olson, Sprenkle and Russell (1979, 1980) the questions of this research are addressed to the examination of family functioning when both parents work in contrast to family functioning when only the father works.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

A. Research Design

The research design used was a cross-sectional explanatory survey on a one time observation. Two different comparison groups were observed to look for the degree of cohesion-adaptation between both types of families.

B. General Characteristics of the Study Population

The population of this study consisted of two types of two parent families; both working partners and one working partner, the husband. The sample originated from the Master Sample of Caguas District of the Department of Labor.

The Caguas District named above includes the towns of Aguas Buenas, Cidra, San Lorenzo, Gurabo, and Caguas itself. All these towns are geographically located in the center of the Island.

The use of this source for sample selection permitted the access to different families from diverse socioeconomic levels and occupations.

C. Sampling Procedures

The sample of the study, selected from the Master Sample of the Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Labor of Puerto Rico, represented a cross section of a population of approximately 177,344 households.
For the selection of the sample, a search was done to identify the families where both partners work and those where only the husband works. Another selection criteria was that all families had at least one child over the age of twelve.

Approximately 950 control cards were revised in November of 1981, and separate lists for both groups were prepared. A total of 112 families were found where only the father worked and 70 families were located in which both parents work. Eighty-five families from the first group and fifty-two families from the second group were selected at random. The sampling error is estimated to be 9.5 percent.

A total of 27 families were eliminated, twenty-two of which were families where only the father worked. The reasons for elimination were unemployment, emigration, separation or divorce, death, refusal to answer or lack of understanding during the interview. In sum, 20 percent of the selected sample was eliminated.

The residence of the final sample of both types of families was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City or Town</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caguas</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aguas Buenas</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Lorenzo</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gurabo</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidra</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>63</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>57%</strong></td>
<td><strong>43%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 1** Residence Municipality of Families
The major proportion of the sample were families from Caguas, a town which is not representative of the towns of the Island. Caguas has been characterized as one of rapid mobility, urbanization and socioeconomic change in a short span of time. Since 1970, Caguas has been considered a metropolitan area (Planning Board, 1980).

D. Data Collection Schedule

The data collection schedule consisted of four parts:
1. General characteristics of the subjects.
2. Internal constraints of the family.
3. Opinions about work.
4. Cohesion and adaptation of the family.

Appendix A includes the various instruments used. A brief description of each section follows.

General Characteristics of the Subjects
This part consisted of 15 items: residence, age, sex, occupation, marital status, family size, care of children, number of prior marriages, years of schooling completed, accessibility of job, working schedule, amount of time working in present job, income, other earnings, and religion.

Internal Constraints of the Family
The variables included in this section were: difficulties of family members, economic expenditures, and difficulties with relatives. For each variable a Likert scale type of statement was prepared. The intention was to measure events occurring within a family which created uncertainty, and with which the family had to be prepared to cope since its functioning could be negatively affected.

Opinions About Work
In this section of the schedule three variables were included: flexibility of the working schedule, job security, and job satisfaction. These variables were considered linkages of the family with the external world.
For each variable a Likert scale type of statement was prepared. The first two scales were prepared by the author; the third one consisted of a six item job satisfaction scale originally developed by Aiken and Hage (1966) as part of their Alienation From Work Scale. These items were modified to be used by the respondents of this research who were professionals, skilled and unskilled workers.

FACES - Family Adaptability and Cohesion Evaluation Scales (David H. Olson, Richard Bell, Joyce Portner, 1978)

This part consisted of a hundred and eleven items systematically arranged to measure both cohesion and adaptation of the family system. The scale provides an assessment of cohesion and adaptation as perceived by each family member.

Adaptation has seven subscales, these being assertiveness, control, discipline, negotiation, roles, rules, and system feedback. Cohesion has nine subscales: emotional bonding, independence, family boundaries, coalitions, time, space, friends, decision making, interests and recreation of the family.

E. Validity and Reliability of the Data Collection Schedule

The reliability and validity of the instruments were measured by the pre-test after the translation into Spanish. The first three parts of the data collection schedule were constructed by the researcher and special consideration was given to their consistency.

The three scales included in part two of the data collection instrument, Internal Constraints of the Family, were pre-tested with fifteen respondents. A split-half test of reliability utilizing the Spearman Brown Proficiency formula yielded the following correlations: Difficulties with Relatives, $r = .93$; Economic Expenditures, $r = .64$; and Difficulties of Family Members, $r = .65$.

The three scales included in part three, Opinions About Work, were pre-tested first with six respondents. A low correlation between two of the scales was obtained and after a revision a second pre-test
was made. This second pre-test produced the following r values: Flexibility of Working Schedule, \( r = 0.67 \), Job Security, \( r = 0.65 \), and Job Satisfaction, \( r = 0.90 \).

The third part, FACES Scales, was originally developed by Olson, Bell and Portner in 1978. The internal consistency (alpha) reliability of the total scores for adaptability and cohesion was high (\( r = 0.75 \) and \( r = 0.83 \), respectively). However, the split-half reliability test for each of the subscales (cohesion and adaptation) was very low. As a result of these findings, total scores were used for cohesion and adaptability (Olson et. al., 1978). Dr. María E. Díaz, former professor from the Graduate School of Social Work of the University of Puerto Rico revised the Spanish version. This section was pre-tested with persons of different ages and school levels for accuracy in vocabulary comprehension.

F. Administration of the Data Collection Schedule

After the selection of the sample families, a letter was sent to them describing the nature and purpose of the study and asking for their voluntary participation.

Four interviewers were used to collect the data: two social workers with a bachelor's degree, a psychologist, and the researcher. The interviewers were trained by the researcher in the procedures of administering the data collection schedule. Because the aspect of cohesion-adaptation dealt with intimate patterns of relationships within the family, culturally which are considered private and delicate matters, skilled interviewers were essential to guarantee confidentiality as well as the accuracy of the observations. The schedule was administered in an interview to one, two or more members of the families depending on the accessibility of the family members. It was necessary to visit the family at different moments because not all the members were at home at the same time. The interviewers interpreted the instructions and explained those items that were unclear to the respondents. To those family members who had a lower
educational level, the interviewer read the statements and the interviewee selected the answer.

Part one was completed by the interviewer. Parts two and four were administered to all members of the family over twelve years of age, and part three was administered to those parents working outside the home.

The 110 families interviewed produced a total of 405 respondents, 220 parents and 185 children over twelve years. An average of four members (\(\bar{x}=3.68\)) for each family completed the data collection schedule.

It is important to remember that the data was based on the individual self-report which could be a subjective assessment. In other words, it was expected that individuals within the same family could see things differently. Because of that difference among family members' reports, it was necessary to devise a procedure to obtain a summary score. Thus an average was obtained on the individual member's scores on those variables measured by scales (difficulties of family members, economic expenditures, problems with relatives, job flexibility, job security, job satisfaction, and cohesion-adaptation).

G. Statistical Measurements Used for Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to describe demographic characteristics and scale distributions of: income, family size, difficulties of the members, economic expenditures, problems with relatives, flexibility of working schedule, job security, job satisfaction and cohesion-adaptation.

The major hypothesis was measured by the use of the T-Test to determine significance between the type of family and the major dependent variables. A .05 level of significance was assumed.

The cohesion-adaptation variable was analyzed by using Pearson Product Moment Correlation with the above mentioned variables.
I. Research Limitations

This study has several limitations: it is not representative of the Puerto Rican family since only two types of families were observed. The single parent family, the unemployed, retired, or disabled parent family were not taken into consideration. It is also not representative because of the small sample size and its restriction to a geographical area. The sample was taken from five towns in the center of the Island which included Caguas. This last town is one of high mobility and urbanization with a population of 118,500 for 1980 and is atypical from the rest of the Island towns in terms of family income.

Another limitation is the use of the FACES Scale to measure cohesion-adaptation. It must be acknowledged that the scale was developed within the United States and had to be translated for use in another culture. However it was pre-tested for vocabulary equivalencies and the utmost care was taken when translating the items to preserve their meaning.
CHAPTER IV
MAJOR FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA COMPARING
THE TWO TYPES OF FAMILIES

The description of the characteristics of the families in
light of the research purposes follows. Mean values, along with
the frequency distributions are presented for both types of families.

A. Family Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Size</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Value 5.43

As shown in Table 1, the mean values of each group did
not present a significant contrast in relation to the mean
value of the total sample. This finding is different from the
mean value for the Island. According to the Planning Board, the
average family size for 1980 was 3.7 members per family.
B. Residence

The residence of the two types of families differed: urban for families where both parents work; and rural for families where only the father works. Table 2 reveals this observation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Value 1.51 1.47 1.49

C. Age of Parents

The age of the parents were mostly between 40 to 45 years. It was expected that the family would be handling adolescents because of the sampling criteria that one child was over 12 years old. The age of fathers ($\bar{X}=44.9$) and mothers ($\bar{X}=42.2$) in the family where only the father works had a tendency to be older than the ages of fathers ($\bar{X}=42.87$) and mothers ($\bar{X}=39.94$) of the family where both parents work. In other words, the couple of working parents was younger than the couple where only the father works (See Table 3).

D. Number of Marriages

The present marriage was the first one for most of the parents in both groups. Eighty-five percent of both the fathers and mothers were married for the first time and 15 percent of the couples in both types of families were on their second or third
### TABLE 3 - Ages of the Parents by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Father's Age</th>
<th>Mother's Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>23 49</td>
<td>39 5</td>
<td>44.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>33 52</td>
<td>18 38</td>
<td>51 46</td>
<td>42.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td>16 15</td>
<td>44.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>4 7</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>42.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>57 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
<td>39.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>110 100</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>41.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Marriages</td>
<td>Type of Family</td>
<td>Type of Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father's Marriage</td>
<td>Mother's Marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father Works</td>
<td>Both Work</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
marriage (See Table 4).

E. Number of Children

The family type where both parents work had a lower proportion of children than the family type where only the father works. The mean value for the latter was 3.37 while for mean for the former type of family, where both parents work, was 2.79.

This data seems to confirm the fact that the Puerto Rican family size has decreased. Birth rate has declined from 26.0 in 1969 to 24.3 in 1979 (Planning Board, 1980).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 3</td>
<td>37 59</td>
<td>38 81</td>
<td>75 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6</td>
<td>22 35</td>
<td>8 17</td>
<td>30 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. Years of Schooling of the Parents

One of the factors explored in the demographic aspects was the amount of school years completed by the parents in the sample. It is interesting to observe that in the type of family where both parents work, the father as well as the mother had completed more years of schooling than the father and mother of the family where the father works.
Table 6 presents a description of the frequencies for both types of families by their years of schooling.

An interesting aspect was revealed in regard to the years of schooling completed by parents. The mother's educational level with the group where both parents work had a higher mean value ($\bar{x}=13.79$) than that of the father's ($\bar{x}=12.53$). But in the family where only the father works, the father had a higher mean value for educational level ($\bar{x}=10.79$) than the mother ($\bar{x}=9.40$).

G. Annual Income of the Family

The family where both parents work had a mean value of annual income ($\bar{x}=10.0$) that is, from $15,000 to $19,999, than the family where only the father works ($\bar{x}=7.59$) or $9,000 to $9,999. This increase was expected because of the combined salaries.

The mean value for the annual income of the total sample was between $10,000 and $14,999; it was similar to that of the Island annual average income for 1980 which was $12,929 at current dollars (Puerto Rico Planning Board, 1980). Of course it has to be mentioned that in the Planning Board's survey, other families were included, such as the unemployed, retired, single parents, disabled or aged families. It should also be mentioned that most parents in this research had been working for more than ten years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>16 14</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>16 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 17</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>5 11</td>
<td>21 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 40</td>
<td>17 36</td>
<td>42 38</td>
<td>24 9</td>
<td>13 28</td>
<td>37 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td></td>
<td>13 21</td>
<td>20 43</td>
<td>33 30</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td>25 53</td>
<td>32 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 +</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>5 5</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>4 8</td>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>12.53</td>
<td>11.54</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>11.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7 - Years of Schooling by Type of Family
A more specific analysis of parents' income in both types of families revealed that the fathers' had a higher income than the mothers in both types of families. However, the working mother had the highest mean years of schooling ($\bar{x}=13.79$). The mean income for fathers of both types of families fell between $9,000 and 9,999 in contrast to the mothers' income, which fell between $8,000 and 8,999, as shown in Table 9.

**TABLE 8 - Annual Income by Type of Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - 3,999</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>9 14</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>9 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000 - 8,999</td>
<td>13 21</td>
<td>- -</td>
<td>13 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>19 30</td>
<td>17 36</td>
<td>36 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 19,999</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>10 21</td>
<td>15 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 +</td>
<td>12 19</td>
<td>20 43</td>
<td>32 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>9,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>15,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>10,000 to 14,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 - Annual Income of the Mother as Compared to Father by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-3,999</td>
<td>5  8</td>
<td>-  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,000-5,999</td>
<td>9  14</td>
<td>4   9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000-8,999</td>
<td>13  21</td>
<td>13  28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-14,999</td>
<td>20  32</td>
<td>19  40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>5   8</td>
<td>9   19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000+</td>
<td>11  17</td>
<td>2   4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63  100</td>
<td>47  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>7.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Other Earnings

Thirty-four families or 31 percent of the total sample received food stamps at the time of data collection. In the families where only the father works, 43 percent received food stamps, while for the other type of family, only 15 percent received the same assistance, as shown on Table 10.
TABLE 10 - Other Earnings of the Family by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Earnings</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Stamps</td>
<td>27 43</td>
<td>7 5</td>
<td>34 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>2 3</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>6 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Other</td>
<td>34 54</td>
<td>36 76</td>
<td>70 63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I. Religion

The Spaniards who colonized Puerto Rico during the 16th century brought the Roman Catholic religion and since then the island has had mostly a Catholic orientation. As shown in Table 11, the family where only the father works were 80 percent Catholic, being slightly higher than the family where both parents work, which was 74 percent.

TABLE 11 - Religion by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No. Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>50 80</td>
<td>35 74</td>
<td>85 77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist</td>
<td>4 6</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>8 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8 12</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>3 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
J. Occupation of Parents

The father's occupation for the total sample was: 24 percent craftman, 18 percent sales workers, 12 percent managers or administrators, 12 percent service workers, and 11 percent professional workers. In both types of families the craftman was the most frequent occupation. The most frequent occupation for the mothers was either professional or technical. Table 12 presents the entire range of occupations for both types of families.

K. Care of Children While Mothers Work

Out of the forty-seven families where the mother works outside the home, 19 (40 percent) had someone to care for the children. Relatives cared for the children (28 percent) and friends cared for the children (13 percent). Forty percent or 28 families did not have anyone to care for their children as their children were adolescents or young adults who could be left alone at home.

L. Relationships Among the Demographic Characteristics

In both types of families there was a moderate to strong relationship between years of schooling of the mother and annual income of the family (r=.59 for the total sample; r=.70 where both parents work, and r=.45 where only the father works). The years of schooling both the father and mother in both types of families were strongly related (r=.55) as well as the ages of both parents. In other words, the level of schooling and parents' ages were highly correlated in both types of families.

The annual income of the family was strongly related to the schooling of the father (r=.51) and schooling of the mother (r=.58) for the total sample. Likewise, in the families where both parents work, the correlations were .50 and .54 for fathers and mothers, respectively. Table 13 reveals these and other correlations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Only: One: Father</th>
<th>Both: Father</th>
<th>Both: Mother</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Technical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers and Administrators</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operators</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport Operators</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agr. Farm Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Labor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Work</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 13 - Inter correlations of Some Demographic Characteristics by Type of Family

(Pearson Correlation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intercorrelation Of Variables</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Schooling/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Income</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Schooling/</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Family Income</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Age/</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Age</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V
MAJOR INDEPENDENT VARIABLE: TYPE OF FAMILY

This research directed some of its questions toward differences in internal and external factors of each type of family, in hopes of identifying specific situations particular to each type of family. The following presentation represents hypothesis tests between the type of family and internal and external factors.

A. Internal Factors by Type of Family

The internal constraints of the families were measured by three Likert scales which determined: difficulties of family members, economic expenditures, and problems with relatives. The following is a description of the scores for the total as well as for the two types of families. Each family member answered and a score for each family was generated.

1. Difficulties of Family Members

The analysis of the mean scores of family members' difficulties indicated: ̅x=9.47 for the family where both parents work; ̅x=9.42 for the family where only the father works, and ̅x=9.44 for the total family sample. Therefore, the mean values for family difficulties were very similar for both groups.

This variable had a range of possible scores between seven and thirty-five. Fifteen percent of the total sample had a score higher than 13 points, using 13 as the midpoint. In other words, a small percentage of the total sample families perceived family difficulties as a problem. However, 27 percent of the families where both parents work were above 13, while only 14 percent of the families where only the father works scored above 13.
TABLE 14 - Family Members' Difficulties by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulties Score</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Lower scores represent disagreement and higher scores represent agreement.
2. Economic Expenditures of the Family

The likert scale which measured the economic expenditures of the family had a possible range of 34 points, from 0 to 33. A score of 16 or more was interpreted as enough or too many expenditures.

Both types of families had similar mean scores: where both parents work the mean was 16.26 and where only the father works the mean was 15.68. The mean for the total was 15.93. The frequency distribution revealed that the family where both parents work had a more normal distribution, as 49 percent had a score of 16 or less, and 51 percent had a score of more than 17. In other words, approximately 50 percent of these families considered their economic expenditures as little or moderate, while the other 50 percent felt that they had high expenditures (See Table 15).

In contrast, thirty-nine (62 percent) families where only the father works thought that their economic expenditures were little or moderate, although their annual income was lower.

3. Problems with Relatives

The likert scale of problems with relatives had possible scores from 6 to 30 points with a middle score of 12 points.

A comparison of mean values for both types of families revealed a very similar mean score for the two groups: families where only the father works ($\bar{x}=11.79$) and families where both parents work ($\bar{x}=12.45$) (See Table 16).

About three-fourths of the families in each group as well as the total had a score of 14 or less, while approximately 25 percent had a moderate or high score on problems with relatives.

B. Test of Significance of Internal Factors

The T-Test comparing the means of the two groups was non-significant ($t=1.84$, $df=108$, $p=.068$). To be significant, the $t$ value must have been at least 1.98.
### TABLE 15 - Economic Expenditures by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Expenditures 1</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Value: 15.68 (Only Father Works), 16.26 (Both Parents Work), 15.94 (Total)
Skewness: 0.291 (Only Father Works), 0.284 (Both Parents Work), 0.282 (Total)
Standard Deviation: 3.00 (Both Parents Work), 3.02 (Total)

1) Low scores represent low economic expenditures and high scores represent high economic expenditures.

### TABLE 16 - Problems with Relatives by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Relative Problems 1</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 - 19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 +</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Value: 11.79 (Only Father Works), 12.45 (Both Parents Work), 12.07 (Total)
Skewness: 0.502 (Only Father Works), 0.669 (Both Parents Work), 0.563 (Total)
Standard Deviation: 3.54 (Both Parents Work), 3.60 (Total)

1) Low scores represent disagreement and high scores represent agreement.
There was a significant difference between the type of family and annual income ($t = -5.87$, $p = .001$). However, from the analysis of the other T-Test values, it is concluded that there was no significant difference between the type of family and internal constraints (problems with relatives, family members' difficulties, and income expenditures). No $t$ value reached 1.98 for a .05 level of significance.

**TABLE 17 - Tests of Significance of Internal Factor Variables by Type of Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal Factors</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>T-Value (df=108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Mean 5.4</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Mean 7.5</td>
<td>-5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with Relatives</td>
<td>Mean 11.8</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members Difficulties</td>
<td>Mean 9.4</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Expenditures</td>
<td>Mean 15.7</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Mean 4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Mean 10.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems with Relatives</td>
<td>Mean 12.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Members Difficulties</td>
<td>Mean 9.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Expenditures</td>
<td>Mean 16.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **External Factors by Type of Family**

These variables concerned job flexibility, job security and job satisfaction, and were answered by parents who were working. Where both parents worked, an average was obtained. Tables 18, 19, and 20 present a description of those factors.

1. **Flexibility of Working Schedule**

The family where both parents work had a higher score, meaning more flexibility, than the family where only the father works. The
mean for the total sample was 36.76, while the means for families where both parents work and where only one parent works were, respectively, 37.79 and 35.98. Table 18 displays these means.

2. **Job Security**

In the family where only the father works, ten fathers or 16 percent obtained a score of less than 30 points, while only five or 11 percent of the sample of two working parent families were in this same range. Although both types of families had a similar mean value, a higher percentage where both parents work had a score of 31 or more (See Table 19).

3. **Job Satisfaction**

The family where only the father works obtained a higher mean value for job satisfaction ($\bar{X}=25.00$) than the family where both parents work; their mean was 23.50. More than half of the parents where only the father works obtained a score of 26 points or more out of a maximum score of 30 on the likert scale as shown in Table 20. However, as shown on Table 21, the father of the family where both parents work had the lowest mean value ($\bar{X}=22.70$).

**TABLE 18 - Flexibility of Working Schedule by Type of Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Flexibility</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>13 21</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>16 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>33 52</td>
<td>28 60</td>
<td>61 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>17 27</td>
<td>16 34</td>
<td>33 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>35.98</td>
<td>37.79</td>
<td>36.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Low scores represent low flexibility and high scores represent high flexibility.
### TABLE 19 - Job Security by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Job Security</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>39.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Low scores represent low security and high scores represent high security.

### TABLE 20 - Job Satisfaction by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Low scores represent low satisfaction and high scores represent high satisfaction.
TABLE 21 - Job Satisfaction of Father and Mother by Type of Family
(Individual Scores of Parents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 +</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>22.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Low scores represent low satisfaction and high scores represent high satisfaction.

D. Tests of Significance of External Factors

The external contingencies of the parent's job were compared by the type of family utilizing a T-Test. The following t values were obtained: flexibility of working schedule, -1.47, job security, .03, job satisfaction, 1.94. The last variable mentioned was significantly different for the type of family (p=.05). Thus, the only variable which presented a significant difference between the mean values of both groups was job satisfaction. In other words, the family where only the father works had a significantly higher mean score than the family where both parents work in regards to job satisfaction.
TABLE 22 - Tests of Significance of Variables
Related to Job by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>T-Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Related Variables 1)</strong></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Work Schedule</td>
<td>35.98</td>
<td>37.78</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>25.39</td>
<td>23.50</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Degrees of Freedom = 108
CHAPTER VI
MAJOR DEPENDENT VARIABLE: COHESION AND ADAPTATION
OF THE FAMILY

The major research question of this research was directed
toward the differences in the degree of cohesion-adaptation of both
types of families: the family where only the father works and the
family where both parents work. This chapter presents a description
of the frequencies and mean values for both families in its scores
of cohesion-adaptation, tests of significance by type of family,
and intercorrelations of cohesion-adaptation with other dependent
variables.

A. Description of Mean Values

An average of the individual scores of family members produced
a mean value of 461.60 for cohesion-adaptation for the total sample.
The family where both parents work had a mean of 456.89, and it
was lower than the mean of the family where only the father works,
which was 465.11. Both scores were in the middle category. The
frequency distribution of scores revealed low skewness and
appeared to be normally distributed between 400 and 540 degrees of
cohesion-adaptation.

B. Test of Significance of Major Dependent Variables

The major research hypothesis in this research was that there
would be a significant difference between the types of families on
their degree of cohesion and adaptation. A T-Test of the scores
resulted in the acceptance of the null hypothesis. Although the
family where only the father works had a higher score, the mean
was not significantly different from the mean of the other type of
family. The t value obtained was 1.48 and to be significant it had to reach 1.98 or higher, allowing for 108 degrees of freedom.

### TABLE 23 - Cohesion-Adaptation by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores on Cohesion-Adaptation</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 - 425</td>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>5 11</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426 - 450</td>
<td>13 21</td>
<td>14 30</td>
<td>27 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451 - 475</td>
<td>24 38</td>
<td>16 34</td>
<td>40 36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476 - 500</td>
<td>14 22</td>
<td>9 19</td>
<td>23 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501 - 540</td>
<td>7 11</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td>10 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Value</td>
<td>465.11</td>
<td>456.89</td>
<td>461.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>25.73</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C. Intercorrelation of Cohesion-Adaptation and Other Dependent Variables

The cohesion-adaptation scores were correlated with the rest of the dependent variables for the total sample and within each group. The purpose was to test the minor hypotheses of this research which stated that there would be a significant relationship between cohesion-adaptation and family size, annual income, family members' difficulties, problems with relatives, economic expenditures, job flexibility, job security, and job satisfaction.

The intercorrelation between cohesion-adaptation scores and the above mentioned dependent variables resulted in nonsignificant relationships, as none reached a .05 significance level. The null
hypothesis has to be accepted, indicating that the cohesion-adaptation of the family in this research was not significantly related to those factors.

However an examination of the correlation matrix (See Table 24) revealed that in the family where only the father works, there was a strong correlation between job satisfaction and job security ($r=.63$), a moderate correlation between job security and income ($r=.43$), and a moderate correlation between difficulties of the family members and problems with relatives ($r=.43$). In the family where both parents work, there was a strong correlation between job security and income ($r=.60$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only Father Works</td>
<td>Both Parents Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security/Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security/Income</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties of Family Members/Problems with Relatives</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An exploration of the specific problems of family members (obtained from the Family Members Difficulties Scale) was made to observe the intercorrelations between them.
As shown in Table 25, in the family where both parents work, there was a strong correlation between emotional problems of some family members and alcohol consumption (r=.65), and conflicts with neighbors (r=.55) and gambling (r=.58). In the family where only the father works there was a moderate correlation between emotional problems and alcohol consumption (r=.45) and conflicts with neighbors (r=.51).

Gambling as a problem did not appear to be correlated with emotional problems in the family where only the father works (r=.16). Difficulties of family members was not significantly related to cohesion-adaptation scores in either group.

### TABLE 25 - Intercorrelation of Problem Index Variables by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Problems/Alcohol</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Problems/Conflicts with Neighbors</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Problems/Gambling</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. Summary

The object of study in this research was the Puerto Rican family, as a constant and dynamic system. The two types of families observed are the most abundant on the Island: the two parent family where only the father works and the two parent family where both parents work. The motivation of the author in selecting these two types of families was due to the continuous concern, comments and publications in the mass media, government reports and interpretations given by recognized community entities, about changes in family roles and functions. These interpretations have made inferences which imply that such changes are symptomatic of family disorganization and crisis. One of the factors connected with the so-called disorganization and crisis is the increased participation of women in the labor force, being identified as a direct indicator of altered family life.

Thus, the principle purpose of this research was to determine if there were significant differences between families where only the father works and families where both parents work. The independent variable was the type of family. The variables observed were: cohesion-adaptation as a major dependent variable, and income, family size, problems with relatives, economic expenditures, family members' difficulties, flexibility of working schedule, job security, and job satisfaction as minor dependent variables. Another purpose of this research was to establish the
relationship between cohesion-adaptation and the above mentioned
minor dependent variables in both types of families.

The research design used was a cross sectional explanatory survey
of two comparison groups. The population of the study consisted
of the families where both parents work and families where only
the father works. The respondents were drawn from the Master Sample
of Caguas District of the Department of Labor. All the families
had to have at least one child over 12 years old in order to be
included in the study. The Caguas district of the Department of
Labor included the towns of Aguas Buenas, Cidra, Caguas, San
Lorenzo, and Gurabo.

One-hundred and twelve families (112) where only the father
works, only 70 families where both partners work met the population
criteria of this research. For the first group 85 families were
selected at random and 52 families for the second for a 9.5 percent
sampling error. A total of 27 families were eliminated for a final
total sample of 110 families observed.

The data collection schedule consisted of four parts: General
Characteristics of the subjects; Internal Constraints of the Family;
Opinions about Work; and the Cohesion-Adaptation Scales. Parts II and
III were likert scales prepared by the author, except for the
job satisfaction scale, which was originally developed by Aiken
and Hage (1966). Part IV was a likert scale prepared by Olson,
Bell and Portner (1978), translated to Spanish by the author.

Part II, Internal Constraints of the Family was pretested, and
the following correlations from the split-half test resulted:
Difficulties with Relatives, r=.93, Economic Expenditures, r=.64,
and Difficulties of Family Members, r=.65.

Part III, Opinions about Work Scales were pretested and the
following correlations from the split-half test were obtained:
Flexibility of Working Schedule, r=.67, Job Satisfaction, r=.90, and
Job Security, r=.65.

FACES Scales, developed by Olson, Bell, and Portner (1978) had
internal consistency (alpha) reliability as high as .75 for cohesion
and .83 for adaptation.

A hundred and ten families answered the data collection schedule including a grand total of 405 respondents, 220 of which were parents and 185 of which were children over 12 years old. An average of four members per family answered the schedule.

The data was analyzed by the use of descriptive statistics and frequency distributions. A T-Test was used in the analysis of significant differences between types of families. Pearson Correlation coefficients were used to determine relationships between dependent variables.

Some of the limitations of this research were: it was not representative of the Puerto Rican family because only two types of families were observed; its sample was drawn from five towns of the center of the Island; and the greatest percentage of the families were from Caguas, an atypical town by its high population, great mobility and rapidly growing urbanization in comparison with the rest of the Island.

Another limitation is that the FACES Scale for Cohesion-Adaptation was not validated after translation to Spanish.

B. **Conclusions**

1. Profile of Both Types of Families (with at least one child over 12 years old)
   a. **Only Father Working**

   This type of family included approximately 5.4 members, with 3.4 being children, most of them living in the rural area. The father had a mean age of 45 years old and the mean for the mother was 42. The mean years of schooling completed by the father was 11 years and the mean for the mother was 9 years. Their annual mean income was below the mean income of the total sample population and also below the average income in current dollars for the Island in 1980. Forty-three percent of them received food stamps at the time of data collection. The occupations of the fathers in rank
order of frequencies were: craftsmen, sales workers, and private service workers.

More than 80 percent of both fathers and mothers were on their first marriage and were Catholics.

There was a significant relationship ($r=.60$) between mother's schooling and father's schooling. Also significant was the relation between mother's age and father's age ($r=.80$).

b. **Both Parents Work**

This type of family had a size of 4.8 members with 2.7 children and most of them lived in the urban areas. The father had a mean age of 42 years and the mother's mean age was 40 years. The mean years of schooling completed by the father was 13 years and the mother had completed 14 years on the average.

The mean annual income of the family was above the mean for the total sample population and also above the average income in current dollars for the Island in 1980. The annual income mean of the mother in the sample population was lower than the annual income of the father although she had more years of schooling completed. Only 15 percent of the families received food stamps at the time of data collection. The occupations of the father in rank order frequencies were: craftsmen, sales workers, and professional or technical. The occupations of the mother in rank order frequencies were professional and technical, clerical and private service workers.

More than 80 percent of both father and mother were on their first marriage. A higher percent of families (26) of this type were of other religions rather than Catholic, which was the religion of 74 percent of the families.

Approximately sixty percent of the families left their children alone at home to care for themselves. Out of 41 percent of families who needed care for their children, 28 percent used relatives and 13 percent used friends.

There was a significant relationship between mothers' schooling with mother's income ($r=.70$) and mother's schooling with annual family
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income (r=.70). The relationship between mother's age and father's age (.80) was also significant.

2. Significant Differences Between Both Types of Families

   a. Cohesion-Adaptation
      The major research question was addressed to the significant difference between both types of families on their degree of cohesion-adaptation. A T-Test of the scores on cohesion-adaptation revealed no significant difference between its mean scores.

   b. Income
      The annual income of the family presented a significant difference. The family where both parents work had a significantly higher income than the family where only the father works.

   c. Family Size
      Although the family where both parents work is smaller and has less children, the mean values of those variables were not significantly different from each other. Family size obtained a t value of 1.84 at a .06 level of significance.

   d. Difficulties of Family Members
      The family where only the father works had a mean score of 9.41, while the family with both parents working had a mean of 9.44. The t value did not present a significant difference.

   e. Economic Expenditures
      The mean scores of both types of families were very similar, both parents working had a mean of 16.26, while families where only the father worked had a mean of 15.68. The t value did not reach significance.

   f. Problems with Relatives
      The family where only the father works had a mean of 11.79 for problems with relatives. The family where both parents work had a mean of 12.45 for the same variable. The t value was non-significant.
g. **Flexibility of Working Schedule**

The family where only the father works had a mean of 35.98 while for the family where both parents work had a mean of 37.78. The t value of -1.47 had a level of significance higher than .05. Therefore the difference was not significant.

h. **Job Security**

The family where only the father works had a mean of 39.30, and the family where both parents work had a mean of 39.26. Its t value indicated a non-significant difference.

i. **Job Satisfaction**

The family where only the father works had a mean of 25.39 and the family where both parents work had a mean of 23.50. The t value obtained was 1.94 at a level of significance of .05. This was a significant difference between the type of family in regard to job satisfaction.

3. **Significant Relationships Between Dependent Variables**

The minor hypothesis of this research intended to explore the relationship between cohesion-adaptation and the rest of the mentioned dependent variables. No significant relationships resulted, since none of those dependent variables were significantly correlated. The null hypotheses had to be accepted, that is, cohesion-adaptation of the families in this research was not significantly related to those factors.

C. **Interpretation of Findings**

1. **Cohesion-Adaptation and Demographic Characteristics**

Several interpretations could be given for the finding of non-significance in the level of cohesion-adaptation between both types of families.

There is no significant difference in the functioning of both types of families. The greatest percentages of families in this research were functioning at central levels of cohesion-adaptation.
According to this result, both groups had a balance of cohesion-adaptation. A probable explanation could be that though the mother had a job outside the home, her household tasks continued the same. Dr. Carmen Fidelina Quiñones de Rodríguez found in her research on working mothers in Puerto Rico that while most families approached equality in decision-making patterns, they remained sex-differentiated in the performance of daily housekeeping tasks. She identified a discrepancy in male-female family relationships between the decision-making level and basic household tasks (Quiñones, 1976:153).

An examination of the demographic characteristics of both groups revealed very common characteristics between them. Both groups were nuclear families; 80 percent were on their first marriage and dealing with the same developmental stage: a family with adolescents. The father's mean age was consistently older by 2 or 3 years than the mother's mean age in both groups. That is, 45 years old for the father and 42 years old for the mother in the family where only the father works. In the family where both parents work, the mean age for the father was 42 years old and for the mother 40 years. Both groups had a significant relationship between parents' ages (r=.80).

Another common characteristic was the size of both families. Although there was a moderate difference in their respective size (4.8 members where both parents work and 5.4 where only the father works), it was not significantly different at the .05 level.

The educational level of parents in both types of families was similar. In the family where only the father worked, the mean years of schooling completed was at high school level (9 years for the mother and 11 years for the father). In the family where both parents work, the partners had completed high school, but the mother had more years of schooling completed (14 years for the mother and 13 years for the father). In other words, the parents of both groups had similar educational backgrounds.

The fathers' occupations most frequent in both types of families were: craftsmen and sales workers.
The only socioeconomic characteristics which appeared significantly different was income. The family where both parents work had a higher income ($t=5.87$, $p=.001$).

The perception of both types of families about their economic expenditures did not present a significant difference (See Table 15). Both groups perceived their expenditures within a middle position out of a range of 0 to 33 points. A possible explanation could be that both groups made financial arrangements to adjust to their income.

2. Cohesion-Adaptation and Internal Factors

Seventy-six percent of the families where both parents work and 62 percent of the families where only the father works had central scores on cohesion-adaptation (See Table 26). So although 75 percent of the total sample had a balanced cohesion-adaptation score, the family where both parents work had a greater percentage at the moderate adaptation level. These results are consistent with the low scores obtained for the variables of family members' difficulties and problems with relatives. Above 60 percent of the total sample had a score of less than 9 points (middle score was 13 points) on the variable of difficulties of family members (See Table 14). For the variable of problems with relatives, about three-fourths of the total obtained a score of less than 14 points (12 points was the middle score, See Table 16). Theoretically these results appear to be consistent with the assumption that a moderate degree of family cohesion-adaptation is more functional and effective than either extremes (Russell, 1979).

Based on these findings, most of the families in this research were functioning at central levels of cohesion-adaptation; their family members did not have extreme interpersonal difficulties or abnormal behavior and did not have extreme problems with their relatives.
3. Interrelationship with External Factors

The job related variables were not significantly related to the cohesion-adaptation level of the family. However, in the family where both parents work, job security and income were strongly correlated ($r = .60$). And in the family where only the father works, job security was strongly with job satisfaction ($r = .63$). In other words, for the parents of the first group, job security is influenced by income, while in the second group job security is influenced by job satisfaction.

An analysis of the mean scores of job satisfaction in both types of families revealed a significant difference between both groups. In addition, the mean score of the mother's job satisfaction was higher than the father's job satisfaction score for families where both parents work (See Table 21). The highest mean among the three working parents was that of the father in the family where only the father works, while the lowest mean score was that of the father of the family where both parents work.

The flexibility of the working schedule was not correlated with the other job related variables.

The nonsignificant results in the major dependent variable, cohesion-adaptation, and other dependent variables could be the product of the research methodology. A greater sample from a more diverse geographical area would probably show statistical differences between both types of families. Too similar socioeconomic characteristics may be counteracting the influence of the single independent variable selected in this research.

In addition to which parent works, other variables could be controlled: selecting different samples by diverse family size, income, residence, educational level or occupation. That would mean the broadening of the concept of family type and defining it not only in relation to work, but adding other parameters.
4. Levels of Cohesion-Adaptation on the Island

Although it was not the purpose of this research to categorize families of either type within the structural cutting points of levels of cohesion-adaptation suggested by Olson, Bell, and Portner in 1978, it is interesting to compare their results with the means of the families on the Island. These authors found a mean score of 434 for cohesion-adaptation with a standard deviation of 34. This research revealed a higher mean score for the families in Puerto Rico, \( \bar{x} = 461.6 \) and a standard deviation of 29. These results were expected due to the existing differences in cultural values and traditions, religious beliefs and the particular socioeconomic development of the Island.

It was suggested by Olson, Bell, and Portner that in both processes of cohesion-adaptation, a balanced level of adaptability is more conducive and viable for family functioning. When separation or connection between members are balanced there is a better functional basis for the identified issues, and the family is able to deal more effectively with situational stresses and developmental change. Some families possibly because of cultural differences are able to function at extreme points without problems.

Thus according to Olson's, Bell's and Portner's viewpoint, the author of this research used the same procedures for establishing cutting points for determining various levels of cohesion and adaptability for the family at normative levels of functioning. The decision was reinforced after examining the frequency distribution, its normalcy and low skewness (.329), and standard deviation (29).

The cutting points are based on the mean and standard deviations of each scale. The mean score and one standard deviation above and below the mean are used for determining the central level. Thus the highest level would be 491 (the mean of 462 plus the standard deviation of 29). The lowest level would be 431 (462 minus 29). Table 26 presents the distribution of sample families at the
different levels.

### TABLE 26 - Levels of Cohesion-Adaptation by Type of Family

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesion-Adaptation Level</th>
<th>Type of Family</th>
<th>Only Father Works</th>
<th>Both Parents Work</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowest to 431</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td>16 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431 to 491</td>
<td></td>
<td>39 62</td>
<td>36 76</td>
<td>75 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>492 to Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 22</td>
<td>5 11</td>
<td>19 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>63 100</td>
<td>47 100</td>
<td>110 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentage of individuals found at each level by Olson, Bell, and Porter were 15 percent at the lowest level, 71 percent at the central level, and 14 percent at the highest level. In this research both types of families were mainly grouped at the central level, 62 and 76 percent, respectively for each type of family. Although these percentages were very similar to those of Olson's, et. al. research, a higher proportion (22 percent) of the family where only the father works were functioning at the highest level of cohesion-adaptation. The family where both parents work had a higher proportion (76 percent) at the central level. According to Table 26, the great majority of families are functioning at moderate levels of cohesion-adaptation and there was no significant difference between family types.

D. Implications for Social Work

The social work profession has recognized the family as vital to individual and societal functioning. Even more, Hartman (1977) has pointed out that the family should be the central focus of direct practice. Social work in Puerto Rico must identify the
particular characteristics and family functioning within its culture. Although not applicable to the whole population, this research generated knowledge about two type of families defined by which parent is working (one or both).

Most often social work research is about problems and "deficiencies" in human systems. Family therapy, a topic frequently found in social work literature is only one component of a comprehensive view of the family to which the social work practitioner should be exposed (Howe, 1974:283). The profession should broaden its view about the family as an institution and group system. This research was focused on normal or healthy family systems looking for existing variables. The research findings described specific group properties of the families rather than their dyadic characteristics since data was collected from three or more members of the family.

Among different sectors of the Puerto Rican community, it is being assumed that the family has weakened, that its deterioration is taking place, and that social policies should be developed to restore families to their previous strength. But a constellation of factors may be producing that phenomenon.

Current popular beliefs and values are strongly based on a normal nuclear family made up by a husband working and a mother remaining home to raise the children. Most social policies are shaped by this as a norm and define variants as "deviant forms." The inclusion or exclusion of families from services tend to penalize or benefit certain families.

Findings of the research imply that either of these two types could be viewed as the "ideal" family type. One is functioning at the same degree of cohesion-adaptation as the other and in both groups there are extremes (See Table 26). Moreover, the family where both parents work had a higher percent functioning at moderate levels of cohesion-adaptation.

The research findings could contribute to clarify that the single factor or one or both parents working is not the only
dimension to consider in the assessment of family dysfunction. Other independent variables could be considered in future research such as family size and composition, parents ages, educational level of partners, and occupation of parents.

The findings of this research suggest the need to offer a vision of the family as an entity which appears to be in a process of making adaptations according to external circumstances and family members' needs. Three institutions may serve as a network for disseminating this information: the Education Department, the Social Services Department, and the Health Department through its Mental Health Program. The Governmental Commission for the Strengthening of the Family may be the best agency to coordinate this effort. The commitment of that agency on behalf of a positive vision of the family is the cornerstone of an advocacy program. It must involve the entire agency, including staff, board, and volunteers in an ongoing activity.

The creation of an advocacy committee has important functions. It can be informed on local problems and issues presented by those departmental services in order to make continuous assessment of its priorities for action.

Family life education groups can take many forms. They can range from small ongoing groups to large community lectures. Educational methods such as informal meetings, panels, exhibits, pamphlets, and press coverage can be aimed at educating segments of the population.

E. Recommendations

It seems proper to recommend that the Commission for the Protection and Strengthening of the Family could assume responsibility for disclosing the non-statistical difference between both types of families observed in this research. The author also recommends caution in the assessment of factors which produce social dis-organization or crisis. The family has always reflected social
change and needs to reorganize its structure and interrelations in order to satisfy family members' needs and goals.

According to this research most of the families observed had an effective level of functioning, operating at central levels of cohesion-adaptation, which is considered an indicator of maintenance of the family as a system.

Other types of families should be studied such as the single parent family, families affected by unemployment, or with younger children. Also it would be useful to study the family with clinical syndromes to look for variables present with significant relationships to cohesion-adaptation. None of the families studied in this research were identified by a clinical or social treatment agency.

The author also recommends the construction of a scale validated on the Island for clinical intervention. It could be useful for a more systematic diagnosis and to establish specific treatment goals. Once treatment has begun, the therapist could also use the scale to assess what changes have taken place in terms of the concepts related to each dimension of cohesion-adaptation.

A future research endeavor could divide the sample by their levels of cohesion and adaptation (those with extreme scores as one group and those at central scores as another). A statistical analysis of demographic characteristics could be made in search of significant relationships between them.

Another possibility would be to search for relationships between the family's nature and composition and the world of work through the identification of parents whose job security, job flexibility, or job satisfaction is very low, and examine if there are significant relationships among the demographic characteristics.

Finally, the author recommends for future research the consideration of working women and their expectations from marriage.
APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION SCHEDULE
Part One

General Characteristics

Section I - Characteristics of the Family

Schedule Number __________________ ____________

1. Residence

   Urban _________
   Rural _________
   Semi urban ______

2. Family Composition:

   Relationship :  | Sex : Age : Years of: | Earning by
   to the father: | F: M: School :Occupation: salary

   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |
   | | | | |

3. Marital Status of Parents

   Single __________
   Married __________
   Separated __________
   Divorced __________
   Cohabitation ______

4. Number of present marriage:

   None __________
   First __________
   Second __________
   Third __________
   More than third ___
5. Care of the children if the mother works: 

- Neighbor outside home ______
- Neighbor in the home ______
- Relatives outside home ______
- Relatives in the home ______
- Alone ______________________
- Child-care center _________
- Mother do not works ________
  (Don't apply)

6. Payment for care of children: 

- Yes ________
- No ___________

7. Father's Job 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time to arrive from job</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Schedule of Work</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of time working in this job</td>
<td>______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Other earning: (check one or more) 

- Food Stamps _________
- Social Security _______
- Veterans Compensation ______
- Other governmental aid ______
- Relatives ________________
- None ______________________

9. Religion: 

- None ______
- Catholic ______
- Baptist ______
- Other (specify) ______
Part Two

Internal Constraints

Section I - Difficulties of Family Members

In my family there are members who have difficulties because of:

excessive alcohol consumption
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

emotional problems
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

drug consumption
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

excessive gambling (horse races, lottery, others)
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

problems at school
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

problems at work
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

conflict with neighbors or persons in the community
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

do not have a job
Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree
Part Two

Internal Constraints

Section II—Economic Expenditure and Strains of the Family

Below are a series of expenditures which generally a family have. Using a check mark select the consumption level which you consider describe better if you consider that the investment of money is low, moderate or high in relation to the earning of the family.

Economic Expenditures in my family are invested in: (Check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly payments to financial agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing utilities (electricity, water, phone)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (to work or school)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gambling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>childrens care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I consider that my family:

___ Do not have economic strains
___ Have economic strains
___ No observation made
Listed below are statements about relatives in your family. For each statement circle the number which better describes what you believe.

1. Our relatives are helpful for us.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

2. They are always making intrusion on our matters.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

3. We accept them as part of our family.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

4. They are obstacles to our happiness.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

5. Various relatives are trying to bring problems to our family.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

6. Our relatives are respectful of our decision.
   Totally Disagree: 1 2 3 4 5   Totally Agree

---

1/ Relatives refer to in-laws of both partners in the family.
Part Three

Opinion about Work

Section 1 - Flexibility of Working Schedule

Listed below are statements about your work. For each statement circle the number which better describes what you believe.

1. I can take time from my job to take care of my family when someone is ill.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

2. Working overtime unexpectedly brings problems to my family.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

3. I like a working schedule which allows me to be with my family.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

4. I have to work after regular working hours.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

5. I can have vacations when my children have their too.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

6. I can control overtime hours of work.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

7. I like the working schedule that I have.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

8. My work consumes too much of my time.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

9. No matter the reason, if I get late to my work there are penalties.
   Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always

10. I can commute time from work to use as I need.
    Never 1 2 3 4 5 Always
Part Three
Opinion about Work

Section II- Security of Your Job

Listed below are statements about your work. For each statement circle the number which better describes what you believe.

1. I can be easily fired from my job.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

2. I am sure that I can retain my job.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

3. I have to be productive in my job to maintain it.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

4. If I'm absent because of personal reasons from my job I lose it.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

5. I can be fired from my job until notice.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

6. I am afraid to loose my job.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

7. Other employee can do my job at any moment.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

8. I am needed on my job
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

9. The economic conditions threat the security of my job.
   Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree

10. There is enough work that justify the position of my job.
    Totally Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 Totally Agree
Part Three
Opinion about Work

Section III - Satisfaction with Job

1. How satisfied are you with your present position in terms of your job expectations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2. On the whole, how satisfied are you with your present position when you consider the expectations you had had when you entered this job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. On the whole, how satisfied are you that your supervisor (superior) accepts you as a skilled worker to the degree to which you are entitled by reason of position, training, and experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. How satisfied are you with the progress you are making toward the goals which you set for yourself in your present job (or situation),

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. How satisfied are you with your present job when you compare it to similar job positions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. How satisfied are you in having enough authority to do your work well?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely satisfied</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Part Four
Cohesion and Adaptation of the Family

Faces

4 = true all the time  2 = true some of the time
3 = true most of the time  1 = true none of the time

1. Family members are concerned with each other's welfare.
2. Family members feel free to say what's on their mind.
3. We don't have spur of the amount guests at mealtime.
4. It is hard to know who the leader is in our family.
5. It's difficult for family members to take time away from the family.
6. Family members are afraid to tell the truth because of how harsh the punishment will be.
7. Most personal friends are not family friends.
8. Family members talk a lot but nothing ever gets done.
9. Family members feel guilty if they want to spend some time alone.
10. There are times when other family members do things that make me unhappy.
11. In our family we know where all family members are at all times.
12. Family members have some say in what is required of them.
13. The parents in our family stick together.
14. I have some needs that are not being met by family members.
15. Family members make the rules together.
16. It seems like there is never any place to be alone in our house.
17. It is difficult to keep track of what other family members are doing.
18. Family members do not check with each other when making decisions.
19. My family completely understand and sympathizes with my every mood.
20. Family ties are more important to us than any friendship could possibly be.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>When our family has an argument, family members just keep to themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Family members often answer questions that were addressed to another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The parents check with the children before making important decisions in our family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Punishment is usually pretty fair in our family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Family members like to spend some of their free time with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Family members are encouraged to have friends of their own as well as family friends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Family members discuss problems and usually feel good about the solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Family members share almost all interests and hobbies with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Our family is not a perfect success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Family members are extremely independent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>No one in our family seems to be able to keep track of what their duties are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Family members feel it's &quot;everyone for themselves.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Every new thing I've learned about my family has pleased me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Our family has a rule for almost every possible situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>We respect each other's privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Once our family has planned to do something, it's difficult to change it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>In our family we are on our own when there is a problem to solve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>I have never regretted being with my family, not even for a moment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Family members do not turn to each other when they need help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>It is hard to know what other family members are thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Family members make visitors feel at home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Parents make all of the important decisions in our family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faces

4 = true all the time
3 = true most of the time
2 = true some of the time
1 = true none of the time

43. Even when everyone is home, family members spend their time separately.

44. Parents and children in our family discuss together the method of punishment.

45. Family members have little need for friends because the family is so close.

46. We feel good about our ability to solve problems.

47. Although family members have individual interests, they still participate in family activities.

48. My family has all the qualities I've always wanted in a family.

49. Family members are totally on their own in developing their ideas.

50. Once a task is assigned to a family member, there is no chance of changing it.

51. Family members seldom take sides against other members.

52. There are times when I do not feel a great deal of love and affection for my family.

53. When rules are broken, family members are treated fairly.

54. Family members don't enter each other's areas or activities.

55. Family members encourage each other's efforts to find new ways of doing things.

56. Family members discuss important decisions with each other, but usually make their own choices.

57. If I could be a part of any family in the world, I could not have a better match.

58. Home is one of the loneliest places to be.

59. In our family, it's important for everyone to express their opinion.

60. Family members find it easier to discuss things with persons outside the family.

61. There is no leadership in our family.
4 = true all the time  
3 = true most of the time  
2 = true some of the time  
1 = true none of the time

62. We try to plan some things during the week so we can call be together.
63. Family members are not punished or reprimended when they do something wrong.
64. In our family we know each other's close friends.
65. Our family does not discuss its problems.
66. Our family doesn't do things together.
67. If my family has any faults, I am not aware of them.
68. Family members enjoy doing things alone as well as together.
69. In our family, everyone shares responsibilities.
70. Parents agree on how to handle the children.
71. I don't think anyone could possibly be happier than my family and I when we are together.
72. It is unclear what will happen when rules are broken in our family.
73. When a bedroom door is shut, family members will knock before entering.
74. If one way doesn't work in our family, we try another.
75. Family members are expected to have the approval of others before making decisions.
76. Family members are totally involved in each other's lives.
77. Family members speak their mind without considering how it will affect others.
78. Family members feel comfortable inviting their friends along on family activities.
79. Each family member has at least some say in major family decisions.
80. Family members feel pressured to spend most free time together.
81. Members of our family can get away with almost anything.
82. Family members share the same friends.
83. When trying to solve problems, family members jump from one attempted solution to another without giving any of them time to work.
Faces

4 = true all the time
3 = true most of the time
2 = true some of the time
1 = true none of the time

84. We have difficulty thinking of things to do as a family.
85. Family members understand each other completely.
86. It seems as if we agree on everything.
87. It seems as if males and females never do the same chores in our family.
88. Family members know who will agree and who will disagree with them on most family matters.
89. My family could be happier than it is.
90. There is strict punishment for breaking rules in our family.
91. Family members seem to avoid contact with each other when at home.
92. For no apparent reason, family members seem to change their minds.
93. We decide together on family matters and separately on personal matters.
94. Our family has a balance of closeness and separateness.
95. Family members rarely say what they want.
96. It seems there are always people around home who are not members of the family.
97. Certain family members order everyone else around.
98. It seems as if family members can never find time to be together.
99. Family members are severely punished for anything they do wrong.
100. We know very little about the friends of other family members.
101. Family members feel they have no say in solving problems.
102. Members of our family share many interests.
103. Our family is as well adjusted as any family in this world can be.
104. Family members are encouraged to do their own thing.
105. Family members never know how others are going to act.
106. Certain individuals seem to cause most of our family problems.
Faces

4 = true all the time  2 = true some of the time
3 = true most of the time  1 = true none of the time

107. I don't think any family could live together with greater harmony than my family.

108. It is hard to know what the rules are in our family because they always change.

109. Family members find it hard to get away from each other.

110. Family members feel that the family will never change.

111. Family members feel they have to go along with what the family decides to do.
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