

377
N 81
NO. 4636
C. 3

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF MARITAL ROLE
EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO
PERCEIVED PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS
AND PERCEIVED FAMILY INTEGRATION

APPROVED:

Kevin J. Kennelly
Major Professor

Donald L. Wheeler
Minor Professor

Harold D. Follows
Chairman of the Department of Psychology

Robert B. Toulouac
Dean of the Graduate School

17/

Hopewell, C. Alan, An Exploratory Investigation of Marital Role Expectations and their Relationships to Perceived Parent-Child Relations and Perceived Family Integration. Master of Arts (Clinical Psychology), May, 1973, 69 pp., 3 tables, references, 51 titles.

Fifty-one male and 57 female college undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course responded to the Roe-Siegelman PCR Questionnaire, a modified form of Tharp's (1963b) Marital Role Expectation Form (MRE), and a Family Integration Scale as fulfillment of research participation requirements. None of the students had ever been married and all had had intact families at least until their twelfth birthday. Previous research had indicated that generally children who experienced love and warmth in their childhood home had marital role expectations of friendliness, spontaneity, adaptability, trust, responsibility, and leadership, while those who experienced rejecting and neglecting parental behaviors were more likely to have expectations of being seclusive, guilty, hostile, rigid, mistrustful, and irresponsible. Consistent with this research were the findings in the present study that males who experienced warm, loving parent-child relations are more likely to have expectations of friendliness, role sharing, intimacy, trust, and sexual and parental responsibility. Research had also pointed

to links between parents' use of symbolic rewards and the development of responsibility in children. This was confirmed for males in that the perceived use of symbolic rewards by their parents was correlated positively with their expectations that both themselves and their future wives would act responsibly in many areas. Expectations of sexual responsibility for males were also found to be negatively related to the father's use of direct-object punishment. Finally, it was found that males' expectations of socio-emotional integration, togetherness, role sharing, wife adequacy, intimacy, and sexual fidelity are all positively related to the mother's demanding behavior.

Far fewer significant correlations were obtained for females, and it was suggested that this was perhaps an artifact of the MRE. It was found that females' perceptions of parents as loving are related positively to their expectations of friendship, companionship, and the binding up of sex with love and affection. It was also demonstrated that perceived parental use of symbolic rewards is positively related to expectations of friendship, companionship, affection, and responsibility. And finally, it was demonstrated that females who have expectations of masculine dominance tend to view their mothers as having been protective and their fathers as having been demanding.

Males and females who see themselves as highly integrated into their childhood families tend to have expectations of socio-emotional integration, role sharing, and intimacy. For males, these perceptions of childhood family integration are also related to expectations of pre-marital chastity and sexual fidelity for both themselves and their mates, while for females, childhood family integration is also related to expectations of parental adequacy.

It was emphasized that a knowledge of the relationships between perceptions of early home experiences and marital role expectations as well as a knowledge of the general contribution of marital role expectations to marital adjustment should be an area of concern to parents, marital partners, counselors, and educators.

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF MARITAL ROLE
EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO
PERCEIVED PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS
AND PERCEIVED FAMILY INTEGRATION

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

C. Hopewell
C. Alan Hopewell, B. S.

Denton, Texas

May, 1973

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Intercorrelations Between Scores on Scales of the PCR and the Family Integration Scale . . .	26
2. Correlations Among Scores on the MRE and the PCR Scales	28
3. Correlations Between Scores on the Family Integration Scale and Scales of the MRE	37
4. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on Each Scale of Both Mother and Father Forms of the PCR for Males	52
5. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on Each Scale of Both Mother and Father Forms of the PCR for Females	53
6. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on Scales of the Father Form of the PCR for which a Significant Difference was Found Between Males and Females	53
7. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on Scales of the Mother Form of the PCR for which a Significant Difference was Found Between Males and Females	54
8. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on Scales of the MRE for 51 Males and 57 Females	55
9. Means, SDs, and t tests of Scores on the Family Integration Scale	56
10. Correlations Among Scales of the MRE	57
11. Intercorrelations Among Scores on Scales of the Mother Form of the PCR	59
12. Intercorrelations Among Scores on Scales of the Father Form of the PCR	60

AN EXPLORATORY INVESTIGATION OF MARITAL ROLE
EXPECTATIONS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIPS TO
PERCEIVED PARENT-CHILD RELATIONS
AND PERCEIVED FAMILY INTEGRATION

Marital problems have attracted the attention of a large number of educators, concerned marital partners, and professionals of all types, but surveys of the relevant literature have shown many inconsistent findings. These inconsistencies are probably due to the many variations in theoretical and methodological approaches to marital research (Stott, 1951; Tharp, 1963a).

One theoretical approach which has been useful in explaining marital adjustment has been marital role theory, which was introduced by Ort (1950) in his study of happiness in marriage. Dyer (1962) has defined marital role expectations as attitudes and behavior which each spouse perceives as appropriate for himself and his partner, while marital role performance is behavior which each spouse assumes to be proper for his status.

Following Ort's study, a number of authors further specified the basic premises of role theory as related to marital role expectations. Mangus (1957) saw spousal roles in marriage as developing from the interactions between husband and wife which in turn are based on acquired role expectations.

He suggested that the integrative potential of the marriage is diminished if these role expectations are not fulfilled by commensurate performance.

Many of the role expectations which are most likely to lead to a happy and successful marriage have been identified in the literature. Locke (1951) found that expectations (he called them "values") of leadership by the husband are positively correlated with marital adjustment, while Elder (1962) found that couples with expectations of shared leadership were the most happy, while those marriages in which the wife was dominant were the least happy. Expectations that each partner be intimate, friendly, and share household roles such as training, playing, and planning for the children were all shown to be associated with marital adjustment by Benson (1955), Frumkin (1954), and Locke (1951).

In addition, Benson (1955) found that interests and expectations rated as familistic in nature rather than individualistic were positively correlated with marital adjustment. Locke (1951) found that expectations that the spouses engage in mutually satisfying sexual relationships and that they each abstain from socially disapproved behavior were positively related to marital adjustment. Similarly, Kotlar (1965) and Terman (1939) showed that couples who had role expectations which conformed to cultural ideals and norms were more likely to have successful marriages. Terman (1939) found that happily married women had personality traits of

kindliness, cooperation, and charity and expected the same in others, while happily married men had expectations of cooperation, initiative, and responsibility.

Data from both Rapaport & Rasow (1957) and Moser (1961) suggest that specific role expectations are more predictive of marital adjustment than general ones. In an investigation of specific marital role expectations, Tharp (1936b) performed a factor analysis on the items of a marital role expectation questionnaire which he had constructed. In this analysis he reduced marital role expectation variables to several factors and determined that expectations concerning husband and wife roles were at least partially different. This finding has been supported by Slater (1960) who found that although higher socio-economic status is positively related to an emphasis on functional sharing of roles by the marital partners, there still exists a great deal of role differentiation on the basis of sex. Bodarsky (1959), Gould (1962), and Pfeil (1968) have also found that, despite a recent trend toward a sharing of roles, there is still a great deal of role differentiation. Tharp's factors which describe the specific role expectations of both males and females are

1. Socio-Emotional Integration - This factor describes the value placed on the family staying together, playing together, being socially and emotionally integrated, the wife's home-centeredness, and sex being pleasurable and affectionate.

2. Socio-Intellectual Equality - This factor describes the degree to which equality of background, intellectual endowment, and (to a lesser degree) intellectual interests are important.

3. Pre-Marital Chastity - This factor describes the expectation of the spouses not having intercourse with any other partners before marriage.

4. Sexual Fidelity - This factor describes the expectations that each spouse will abstain from extramarital activities.

5. Wife Adequacy - This factor includes the importance of a neat, clean, orderly household and well-behaved children; the wife's ability as housekeeper and cook, and her obedience to her husband and devotion of energies to the home.

Factors having to do with males' role expectations only are

6. Social Influence - This factor describes whether husband or wife should have more influence in deciding the family's social and recreational activity.

7. Togetherness - This factor describes spouses having similar intellectual, social, and recreational interests.

8. Role Sharing - This factor includes the wife being informed of financial and business affairs and the husband taking an active interest in the house and the children.

9. Intimacy - This factor includes variables having to do with friendship, companionship, the roles of lover and sexual partner, the binding up of sex with love and affection, and the finding of pleasure in sexual intercourse with the spouse.

10. Parental Adequacy - This factor describes the importance of the wife as a mother and the husband as a father.

Factors having to do with females' role expectations only are:

11. Community Affairs - This factor describes the importance attached to being a participant in community affairs.

12. Togetherness and Role Sharing - This single factor includes the men's factors of Togetherness and of Role Sharing. The factor describes the importance of mutuality of interests in intellectual, social, and recreational activities as well as the importance of the wife being informed of financial and business affairs and the husband taking an interest in the children and the household.

13. Masculine Dominance - This factor describes the wife's desire for masculine dominance.

14. Intimacy - For women, this factor includes expectations having to do with friendship, companionship, the roles of lover and sexual partner, the binding up of sex with love and affection, and the finding of pleasure in sexual intercourse with the spouse, as well as the importance of the wife as a mother and the husband as a father.

Parent-Child Relations

Expectations of marital behavior do not arise overnight, but, like any other personality characteristic, are the result of learning. As Thomas Blaine (1955), a divorce court judge in Philadelphia, stated: "Unsolved childhood conflicts, unless corrected . . . lead to all kinds of marriage difficulties (p. 136)." Bodarsky (1959) found home experience to be the most important factor in the development of attitudes toward marriage, and Nimkoff (1947), Robins & O'Neal (1958), and Wallin (1954) have all found domestic relations extant in early childhood to be related to adult marital adjustment. Cross and Aron (1971) found spousal differences in marital role expectations to be related to differential parent-child relations in the respective families of orientation, and Bolton (1961) stated: ". . . the learning of marital roles is assumed to be largely culturally transmitted through models available in childhood (p. 235)."

But investigators in general have failed to explore these origins of marital role expectations. As Kephart (1957) pointed out,

We have tended to ignore the various historical bases of our premarital and marital codes . . . As a result . . . [we] have come to view the American family as shallow-rooted, to be studied in cross-section rather than longitudinally. In the very nature of the family, unidimensional analysis of this kind is narrow, at best, and if our goal is to obtain a better understanding of love, courtship, sex behavior, marriage, divorce, and other male-female relationships subsumed under the Family title, then I submit that we are handicapping ourselves by our casual dismissal of the historical approach (pp. 7-8).

That personality variables are a function of parent-child relations has been well established in the literature. As Dewey (1951) stated, "Probably there is no more widely accepted premise among social workers, teachers, physicians, and psychologists than this one: The single most powerful factor in the personality development of the child is the happiness and stability of the home in which he spends his early years (p. 261)."

Many studies have dealt with the formation of personality characteristics which have been demonstrated to be important in obtaining marital adjustment.

Bronfenbrenner (1961) has found what could be termed the loving dimension of parent-child relations to be positively correlated with leadership in boys, and negatively correlated with leadership in girls. He also found that extremes of parental rejection tended to impede the development of leadership in both sexes. Bronfenbrenner (1961) found responsibility to be negatively correlated with parental neglecting and rejecting behaviors, while Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957) found responsibility to be positively related to parental use of symbolic rewards. Nye (1958) found delinquency (which is characterized by irresponsibility and defiance of authority) to be related positively to rejecting parental behavior.

Altman (1958) found maternal acceptance and warmth to be positively related to adaptability and spontaneity. He

also found maternal flexibility to be related to high frustration tolerance in children. Chorost (1961) found that adolescents who perceived their parents as demanding showed more evidence of overt hostility than did those who saw their parents as loving. This was evidently the case when parents were viewed as being overly strict and not loving. Peck (1958) found that a warm family life correlated positively with the friendliness and spontaneity of the children. Slater (1962) found that children's perceptions of parents as loving were associated with buoyancy, spontaneity, and gregariousness; perceptions of parents as casual were characteristic of well adjusted children, and rejecting and neglecting parental behaviors were positively related to gloomy, guilty, and seclusive outcomes in the children.

Roe and Siegelman (1963) constructed the Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) to obtain a measure of the characteristic behavior of parents toward their young children (before the age of 12) as experienced by the child. The PCR was originally administered to college students. The PCR consists of 10 scales, the first six of which fit the theoretical model suggested by Roe (1957), and the last four based upon the work of Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957). These 10 scales are described by Roe and Siegelman (1963) as follows:

Protective - This category includes parents who give the child's interests first priority. They are very indulgent, provide special privileges, are

demonstratively affectionate, may be gushing. They select friends carefully, but will rarely let him visit other homes without them. They protect him from other children, from experiences in which he may suffer disappointment or discomfort or injury. They are highly intrusive and expect to know all about what he is thinking and experiencing. They reward dependency.

Demanding - Parents in this group set up high standards of accomplishment in particular areas, manners, school, etc. They impose strict regulations and demand unquestioning obedience to them, and they do not make exceptions. They expect the child to be busy at all times at some useful activity. They have high punitiveness. They restrict friendships in accord with these standards. They do not try to find out what a child is thinking or feeling, they tell him what to think or feel.

Rejecting - Parents in this group follow the extreme patterns of the preceding group, but this becomes rejecting when their attitude is a rejection of the childishness of the child. They may also reject him as an individual. They are cold and hostile, derogate him and make fun of him and his inadequacies and problems. They may frequently leave him alone and often will not permit other children in the house. They have no regard for the child's point of view. The regulations they establish are not for the sake of training the child, but for protecting the parent from his intrusions.

Neglecting - These parents pay little attention to the child, giving him a minimum of physical care and affection. They forget promises made to him, forget things for him. They are cold, but are not derogatory nor hostile. They leave him alone but do not go out of their way to avoid him.

Casual - These parents pay more attention to the child and are mildly affectionate when they do. They will be responsive to him if they are not busy about something else. They do not think about him or plan for him very much, but take him as part of the general situation. They don't worry much about him and make little definite effort to train him. They are easy-going, have few rules, and do not make much effort to enforce those they have.

Loving - These parents give the child warm and loving attention. They try to help him with projects that are important to him, but they are not intrusive.

They are more likely to reason with the child than to punish him, but they will punish him. They give praise, but not indiscriminately. They try specifically to help him through problems in the way best for him. The child feels able to confide in them and to ask them for help. They invite his friends to the house and try to make things attractive for them. They encourage independence and are willing to let him take chances in order to grow towards it. Distinction between Loving and Casual categories can be difficult. A basic differentiating factor is the amount of thought given to the child's problems.

Symbolic-Love Reward - The parents using this kind of reward praise their children for approved behavior, give them special attention, and are affectionately demonstrative.

Direct-Object Reward - These include tangible rewards such as gifts of money or toys, special trips, or relief from chores.

Symbolic-Love Punishment - Such punishments include shaming the child before others, isolating him, and withdrawing love.

Direct-Object Punishment - These include physical punishment, taking away playthings, reducing allowance, and denying promised trips, etc. (p. 357)

Siegelman (1965) has done an extensive factor analysis of children's reports of parental behaviors from which he has evolved a system in which three independent dimensions of parental behavior are considered. These dimensions are Loving, Demanding, and Punishing, all of which are bipolar continua. The Loving, Protecting, Rejecting, and Neglecting scales of the PCR are similar to Siegelman's dimension of Loving, while the PCR scales of Demanding and Casual are similar to his dimension of Demanding. Goldin (1969) has comprehensively reviewed the literature concerning children's reports of parental behaviors. Goldin believes that

Siegelman's factors best account for the results of correlational studies dealing with children's reports of parental behavior. In 64 studies dealing with children's reports of parental behavior, Goldin found that over 60 per cent of the studies dealt with the Demanding factor, and 40 per cent investigated the Punishing factor. He also found Loving and Demanding to be positively correlated in 18 per cent of the studies.

Family Integration

But Goldin (1969) also stated that more than the dimensions described by the Siegelman conceptual model could be importantly involved in the overall parent-child relationship. Bell (1962) concurred when he stated:

It has long been recognized that the mental health of the individual is related to the family. However, until recently, there has been a failure to conceptualize the family qua family; studies of individual pathology have usually reduced the family to individual psychodynamic terms (p. 175).

Rogers & Sebald (1962) defined family integration as the subordination of individual interests to those of the family group, and noted that the term had been generally used in the literature to denote a type of individual-group altruism, including both the nuclear and the extended families.

Faris (1947) was probably the first author to advance the hypothesis that families which were characterized by

close integration and the transmission of family heritage and values produced individuals who functioned more effectively than those which did not.

As Aldous (1965) stated when she commented on Faris' theory:

Family elders, through example, also present other forms of wisdom to members of the younger generation. The latter learn criteria of mate selection, how to maintain the respect of children required for their guidance, and how to preserve group cooperation (p. 462).

Faris believed such folk knowledge to be generally superior to the ad hoc solutions of the individual who has been cut off from the family heritage. This hypothesis has been supported by Tec (1970) with high school marijuana users, by Amon (1956) and Rohwer (1950) with farm families, and Wilson (1969) with Irish police sergeants. Aldous (1965) also found that family continuity was associated with less marital tension and higher income. Indirect support was also offered by Benson (1955), who found that the number of interests per se had little to do with marital adjustment; rather those interests rated as familistic correlated positively with marital adjustment, while those rated as individualistic were unfavorably related to marital adjustment.

Of special interest was Tec's (1970) study of teenagers' involvement with marijuana, in which he found that subjects classified as high users of marijuana felt that their families were totally indifferent to them, could not talk to the family when troubled, and did not enjoy being with the

family. Those who used marijuana seldom or not at all were more likely to feel that they were accepted by the family, could talk to the family when troubled, and felt that the family was the most important aspect of their life.

Statement of the Problem

The present study is concerned with the relations which exist among perceived parent-child relations, the extent of family integration into the family of orientation, and the marital role expectations of unmarried college students. It is hoped that the present study will extend current theory and empirical knowledge about the relationships in question and provide data that may aid educators, parents, and counselors who deal with these problems.

The research cited above has demonstrated that several specific marital role expectations are more likely to lead to a happy marriage than others and has demonstrated the functional relationship between the formation of personality characteristics associated with these expectations, perceptions of early parent-child relations and extent of integration into the family of orientation. Research has pointed to links between the Loving, Demanding, and Punishing dimensions of the Siegelman conceptual model of parent-child relations, the extent of integration into the family of orientation, and personal and marital role expectation factors of leadership, trust, responsibility, intimacy, initiative, friendliness, familistic interests, cooperation, and

self and other acceptance. These personality and marital expectation variables appear to correspond to Tharp's (1936b) various marital role expectation factors.

While much of the literature has been discussed in terms of the three Siegelman factors, hypotheses are stated in terms of the scores on the PCR scales. The hypotheses formulated for test in this study which deal with both males and females are

1. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Intimacy, Wife Adequacy, and Sexual Fidelity.

2. There will be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, Intimacy, and Sexual Fidelity.

3. There will be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Neglecting scales and the scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, Intimacy, and Sexual Fidelity.

4. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Symbolic-Love Reward scales and scores on the MRE scales of

Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, and Sexual Fidelity.

5. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on the Family Integration Scale and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Intimacy.

Hypotheses dealing only with males are

6. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE scales of Social Influence and Role Sharing.

7. There will be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Social Influence and Role Sharing.

8. There will be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Neglecting scales and scores on the MRE Role Sharing Scale.

9. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Symbolic-Love Reward scales and the scores on the MRE scale of Role Sharing.

10. There will be a significant positive correlation between scores on the Family Integration Scale and scores on the MRE scale of Role Sharing.

Hypotheses dealing only with females are:

11. There will be significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE scales of Community Affairs and Togetherness and Role Sharing.

12. There will be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Community Affairs and Togetherness and Role Sharing.

13. There will be a significant positive correlation between scores on the Family Integration Scale and scores on the MRE scale of Togetherness and Role Sharing.

Method

Subjects

The subjects in this investigation consisted of 51 males and 57 females, all of whom were undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory psychology course. Their participation in the present study fulfilled part of a course requirement for research participation. They had never been married and had families which had been intact until the subject was at least 12 years old.

Instruments

A slightly modified version of Tharp's (1936b) Marital Role Expectation Scale (MRE) was used as the measure of

marital role expectations. The modification was accomplished by reducing the questionnaire to 50 items which would be answered by rating each question on a continuum from 5 (agree very much) to 1 (disagree very much). Items which loaded most highly on the same factors in Tharp's factor analytic study were placed in the same scales for purposes of this investigation. The present MRE scales were derived, then, from Tharp's factor analysis and correspond closely to the factors Tharp discovered in his analysis. Because of this, each scale differs in total possible score. Both the number of items in each scale and the reliability coefficient (coefficient alpha) for each scale are reported below. To some extent the scales, as do the expectations, differ for males and females. Scales which are the same for males and females are

	No. Items in Scale	Males' α	Females' α
1. Socio-Emotional Integration	7	.719	.634
2. Socio-Intellectual Equality	3	.659	.752
3. Pre-Marital Chastity	2	.928	.765
4. Sexual Fidelity	2	.724	.614
5. Wife Adequacy	5	.753	.725

Scales pertaining only to men are:

6. Social Influence	3	.266
7. Togetherness	4	.485
8. Role Sharing	5	.532
9. Intimacy	5	.657
10. Parental Adequacy	2	.966

Scales pertaining only to women are:

11. Community Affairs	4	.454
12. Togetherness and Role Sharing	6	.506
13. Masculine Dominance	3	.627
14. Intimacy	6	.756

The Roe-Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) was administered to each subject, one form describing the behavior of mothers and one form the behavior of fathers. Each form was composed of 130 questions answered on a five point continuum from very true to very untrue. A high score on a particular scale indicates that the parent was perceived as possessing the particular characteristic to a high degree. The ten scales of the questionnaire are:

1. Protecting
2. Demanding
3. Rejecting
4. Neglecting
5. Casual
6. Loving

7. Symbolic-Love Reward
8. Direct-Object Reward
9. Symbolic-Love Punishment
10. Direct-Object Punishment

The Family Integration Scale was developed in accordance with Rogers & Sebald's (1962) suggestion that such a scale contain items which measure attitudes, behavior, and joint participation of family members. Twenty items were taken from both Rogers & Sebald (1962) and Bardis (1959). Answers were scaled from 1 to 5 and a total score was derived, higher scores denoting a greater degree of family integration. Rogers & Sebald's items were items which dealt with the degree to which the family participated jointly in various activities, the degree to which family decision making was family centered, and the degree of integration of the individual within the family household. Attitudinal and behavioral items from the Bardis scale which measured a person's family loyalty and his perception of himself as an integral part of the family unit were used. Items which measured the joint participation of the family in activities were taken from Rogers & Sebald.

The reliability coefficients (coefficient alphas) for the Family Integration Scale were as follows: total (N=108), .871; males (N=51), .846; females (N=57), .893.

Procedure

The three inventories were administered together on a group basis to the 108 subjects, and were given in the following order: PCR Mothers, PCR Fathers, MRE, and Family Integration Scale. The subjects were instructed to answer both PCR questionnaire forms and the Family Integration Scale as they remembered their family up to the age of 12, and the MRE as they expected their own future marriages to be ideally. This procedure for the MRE is similar to Bodarsky's (1959), who asked college students' opinions concerning their anticipated marital roles.

Each subject was given four IBM answer sheets which were coded by the subject's social security number and sex. The forms were then matched for statistical analysis. Pearson Product-Moment correlations between each of the subscales for the PCR, MRE, and the Family Integration total score were obtained.

Results and Discussion

In Appendix I Table 4 and Table 5 are presented the means and the standard deviations (SDs) of the scores on each of the scales of the PCR. By use of the t test it was determined that males perceived their mothers as significantly more neglecting than their fathers ($p < .05$). No other differences between the means for the mother and father scales were significant for the males of the present sample. Females saw

their mothers as more rejecting and neglecting than they did their fathers (both $p < .05$). Also, males were more likely than females to see fathers as rejecting, direct-object punishing, and neglecting, while females were more likely than males to see their fathers as loving (all $p < .01$). Males were more likely than females to view their mothers as symbolic-love punishing ($p < .01$) and direct-object punishing ($p < .05$).

Appendix I Table 8 shows the means and SDs of the scores on each of the scales of the MRE. For the scales which are the same for both sexes, females were more likely than males to have expectations of integration ($p < .05$) and sexual fidelity ($p < .01$).

The reliability coefficients for each scale were presented earlier. The probable reason for the unreliabilities in most cases is the shortness of the scales.

In Appendix I Table 9 appear the means and SDs of the scores on the Family Integration Scale for males, females, and total sample, as well as the t -value for the difference between the mean of the males' and females' scores. The present sample of females viewed themselves as being significantly more integrated into their childhood families than did the males ($p < .05$).

In Appendix II Table 10 appear the correlations among the scales of the MRE. Although the correlations range from

low to moderate, all are positive and many of the correlations are significant, indicating that the scales of the MRE to a degree are measuring the same thing. For example, both the scores on the males' and females' scales of Socio-Emotional Integration correlate significantly with the scores on every MRE scale with the exception of Socio-Intellectual Equality. Both males' and females' scores on Socio-Intellectual Equality correlate significantly with their scores on the Wife Adequacy scale ($p < .05$). Scores on the Pre-Marital Chastity scale are correlated ($p < .01$) with the scores on the Wife Adequacy and Sexual Fidelity scales for both sexes. Males' scores on the Socio-Intellectual Equality scale are significantly related ($p < .05$) to their scores on the Togetherness scale, while their scores on the Pre-Marital Chastity scales are significantly correlated with their scores on the Togetherness and Parental Adequacy scales ($ps < .05$). The significant correlation between males' scores on the Togetherness and Role Sharing scales ($ps < .05$) was unexpected because the items comprising these scales grouped into separate factors in Tharp's (1936b) original study. In the present study, then, the separate Togetherness and Role Sharing scales for males are measuring at least partially the same thing. In Tharp's study this appeared to be the case only for females. For the males, scores on the Togetherness scale also correlated highly ($p < .005$) with scores on the Parental Adequacy

scale, as did the scores on the Role Sharing and Wife Adequacy scales ($p < .05$) and the Intimacy scale ($p < .005$). Males' scores on Sexual Fidelity correlated highly ($p < .005$) with the scores on every scale except Socio-Intellectual Equality. Their scores on the Social Influence scale are correlated with scores on the following scales: Socio-Emotional Integration ($p < .005$), Togetherness ($p < .05$), and Wife Adequacy ($p < .005$).

Females' scores on the Socio-Intellectual Equality scale are correlated significantly with scores on Togetherness and Role Sharing ($p < .005$), Pre-Marital Chastity, and Community Affairs ($p < .05$). Scores for females on the Masculine Dominance scale are significantly related to scores on every scale except Socio-Intellectual Equality and Community Affairs ($p < .05$). Scores on the Togetherness and Role Sharing scale are related to scores on the scales of Wife Adequacy ($p < .005$), Intimacy ($p < .05$), and Sexual Fidelity ($p < .05$). Females' scores on the Intimacy scale are also correlated with their scores on the Wife Adequacy scale ($p < .005$).

Certain overall patterns emerge in the above detailed analyses. For both males and females, expectations that the spouse has not engaged in intercourse with others before marriage, that sex be enjoyable and tied up with love and affection, that marital partners confide in each other and do things together, and that the wife be home-centered are

all highly related. These findings are all consistent with Tharp's (1936b). In addition, men who have these same expectations also expect to have more influence than the wife in deciding social and recreational activities, while women who have these expectations also expect the husband to be dominant in these and other decisions. For both men and women, an expectation that both spouses should be socially and intellectually equal is related to expectations that the spouses will work and play together and that the wife will be adequate in her role as housekeeper. An interesting finding is that for males, expectations of parental adequacy, sexual fidelity, and pre-marital chastity are all significantly correlated. Thus parental and spouse-intimacy roles are positively related for both males and females in the present study. Tharp found this to be true for only the females of his sample.

In Table 1 appear the correlations between the scores on the Family Integration Scale and the scores on the scales of the PCR. It is evident that intercorrelations between scores on the Family Integration Scale and scores on the scales of the PCR are higher for females than for males. Family Integration scores for males were negatively correlated with their scores on the PCR Rejecting and Neglecting scales for both parents (both $ps < .005$). Males' scores on the Family Integration Scale were also negatively related

($p < .05$) to their scores on both the Punishing Direct-Object and Rewarding Direct-Object scales of the Mothers' form of the PCR. Males' Family Integration scores were positively related ($p < .05$) to their scores on the PCR Fathers' scale of Loving, while the correlation between their scores on the Family Integration Scale and PCR Mothers' Loving was almost, but not quite significant.

Evidently the Family Integration Scale is more closely related to females' perceptions of their parent-child relations than to males'. Significant correlations were found for every scale of the PCR for females. Females' scores on the Loving and Protecting scales for both parents were positively related ($p < .05$) to their scores on the Family Integration Scale, while their scores on the Rejecting and Neglecting scales were negatively correlated ($p < .005$). Females' scores on the Family Integration Scale were positively correlated to their scores on PCR scales of Symbolic-Love Rewarding and Direct-Object Rewarding (all $ps < .005$) for both parents, while their Family Integration Scale scores were negatively correlated with their scores on the PCR Direct-Object and Symbolic-Love Punishing scales for both parents (all $ps < .05$). Females' scores on the Family Integration Scale were also positively correlated with their scores on the PCR Casual scale (both $ps < .05$) and negatively correlated with their scores on the PCR Demanding scale ($p < .01$) for both parents.

Table 1¹Intercorrelations Between Scores on Scales of the PCR
and the Family Integration Scale

PCR Scales	Family Integration Scale		
	Males (N=51)	Females (N=57)	Total (N=108)
<u>Mother</u>			
Protecting	110	331*	160
Punishing			
Symbolic-Love	-201	-355**	-248**
Rejecting	-480***	-518***	-437***
Casual	-082	336*	141
Rewarding			
Symbolic-Love	088	600***	273***
Demanding	-124	-381***	-229**
Punishing			
Direct-Object	-308*	-303*	-295***
Loving	277	705***	426***
Neglecting	-472**	-538***	-428***
Rewarding			
Direct-Object	-349*	443***	187
<u>Father</u>			
Protecting	068	331*	215
Punishing			
Symbolic-Love	-150	-355*	-273***
Rejecting	-367**	-518***	-449***
Casual	-060	336*	162
Rewarding			
Symbolic-Love	081	600***	386***
Demanding	-122	-381**	-276***
Punishing			
Direct-Object	-187	-303*	-260**
Loving	281*	705***	501***
Neglecting	-333*	-538***	-438***
Rewarding			
Direct-Object	009	443***	250**

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.005

¹Decimals preceding each correlation coefficient have been dropped

Note: Two-tailed tests used in all cases

Several trends became apparent in that males who described themselves as being highly integrated into their family, as taking part in a large number of family-oriented activities, as feeling close to their family, and as feeling that the family was one of the most important influences in their lives were likely to see their parents as loving and accepting. Males who were not integrated into their families tended to perceive their parents as rejecting and neglecting. Females who rated themselves as integrated into the family and as greatly valuing the family were likely to view both parents as protecting and loving rather than as rejecting or neglecting. Parents in integrated families were also seen as being low in any kind of punitiveness and as rewarding their children with both love and affection and material goods.

In Table 2 appear the correlations among scores on the scales of the PCR and the MRE. Correlations for which a specific directional hypothesis had been stated were evaluated by means of one-tailed tests. Those for which there were no specific, stated hypotheses were evaluated by means of two-tailed tests.

Results of Hypotheses Concerned with Both Males and Females

Hypothesis (1), that there would be significant positive correlations between scores on the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Intimacy, Wife Adequacy, and Sexual Fidelity, was

Table 2¹
Correlations Among Scores on the MRE and the PCR Scales²

Males (N=51)

MRE	PCR Mother Scales									
	PRO	PUN S-L	REJ	CAS	REW S-L	DEM	PUN D-O	LOV	NEG	REW D-O
SEI	254	137	-116	046	428***	442***	-012	386***	-251*	337*
SIE	319*	313*	152	-041	236	168	138	168	-011	356**
PMC	162	-007	-219	-148	115	200	-019	154	-250	116
SI	-115	038	-006	-082	080	220	157	169	-198	008
Tog	238	058	-136	-054	270	372**	027	273*	-193	230
RS	030	103	-150	-186	233*	412***	-085	286*	-283*	-006
WA	373**	276*	169	-119	298*	370***	203	271	-227	257
Int	-042	-039	-157	-133	146	265*	-027	114	-155	161
PA	-049	-167	-187	-072	084	262	-176	133	-122	132
Sex F	013	-095	-283*	-059	204	376**	-121	217	-296*	165

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.005

¹All decimal points preceding the correlation coefficients have been dropped.

²Correlations which were predicted to be significant are underlined in the table.

These correlations are evaluated for significance by means of a one-tailed test since the direction was specified in the stated hypotheses. All other correlations in the table were evaluated for significance by means of two-tailed tests.

Note: See Appendix Ib for explanation of abbreviations.

Table 2 Continued

Males (N=51)

MRE	PCR Father Scales									
	PRO	PUN S-L	REJ	CAS	REW S-L	DEM	PUN D-O	LOV	NEG	REW D-O
SEI	187	-001	-336**	140	350**	045	-095	510***	-234*	334*
SIE	086	236	-054	103	280*	005	196	142	095	228
PMC	175	-208	-343*	-009	080	-067	-162	+200	-316*	020
SI	-176	168	-028	150	-004	073	046	201	-136	074
Tog	242	159	-168	-148	257	293*	093	243	-183	174
RS	069	-051	-394***	-109	240*	103	-122	558***	-401***	094
WA	168	116	-087	250	261*	-038	171	437***	-019	434***
Int	-018	-061	-281*	029	250	025	-103	150	-108	182
PA	-017	-014	-228	233	032	163	-096	121	-125	008
Sex F	105	-189	-387***	049	140	-029	-275*	312*	-338**	230

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.005

Table 2 Continued
Females (N=57)

MRE	PCR Mother Scales									
	PRO	PUN S-L	REJ	CAS	REW S-L	DEM	PUN D-O	LOV	NEG	REW D-O
SEI	115	-072	035	172	074	040	-008	137	-095	084
SIE	025	220	157	149	204	147	-051	-050	083	114
PMC	061	039	195	-119	-190	132	-020	097	147	-200
CA	021	061	037	-074	088	-014	047	-023	-037	-034
T & RS	150	-023	-030	187	225	000	057	170	-095	169
MD	397***	100	-005	078	113	136	-100	192	-068	100
WA	252	089	147	113	078	129	007	066	052	100
Int	250	-057	-070	257	264*	-141	-075	332**	-116	258
Sex F	190	012	-016	047	152	018	-031	083	-008	144

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.001

Table 2 Continued

Females (N=57)

MRE	PCR Father Scales									
	PRO	PUN S-L	REJ	CAS	REW S-L	DEM	PUN D-O	LOV	NEG	REW D-O
SEI	204	035	076	-072	135	126	-060	163	-043	097
SIE	115	118	022	088	246	010	-139	117	-104	-011
PMC	163	080	252	-176	-090	134	001	-080	020	-180
CA	-033	-091	-002	-008	-026	-131	-034	042	-015	006
T & RS	250	135	145	091	110	077	-127	026	072	184
MD	136	217	197	-165	027	301*	139	-055	025	-035
WA	248	179	193	-156	187	276*	096	036	032	176
Int	216	075	033	-053	339**	082	-010	175	-060	121
Sex F	037	032	092	-091	191	-034	-011	061	019	026

*p<.05

**p<.01

only partially confirmed. Males' scores on both PCR Loving scales were positively related to their scores on the MRE Socio-Emotional Integration scale ($p < .005$), while their scores on PCR Fathers' Loving scales were positively correlated with their scores on the MRE Sexual Fidelity scale ($p < .05$). Females' scores on Mothers' PCR Loving scale were positively correlated with their scores on the MRE Intimacy scale ($p < .01$).

The second hypothesis predicted that there would be significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, Intimacy, and Sexual fidelity. The hypothesis was partially confirmed for males and not at all confirmed for females. Males' scores on the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scale were negatively correlated with their scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration ($p < .01$) and Intimacy ($p < .05$), while their scores on both Mothers' and Fathers' Rejecting scales were negatively correlated with their scores on Sexual Fidelity ($p < .05$).

Hypothesis (3) predicted significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Neglecting scales and the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, Intimacy, and Sexual Fidelity. Partial confirmation was obtained in that there were significant negative correlations between males' scores on both

Mothers' and Fathers' PCR Neglecting scales and the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Sexual Fidelity ($p < .05$). No significant correlations for females' scores were obtained.

Hypothesis (4) was concerned with the correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and Fathers' PCR Symbolic-Love Reward scales and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration, Wife Adequacy, and Sexual Fidelity. The hypothesis was supported in that a significant positive correlation was obtained between males' scores on the Symbolic-Love Rewarding scales and the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Wife Adequacy ($p < .05$). The hypothesis was not supported in that there were no significant correlations for females' scores and in that males' scores on the PCR scales of Symbolic-Love Rewarding and the MRE scale of Sexual Fidelity were not significantly correlated.

Results of Hypotheses Concerned Only with Males

Hypothesis (6) predicted significant positive correlations between the scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE scales of Social Influence and Role Sharing. The hypothesis was supported in that males' PCR Loving scores were positively correlated with scores on the MRE Role Sharing scale ($p < .05$), but not supported in that there were no significant correlations between scores on the PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE Social Influence scale.

Negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Social Influence and Role Sharing were predicted in the seventh hypothesis. This hypothesis was not confirmed except in the single finding that males' scores on the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales were correlated negatively with their scores on the MRE Role Sharing scale ($p < .005$).

Hypothesis (8) predicted significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Neglecting scales and the scores on the MRE scale of Role Sharing. These predicted negative correlations were significant at or better than the .05 level.

Hypothesis (9) was concerned with the correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Symbolic-Love Rewarding scales and the scores on the MRE scale of Role Sharing, and was confirmed in that correlations were significantly positive at or better than the .05 level.

Results of Hypotheses Concerned Only with Females

Hypothesis (11) predicted significant positive correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Loving scales and scores on the MRE scales of Community Affairs and Togetherness and Role Sharing. The hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis (12) predicted significant negative correlations between scores on both the Mothers' and the Fathers' PCR Rejecting scales and scores on the MRE scales of Community

Affairs and Togetherness and Role Sharing. This hypothesis was also not supported by the data.

The following significant correlations between the scores on the PCR scales and scores on the MRE scales were not predicted: for males, scores on both parents' Symbolic-Love Rewarding PCR scales correlated positively with scores on the MRE scale of Socio-Intellectual Equality ($ps < .05$), as were the scores on both parents' PCR Demanding scales and scores on the MRE scale of Togetherness ($ps < .05$); scores on PCR Mothers' scales of Symbolic-Love Rewarding and Protecting were positively correlated with scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Wife Adequacy; scores on the PCR Mothers' Demanding scale correlated positively with scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration ($p < .005$), Togetherness ($p < .01$), Role Sharing ($p < .005$), Wife Adequacy ($p < .005$), Intimacy ($p < .05$), and Sexual Fidelity ($p < .01$); scores on the PCR Mothers' Loving scale were positively correlated with scores on the MRE scale of Togetherness ($p < .05$); scores on the PCR Mothers' Direct-Object Rewarding scale were positively correlated with scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Socio-Intellectual Equality ($ps < .05$); scores on the MRE scale of Pre-Marital Chastity were negatively related to scores on PCR Fathers' Rejecting and Neglecting scales ($ps < .05$); scores on the PCR Fathers' scale of Direct-Object Rewarding were positively related to scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Wife

Adequacy ($p < .05$); and finally, scores on the PCR Fathers' Loving scale were positively correlated with scores on the MRE scales of Wife Adequacy ($p < .005$) and Sexual Fidelity ($p < .05$).

Unpredicted significant correlations for females are as follows: scores on both parents' PCR Symbolic-Love Rewarding scales were positively related to Intimacy ($p < .05$); scores on the MRE scale of Desire for Masculine Dominance were positively correlated with scores on the PCR Mothers' Protecting scale and the PCR Fathers' Demanding scale ($p < .05$); scores on the PCR Mothers' scale of Loving were positively related to scores on the MRE scale of Intimacy ($p < .01$); and finally, scores on the PCR Fathers' scale of Demanding were positively correlated with the scores on the MRE scale of Wife Adequacy ($p < .05$).

In Table 3 appear the correlations between the scores on the Family Integration Scale and the various measures of the MRE. Hypothesis (5), that there would be significant positive correlations between scores on the Family Integration Scale and scores on the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Intimacy, was partially confirmed in that males' scores on the Family Integration Scale were positively correlated with their scores on the MRE scale of Socio-Emotional Integration ($p < .01$), and females' scores on the Family Integration Scale were positively related to their

Table 3¹

Correlations Between Scores on the Family Integration Scale and Scales of the MRE²

MRE	Family Integration Scale		
Scale	Males (N=51)	Females (N=57)	Total (N=108)
SEI	<u>312</u> **	<u>288</u> *	305***
SIE	<u>198</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>201</u> *
PMC	464***	142	280***
Sex F	283*	142	141
WA	276*	173	212*
SI	214		
Tog	210		
RS	<u>193</u>		
Int	<u>118</u>	<u>287</u> *	
PA	<u>160</u>		
CA		195	
T & RS		136	
MD		103	

*p .05

**p .01

***p .005

¹Correlations for which there was a previous directional hypothesis stated are underlined and were evaluated for significance by means of a one-tailed test. All other correlations were evaluated by means of a two-tailed test.

²Decimals preceding each correlation coefficient have been dropped.

scores on both of the MRE scales of Socio-Emotional Integration and Intimacy ($ps < .05$). Hypothesis (10) was not supported in that males' scores on the Family Integration Scale and their scores on the MRE scale of Role Sharing were not significantly correlated. Hypothesis (13) was not supported in that females' scores on the Family Integration Scale were not significantly correlated with their scores on the MRE scale of Togetherness and Role Sharing. An interesting finding was that the correlations between the males' scores on the Family Integration Scale and their scores on the MRE scales of Pre-Marital Chastity, Sexual Fidelity, and Wife Adequacy were all significantly positive (all $ps < .05$).

Concerning the total number of correlations between scores on the scales of the PCR and the MRE, 22 per cent of the males' correlations were significant while only 3.9 per cent of the females' correlations were significant. Of the total number of correlations between scores on the Family Integration Scale and the scales of the MRE, 40 per cent of the males' correlations were significant, while only 22 per cent of the females' correlations were significant. Because of these patterns it was tentatively suggested that the MRE is a better measure of the marital role expectations of males than of females.

Several major trends are evident in the analysis of parent-child relations and marital role expectations. Previous research was supported insofar as it had demonstrated

functional relationships between certain parent-child relations and personality variables. It was assumed that people with a certain personality characteristic would be likely to expect themselves and others to act in accordance with that characteristic. The data in this study indicated that males' perceptions of their parents as loving are positively related to their expectations that their future family will stay together, will be socially and emotionally integrated, that their wife will be home-centered, and that sex will be pleasurable and affectionate. These perceptions are also related to males' expectations that the wife should be informed of financial and business affairs, that the husband will take an active interest in the house and the children, and that both spouses will abstain from extramarital affairs. These findings are generally consistent with the research by Altman (1958), Peck (1958), and Slater (1962) who all found that parental warmth and acceptance is related to such positive personality traits in children as friendliness, openness, spontaneity, and gregariousness. Correspondingly, males' perceptions of parents as rejecting and neglecting are negatively correlated with these same marital expectation factors. This supports the findings of Bronfenbrenner (1961) and Nye (1958) who have indicated that parental rejecting and neglecting behaviors are related to hostility, distrust, irresponsibility, and many other negative personality traits.

In addition, males' perceptions of mothers as loving are positively related to expectations that the spouses have similar intellectual, social, and recreational interests. Males' perceptions of fathers as loving are related to their expectations that the wife be both an adequate housekeeper and parent. Males' perceptions of fathers as rejecting and neglecting are negatively correlated with expectations of pre-marital chastity, while their perceptions of fathers as rejecting are also negatively correlated with expectations of socio-emotional integration, role sharing, intimacy with the spouse and the binding up of sex with love and affection. Males' perceptions of their mothers as protecting are positively related to their expectations that their future family will be close and do many things together, that sex will be pleasurable and affectionate, and that their wives will be adequate parents and housekeepers. Perceptions of fathers as protecting do not relate to any of the MRE factors.

Males' perceptions of parents as casual in their behavior do not correlate significantly with any of the MRE scales, but their perceptions of mothers as demanding are positively related to their marital expectations of socio-emotional integration, role sharing, intimacy, and sexual fidelity, and their perceptions of both parents as demanding are positively related to expectations that they and their spouse will have similar social, intellectual, and recreational interests. This might be interpreted to be somewhat in

opposition to Chorost's (1961) finding that children who perceive their parents as demanding show a great deal of hostility if it were not for the fact that Golding (1969) reported that the Loving and Demanding factors were positively correlated in 18 per cent of the studies he reviewed.

Males' viewing of both parents as high in symbolic forms of reward, e.g. verbal praise, is positively related to their expectations that their future marriages will be socially and emotionally integrated, socially and intellectually equal, characterized by role sharing, and that their wives will be adequate parents and housekeepers, and that both spouses will be oriented toward the achievement of success and material possessions. Also, males' perceptions of fathers as being direct-object punishing are negatively related to their expectations of sexual fidelity for themselves and their wives. These findings agree with those of Sears, Maccoby, and Levin (1957), who found that parental symbolic-love rewarding behaviors are related to positive characteristics in children, especially responsibility.

Women who have expectations that they will be friends and companions to their husbands, that sex will be tied to love and affection, and that they and their husbands will be adequate parents are more likely to see their mothers as being loving and casual and are more likely to see both parents as symbolic-love rewarding. Females who have expectations that the husband will be the dominant spouse are

likely to view their mothers as having been protecting and their fathers as having been demanding. Also interesting is the finding that those females who have expectations of being adequate wives and parents remember their fathers as having been demanding when they were children. A case might therefore be built that females' perceptions of their fathers as demanding carry over into their marital expectations that their husbands will be dominant.

The data concerned with the degree of their integration into their family in childhood and the value placed on those family ties indicates that males who view themselves as having been an integral part of their family are more likely to have marital role expectations that their future family will be able to play and stay together, be socially and emotionally integrated, that their wives will be home-centered, that sex will be pleasurable and bound up with love and affection, that the spouses will be friends and companions, that neither spouse will have had intercourse with any other partner prior to marriage, and that both spouses will abstain from extra-marital affairs. Females who see themselves as having been an integral part of their family are more likely to have all of the marital expectations mentioned above for males with the exception that they are not as likely to expect pre-marital chastity and sexual fidelity of their prospective spouses.

The data obtained in this study indicate then that children who perceive themselves as having been raised in families characterized by a high degree of closeness, warmth, and affection are likely to have marital role expectations of friendliness, role sharing, intimacy, trust, and sexual and parental responsibility. Males who are raised in families which use praise and affection for rewards have expectations that both themselves and their prospective wives will be responsible in many areas, while their expectations of sexual responsibility are negatively related to their fathers' use of physical and material punishment. Males' expectations of socio-emotional integration, togetherness, role sharing, wife adequacy, intimacy, and sexual fidelity are also related positively to their perceptions of their mothers as demanding. Females who are raised in families which use praise and affection as a means of reward have marital expectations of friendship, companionship, affection, and responsibility, while those who see their mothers as protecting and their fathers as demanding expect their husband to be the dominant spouse in the marriage.

These findings have a great many implications for both professionals and non-professionals of all types. Many studies in the literature have shown that certain marital role expectations and personality characteristics are positively related to a higher probability of marital adjustment and success than are others. For example, Locke (1951) found

that expectations of leadership by the husband are positively correlated with marital adjustment, while Elder (1962) found that couples with expectations of shared leadership are the most happy while those marriages in which the wife is dominant spouse are the least happy. Expectations that each partner be intimate and friendly and share household and financial roles were shown to be related to marital adjustment by Benson (1955), Frumkin (1954), and Locke (1951). In addition, Benson (1955) found that interests and expectations rated as familistic in nature rather than individualistic are positively correlated with marital adjustment. Locke (1951) found that expectations that the spouses engage in mutually satisfying sexual relationships and that each abstain from socially disapproved behavior are positively related to marital adjustment. Similarly Kotlar (1965) and Terman (1939) found that couples who have role expectations which conformed to cultural ideals and norms are more likely to have successful marriages. Terman (1939) showed that happily married women had personality traits of kindness, cooperation, and charity, and expected the same traits in others, while happily married men had expectations of cooperation, initiative, and responsibility.

As has been demonstrated by the data in this and other studies (Altman, 1958; Chorost, 1961; Peck, 1958; and others), people who grow up in certain types of homes are likely to

have both the marital role expectations and the personality characteristics which are vital to a happy and successful marriage. As has been demonstrated by this study, the ideal home which would contribute to the child's development of the most desirable marital expectations would be one which is close, affectionate, does many things together, keeps open lines of communication with the children and is interested in them, is highly integrated, expects the children to live up to certain goals and fulfill their potentials but is not unduly harsh, sets limits for responsible behavior, generally uses symbolic rewards such as praise and affection and, especially with girls, is protective. Parents who are concerned with providing their young with the skills and attitudes necessary for a successful marriage and family life should endeavor to create and maintain these kinds of home atmospheres. Children raised in such homes will not only be likely to develop the personality characteristics which are so important in marriage but will also benefit directly from the observation of critical marital skills and expectations displayed by their parents. Such children will be more likely to be affectionate, intimate, and responsible in their own marriage, take an active interest in the marriage, the family, and their own children, and be able to respect and share one another's parental roles without role confusion (as when the wife becomes the dominant spouse).

In addition, marriage counselors should be concerned with the types of marital role expectations which are most likely to lead to a happy and successful marriage. Pre-marital counseling should be a time when counselors can explore these expectations with the prospective marital partners. Persons with expectations which would likely lead to a poor or unsuccessful marriage should be made aware of the negative effect these expectations are likely to have on their chances of marital success. These people could also be advised to delay their marriage until they have carefully reviewed their attitudes and expectations concerning marriage.

A knowledge of the contribution of parent-child relations to marital role expectations could help the marriage counselor deal with the rationalizations for poor marital expectations given by his clients. For example, a couple might inform the counselor that they plan to enter a "modern" marriage in which neither partner would be expected to maintain sexual fidelity or responsibility. The counselor could point out that no matter how much an idea like this is in style, these types of expectations commonly lead to unsuccessful marriages. The counselor could then point out that his clients' expectations are probably the result of their own poor relations with their respective families rather than the result of an avant-garde philosophy, and that these types of expectations will only lead to a continuance of poor marital and family relations in their own case. The counselor

can therefore avoid a tiresome argument concerning the outmoded values of the middle class and can present some cold, hard facts to his clients.

It is said that prevention is the best kind of medicine. It should therefore be the pre-marital counselor's duty to be acquainted with the marital expectations which are most likely to lead to a successful marriage and their relationships to parent-child relations so that he might transmit this information to his clients in order to avoid and/or minimize future marriage problems.

This knowledge is equally important to the counselor who deals with the problems of couples who are already married. A knowledge of the relationships between marital role expectations and parent-child relations would help him to show his clients where problems arise and how they might be solved or ameliorated. Both pre-marriage and marriage counselors could also advise their clients in ways in which they could increase the probability that their own children would be able to achieve successful marriages by a knowledge of these relationships.

Educators need to be well aware of the interrelationships between these variables so that they can effectively train students in methods which will maximize the success of not only their own marriages, but will also result in the students' homes becoming more effective training grounds for

future happy and successful citizens, parents, and marriage partners rather than neurotic and miserable divorcees.

Summary

The purpose of this investigation was to explore the various relationships between measures of marital role expectations, measures of perceived parent-child relations, and the integration of the family or orientation. The scales of the Roe-Siegelman Parent-Child Relations Questionnaire (PCR) were used as the measure of parent-child relations, a modified form of Tharp's (1963b) Marital Role Expectations Form (MRE) was used as the measure of marital role expectations, and a Family Integration Scale, constructed using items from Bardis (1959) and Rogers and Sebald (1962), was used as the measure of family integration. The inventories were administered to 51 males and 57 females, all undergraduate students who had never been married and whose families were intact at least until their twelfth birthday.

Previous research had pointed to relations between factors of marital adjustment, parent-child relations, and the extent of family integration. Research had indicated that generally children who experienced love and warmth in their home had marital expectations of friendliness, spontaneity, adaptability, trust, responsibility, and leadership, while those who experienced rejecting and neglecting parental

behaviors were more likely to have expectations of being seclusive, guilt-laden, hostile, rigid, mistrustful, and irresponsible. Consistent with this research were the findings in the present study that males who experienced warm, loving parent-child relations are more likely to have expectations of friendliness, role sharing, intimacy, trust, and sexual and parental responsibility. Research had also pointed to links between parents' use of symbolic rewards and the development of responsibility in children. This was confirmed for males in that the use of symbolic rewards by their parents was correlated positively with their expectations that both themselves and their future wives would act responsibly in many areas. Sexual responsibility for males was also found to be negatively related to the father's use of direct-object punishment. Finally, it was found that males' expectations of socio-emotional integration, togetherness, role sharing, wife adequacy, intimacy, and sexual fidelity are all positively related to the mother's demanding behavior.

Far fewer significant correlations were obtained for females, and it was suggested that this was perhaps an artifact of the MRE. It was found that females' perceptions of parents as loving are related positively to their expectations of friendship, companionship, and the binding up of sex with love and affection. It was also demonstrated that parental use of symbolic rewards is positively related to expectations of friendship, companionship, affection, and

responsibility. And finally, it was demonstrated that females who have expectations of masculine dominance also tend to view their mothers as having been protecting and their fathers as having been demanding.

Males and females who see themselves as highly integrated into their families tend to have expectations of soci-emotional integration, role sharing, and intimacy. For males, these perceptions of family integration are also related to expectations of pre-marital chastity and sexual fidelity, while for females they are also related to expectations of parental adequacy.

It was emphasized that a knowledge of the relationships between perceptions of early home experiences and marital expectations as well as a knowledge of the general contribution of marital role expectations to marital adjustment should be an area of concern to parents, marital partners, counselors, and educators.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Means, SDs, and t-tests for Scores on Scales of the
PCR, MRE, and Family Integration Scale

Table 4

Means, SDs, and t-tests of Scores on Each Scale of Both
Mother and Father Forms of the PCR for Males (N=51)

PCR Scale	Form	Means	SDs	<u>t</u>
PRO	Mother	42.86	8.12	NS ¹
	Father	45.18	6.42	
PUN S-L	Mother	28.29	6.37	NS
	Father	29.02	5.62	
REJ	Mother	33.75	9.49	NS
	Father	31.63	8.67	
CAS	Mother	44.78	8.47	NS
	Father	45.59	8.20	
REW S-L	Mother	33.43	6.73	NS
	Father	34.94	4.58	
DEM	Mother	48.92	9.48	NS
	Father	45.63	8.29	
PUN D-O	Mother	27.67	7.88	NS
	Father	27.67	5.98	
LOV	Mother	54.00	9.69	NS
	Father	56.35	8.97	
NEG	Mother	34.02	9.09	2.35*
	Father	30.00	8.20	
REW D-O	Mother	27.92	6.99	NS
	Father	29.14	6.42	

¹Non-significant

*p<.05

Table 5

Means, SDs, and t-tests of Scores on Each Scale of Both Mother and Father Forms of the PCR for Females (N=57)

PCR Scale	Form	Means	SDs	<u>t</u>
PRO	Mother	45.51	8.24	NS
	Father	44.02	7.66	
PUN S-L	Mother	25.96	6.47	NS
	Father	27.40	6.47	
REJ	Mother	31.68	11.12	2.19*
	Father	27.65	8.38	
CAS	Mother	45.37	9.44	NS
	Father	46.63	8.65	
REW S-L	Mother	34.49	7.08	NS
	Father	35.44	5.51	
DEM	Mother	46.25	10.61	NS
	Father	43.16	9.39	
PUN D-O	Mother	24.44	7.62	NS
	Father	24.67	6.51	
LOV	Mother	56.49	11.32	2.54*
	Father	61.37	9.10	
NEG	Mother	32.12	11.10	3.06**
	Father	26.77	7.16	
REW D-O	Mother	28.51	7.63	NS
	Father	28.58	7.07	

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 6

Means, SDs, and t -tests of Scores on Scales of the Father Form of the PCR for which a Significant Difference was Found Between Males and Females

PCR Scale	Sex	Means	SDs	t
REJ	Males	31.63	8.67	2.74**
	Females	27.65	8.38	
PUN D-O	Males	27.67	5.98	2.50*
	Females	24.67	6.51	
LOV	Males	56.35	8.97	2.89**
	Females	61.37	9.10	
NEG	Males	30.00	8.20	2.17*
	Females	26.77	7.16	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 7

Means, SDs, and t -tests of Scores on Scales of the Mother Form of the PCR for which a Significant Difference was Found Between Males and Females

PCR Scale	Sex	Means	SDs	t
PUN S-L	Males	28.29	6.37	2.51*
	Females	25.96	6.47	
PUN D-O	Males	27.67	7.88	2.17*
	Females	24.44	7.62	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Table 8

Means, SDs, and t-tests of Scores on Scales of the
MRE for 51 Males and 57 Females

MRE Scale	Sex	Means	SDs	t
SEI ^a	Male	37.47	4.31	
	Female	39.14	3.75	NS
SIE ^b	Male	15.24	2.64	
	Female	14.91	3.12	NS
PMC ^c	Male	5.75	2.62	
	Female	4.95	2.47	NS
WA ^d	Male	26.04	2.55	
	Female	25.30	4.53	NS
Sex F ^e	Male	18.02	2.75	
	Female	19.16	1.75	2.53*
SI ^f	Male	13.75	1.89	
Tog ^g	Male	14.61	2.07	
RS ^h	Male	25.41	2.55	
Int ⁱ	Male	28.84	1.84	
PA ^j	Male	9.33	1.09	
Int	Female	39.11	1.93	
CA ^k	Female	14.65	2.54	
T&RS ^l	Female	37.32	3.51	
MD ^m	Female	10.35	2.81	

*p<.05

**p<.01

^aSocio-Emotional Integration^bSocio-Intellectual Equality^cPre-Marital Chastity^dWife Adequacy^eSexual Fidelity^fSocial Influence^gTogetherness^hRole SharingⁱIntimacy^jParental Adequacy^kCommunity Affairs^lTogetherness & Role
Sharing^mDesire for Masculine
Dominance

Table 9

Means, SDs, and t -test of Scores on the
Family Integration Scale

Sex	Means	SDs	t
Males (N=51)	52.00	10.71	
Females (N=57)	58.12	14.09	2.56**
Total (N=108)	55.06	12.07	

** $p < .01$

APPENDIX II

Correlations Among Scales of the MRE and the PCR

Table 10¹Correlations Among Scales of the MRE for Males (N=51)²

	SIE	PMC	Tog	RS	WA	Int	PA	Sex F	SI
SEI	211	495***	500***	557***	684***	502***	519***	680***	436***
SIE		145	339*	116	311*	222	194	129	121
PMC			287*	249	361**	154	374**	523***	124
Tog				307*	214	247*	494***	392***	328*
RS					375**	180	295*	421***	251
Wa						304*	264*	443***	449***
Int							396***	619***	265
PA								446***	179

*p<.05

**p<.01

***p<.005

¹All decimal points preceding the correlation coefficients have been dropped.²All correlations tested for significance with a two-tailed test.

Table 10¹(continued)
 Correlations Among Scales of the MRE for Females (N=57)

	SIE	PMC	CA	T&RS	MD	WA	Int	Sex F
SEI	129	392***	285*	603***	525***	664***	614***	497***
SIE		103	225	384***	229	289*	209	117
PMC			240	316*	388***	384***	207	431***
CA				301*	212	289*	136	098
T&RS					364**	606***	311*	323*
MD						694***	377***	387***
WA							392***	330*

*p<.05
 **p<.01
 ***p<.005

Table 11¹

Intercorrelations Among Scores on Scales of the Mother Form of the PCR (N=108)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 PRO									
2 PUN S-L	18								
3 REJ	-08	63**							
4 CAS	22*	-20*	-11						
5 REW S-L	56**	15	-28**	21*					
6 DEM	05	62**	52**	-45**	-06				
7 PUN D-O	-04	64**	52**	-39**	04	52**			
8 LOV	50**	-13	-53**	27**	75**	-33**	-21*		
9 NEG	-21*	40**	77**	11	-41**	31**	27**	-65**	
10 REW D-O	49**	18	-17	42**	67**	-05	-01	51**	58**

*p<.05

**p<.01

¹All decimals preceding the correlation coefficients have been dropped.

Note: All correlations evaluated for significance by means of two-tailed tests.

Table 12
Intercorrelations Among Scores on Scales of the Fathers Form of the PCR (N=108)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 PRO									
2 PUN S-L	23**								
3 REJ	09	67**							
4 CAS	24**	-22*	-18						
5 REW S-L	40**	00	-25**	30**					
6 DEM	16	62**	58**	-53**	-11				
7 PUN D-O	00	64**	57**	-37**	-11	56**			
8 LOV	11	-40**	-71**	37**	54**	-46**	-37**		
9 NEG	11	53**	81**	00	-16	38**	48**	-63**	
10 REW D-O	44**	11	-01	38**	53**	-07	19*	37**	04

*p<.05

**p<.01

¹All decimals preceding the correlation coefficients have been dropped.

Note: All correlations evaluated for significance by means of two-tailed tests.

APPENDIX IIIa
Marriage-Role Expectations Form

Roland G. Tharp (A. H. rev.)

How important for the ideal marriage is its
(very important, somewhat important, neither important nor unimportant,
(generally unimportant, very unimportant)

1. that the husband should be the social equal of his wife?
2. that the wife should be the social equal of her husband?
3. that the husband should be at least equal to his wife in intelligence?
4. that the husband should "wear the pants"?
5. that the husband and wife should have similar intellectual interests, such as scientific, literary, musical, etc.?
6. that the husband and wife should like the same types of amusements (cards, dancing, theater, etc.)?
7. that the husband and wife should engage in the same outdoor sports (golf, hiking, swimming, etc.)?
8. that husband and wife, if congenial, should take their vacations together?
9. that husband and wife should respect each other's religious, political, or ethical convictions and not strive to change them?
10. that husband and wife should not try to make each other over in habits, manners, dress, etc.?
11. that the wife should be kept fully informed of the family finances and her husband's business?
12. that the father should take an active interest in the discipline and training of the children?
13. that the household affairs should be run in a neat and orderly manner?
14. that the wife should not have had sexual intercourse with any other man before marriage?
15. that the husband should not have had sexual intercourse with any other woman before marriage?
16. that after marriage the wife should be 100% faithful to her husband in regard to sex?
17. that after marriage the husband should be 100% faithful to his wife in regard to sex?

18. that the wife obey her husband?
 19. that the husband should have the main say-so in family matters?
 20. that the husband should "get ahead" in his job?
 21. that the home be clean and in order at all times?
 22. that the wife devote a major part of her interests and energies to looking after the home and family?
 23. that the home be a place where family members and their friends can relax and enjoy themselves at all times?
 24. that the husband and wife take part in many recreational activities together?
 25. that you have children?
 26. that you own material things (such as a home, car, furniture, clothes, etc.) which compare in value with those of your neighbors, your friends, and the people you (your husband) work(s) with?
 27. that you have sexual intercourse every time you desire it?
 28. that sexual relations be closely bound up with love and affection?
 29. that you find pleasure in your sexual relations with your spouse?
 30. that you have sexual intercourse with your spouse every time you desire it?
 31. that children be good and well-behaved at all times?
 32. that children can grow up in a home atmosphere in which their ideas and feelings are considered and talked over in making family decisions?
 33. that you, your spouse, and your children take part in many recreational activities together?
 34. that the wife be adequate as a mother?
 35. that the husband be adequate as a father?
- How important is it that you be a
36. participant in community affairs?
 37. friend and companion to your spouse?
 38. lover and sexual partner to your spouse?

How important is it that your spouse be a

39. (very, somewhat, neither important nor unimportant, unimportant, very un-) participant in community affairs?

40. friend and companion to you?

41. lover and sexual partner ~~you~~ to you?

How important is it that the husband have greater influence in

42. relationships with relative?

43. choice of friends?

44. recreation and social activities?

45. running the household?

How important is it that the wife have greater influence in

46. relationships with relatives?

47. choice of friends?

48. recreation and social activities?

49. running the household?

How important is it

50. that the family attend church together regularly?

APPENDIX IIIb
Familism Scale

1. Are your parents now living together?
How often did (very often, often, occasionally, seldom, never)
2. your parents help you with your school work and problems?
3. your parents discuss your school situation with your teacher?
4. your parents participate with you in vocational activities or hobbies?
5. you attend events like fairs, athletic games, picnics, movies, etc. as a family?
6. you have a family night during the week?
7. you go to church together as a family?
8. did you have religious activities together at home as a family?
9. you work around the farm or home together as a family?
10. you attend community events with relatives rather than with others?
11. you attend events outside the community with relatives rather than with others?
12. you exchange work more with relatives than with others?
13. you associate more with relatives than with others?
14. you talk to your parents when you were troubled?

Please rate the following:

(very true, true, neither true nor false, untrue, very untrue)

15. I enjoyed being with my family.
16. My family was never indifferent to me as a person.
17. The family was the most important aspect of my life.
18. A person should always be completely loyal to his family.
19. A person should always avoid every action of which his family disapproves.
20. A person should always help his parents with the support of his younger brothers and sisters if necessary.

Items Comprising the MRE Scales

Scales pertaining to both males and females:

1. Socio-Emotional Integration - 22, 23, 25, 31, 32, 33
2. Socio-Intellectual Equality - 1, 2, 3
3. Pre-Marital Chastity - 14, 15
4. Sexual Fidelity - 16, 17
5. Wife Adequacy - 13, 18, 20, 36, 31

Scales pertaining only to males:

6. Social Influence - 42, 43, 44
7. Togetherness - 5, 6, 7, 24
8. Role Sharing - 9, 11, 12, 13, 21
9. Intimacy - 28, 37, 38, 40, 41
10. Parental Adequacy - 34, 35

Scales pertaining only to females:

11. Community Affairs - 9, 24, 36, 39
12. Togetherness & Role Sharing - 6, 7, 11, 12, 13, 25
13. Desire for Masculine Dominance - 4, 18, 45
14. Intimacy - 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41

References

- Aldous, J. The consequences of intergenerational continuity. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 462-468.
- Altman, C. H. Relationships between maternal attitudes and child personality structure. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1958, 12, 160-169.
- Amon, L. The home and family in rural Saskatchewan. Royal Commission on Agriculture and Rural Life. Regina, Saskatchewan, 1956.
- Bardis, P. D. Attitudes toward the family among college students and their parents. Sociology and Social Research, 1959, 43, 352-358.
- Bell, N. W. Extended family relations of disturbed and well families. Family Process, 1962, 1, 175-193.
- Benson, P. The common interests myth in marriage. Social Problems, 1955, 3, 27-34.
- Blaine, T. R. Marriage happiness or unhappiness. Philadelphia: Dorrance & Co., 1955.
- Bodarsky, C. J. A study of college student's anticipated role behavior in marriage. Dissertation Abstracts, 1959, 20(3), 1093.
- Bolton, C. D. Mate selection as the development of a relationship. Marriage & Family Living, 1961, 23, 234-240.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents. In Petrullo, L. & Bass, B. M. (Eds.), Leadership and interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1961, 239-271.
- Burgess, E. W. & Cottrell, L. S., Jr. The prediction of adjustment in marriage. American Sociological Review, 1936, 1, 737-751.
- Chorost, S. B. Parent-child rearing attitudes and their relationships in adolescent aggression. Dissertation Abstracts, 1961, 21, 2782.

- Couch, C. J. The use of the concept "role" and its derivatives in a study of marriage. Marriage & Family Living, 1958, 20, 353-357.
- Cross, H. J. & Aron, R. D. The relationship of unobtrusive measures of marital conflict to remembered differences between parents. Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the APA, 1971, 6(part 1), 365-366.
- Dewey, R. & Humber, W. J. The development of human behavior. New York: MacMillan, 1951.
- Dyer, W. G. Analyzing marital adjustment using role theory. Marriage & Family Living, 1962, 24, 371-375.
- Eastman, D. Self acceptance and marital happiness. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1958, 22, 95-99.
- Elder, G. H., Jr. Family structure and the transmission of values and norms in the process of child rearing. Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 23(2), 741-742.
- Faris, R. E. Interaction of generations and family stability. American Sociological Review, 1947, 12, 159-164.
- Frumkin, R. M. The measurement of marriage adjustment. Annals of American Research - Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1954.
- Geiken, K. F. Expectations concerning husband-wife responsibilities in the home. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 1964, 26, 349-352.
- Goldin, P. C. A review of children's reports of parent behaviors. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 71, 222-236.
- Gould, N. S. Marital role expectations of single college students as related to selected social factors. Dissertation Abstracts, 1962, 22(8), 2906.
- Johnson, W. B. & Terman, L. M. Personality characteristics of happily married, unhappily married, and divorced persons. Character & Personality, 1935, 3, 290-311.
- Kephart, W. M. Some known and unknowns in family research: a sociological critique. Marriage & Family Living, 1957, 19, 7-15.
- Krotlar, S. L. Middle-class marriage role perceptions and marital adjustment. Sociology & Social Research, 1965, 49(3), 281-294.

- Locke, H. J. Predicting adjustment in marriage. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1951.
- Luckey, E. B. Marital satisfaction and personality correlates of spouse. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 1964, 26, 217-220.
- Mangus, A. R. Role theory and marriage counseling. Social Forces, 1957, 35, 200-209.
- Moser, A. J. Marriage role expectations of high school students. Marriage & Family Living, 1961, 23, 42-43.
- Mower, E. R. The differentiation of husband and wife roles. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 1969, 31, 534-540.
- Nye, F. I. Family relationships and delinquent behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.
- Peck, R. F. Family patterns correlated with adolescent personality structure. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1958, 57, 347-350.
- Pfeil, E. Role expectations when entering into marriage. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 1968, 30, 161-165.
- Ort, R. S. A study of role-conflicts as related to happiness in marriage. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 691-699.
- Rapaport, R. & Rasow, I. An approach to family relationships and role performance. Human Relations, 1957, 10(3), 209-221.
- Roe, A. Early determinants of vocational choice. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 212-217.
- Roe, A. & Siegelman, M. A. A parent-child relations questionnaire. Child Development, 1963, 34, 355-369.
- Robins, L. N. & O'Neal, P. The marital history of former problem children. Social Problems, 1958, 5, 347-358.
- Rogers, E. M. & Sebald, H. A distinction between familism, family integration, and kinship orientation. Marriage & Family Living, 1962, 24, 25-30.
- Rohwer, R. A. Family factors in tenure experience: Hamilton Co., Iowa, 1946. Research Bulletin 375, Ames, Iowa: Agricultural Experiment Station, July, 1950.

- Sears, R. R., Maccoby, E. E. & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Slater Carol. Class differences in definition of role and membership in voluntary associations among urban married females. American Journal of Sociology, 1960, 65, 616-619.
- Slater, P. E. Parental behavior and the personality of the child. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 1962, 101, 53-56.
- Tec. N. Family and differential involvement with marijuana: a study of suburban teenagers. Journal of Marriage & the Family, 1970, 32, 656-664.
- Terman, L. M. Psychological factors in marital happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1939.
- Tharp, R. G. Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 1963a, 60(2), 97-117.
- Tharp, R. G. Dimensions of marriage roles. Marriage & Family Living, 1963b, 25, 389-404.
- Stott, L. H. The problem of evaluating family success. Marriage & Family Living, 1951, 13, 149-153.
- Wallin, P. Marital happiness of parents and their children's attitude toward marriage. American Sociological Review, 1954, 19, 20-23.
- Wilson, J. Q. Generational and ethnic differences among career police officers. American Journal of Sociology, 1964, 69, 523-529.