



1965

An investigation of the marital attitudes of married couples in four United States Air Force status groups

Edgar H. Brimberry
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Family, Life Course, and Society Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Brimberry, Edgar H.. (1965). *An investigation of the marital attitudes of married couples in four United States Air Force status groups*. University of the Pacific, Thesis. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/1588

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Libraries at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact mgibney@pacific.edu.

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE MARITAL ATTITUDES OF MARRIED
COUPLES IN FOUR UNITED STATES AIR FORCE STATUS
GROUPS

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Sociology
The University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Sociology

by
Edgar H. Brimberry

June 1965

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION AND	
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED	1
The Purpose of the Investigation	1
Definitions Of Terms	2
Air Force status groups.	2
Marital attitudes.	3
Married couples.	4
Organization Of Thesis	4
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH.	5
Literature And Research Basic To Investigation .	5
III. THE STATUS GROUPS INVESTIGATED AND THE	
SCHEDULES USED	15
Status Groups Investigated	16
Field grade officers	16
Company grade officers	18
Sergeants.	20
Airman	22
Summary and conclusions.	24
Description of The Schedule Used In	
Counseling Air Force Ranks	25
Origin of the schedule used.	25
Content of schedule.	26

CHAPTER	PAGE
IV. THE RESEARCH DESIGNS AND RESULTS	29
Procedures Common To Both Designs.	29
Procedures and Results Of Design I	32
Sample	32
Data extracted from the sample	32
Hypotheses for research design I	33
Computer data for design I	34
Mathematical bases of calculations	35
Results of design I.	39
Procedures And Results Of Design II.	43
Population and sample.	43
Hypotheses for research design II.	43
The analysis of variance	44
Statistical summary.	45
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.	47
BIBLIOGRAPHY	54
APPENDIX A . . .MARRIAGE SUCCESS SCHEDULE.	58
APPENDIX B . . .TABLES	63
APPENDIX C . . .DESIGN I COMPUTER DATA	69

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Code Used for Extracting Data from Marital Success Schedules	61
II. Chi Square Values by Marital Area and Rank	36
III. Adjusted Chi Square Values by Marital Area and Rank	38
IV. Significance of Chi Square Results	40
V. Computation of F. Ratio	67

CHAPTER I

THE PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION AND DEFINITIONS

OF TERMS USED

The need for research in the marital attitudes of Air Force couples is immense. The Air Force marital counselor requires knowledge of the attitudes of the couples coming to him for aid in saving their marriages. The counselor looks for empirical data on Air Force couples as a guide in counseling procedures only to discover that such data does not exist. Much data on the marital attitudes of civilian couples can be found, but this civilian data is applied to Air Force counseling with a doubt that it fits the Air Force situation. This research is an attempt to provide data useful in counseling Air Force couples in the Air Force setting.

I. THE PURPOSE OF THE INVESTIGATION

The purpose of this investigation is to present any variance of marital attitudes in four Air Force status groups. The research has both theoretical and practical import.

There are two theoretical aspects: It is generally thought that marital roles are played differently in one status group than they are in another. If this

generalization is true for the four Air Force status groups, unlike responses to marital questions will be the result. If it is not true for the four groups, like responses will be evident. Another generalization is that there are differential value systems of male and female marriage members. If in answer to marital questions, the male and female responses of Air Force couples are variant by rank, the generalization for these four groups is demonstrated. If the responses are not variant, the value systems for the sexes within the four groups are alike and the generalization is not proven.

The practical aspects flow from the theoretical. If it can be demonstrated that the four Air Force status groups display different marital roles and have various marital responses, Air Force counselors can prepare four types of marital counseling procedures. These counseling refinements could be of great value, making for maximum effect in marital counseling. If such could not be demonstrated, then other studies and refinements would be required. In either case, some knowledge and understanding would be added to the general body of knowledge and understanding now extant.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Air Force status groups. Status groups in the Air Force are distinct as stated in Air Force regulations. The

highest class is the officer class, the second highest is the sergeant class, the lowest, the airman class. This descending order of status, command and responsibility is a given and is not subject to speculation in its formal determination. That is, an officer is an officer, not a sergeant or an airman. The officer might become a sergeant or an airman in very unusual situations but with the loss of officer status. For the purpose of this investigation, officers are divided into two groups: (1) Field Grade officers, which include General ranks, Colonel, Lieutenant Colonel, and Major, and (2) Company Grade officers, which include Captain, First Lieutenant, Second Lieutenant, and all grades of Warrant Officers. All Sergeant grades are ranked in one class, ranging from Chief Master Sergeant through Staff Sergeant. Included in one class are all Airman, ranging from Airman First Class through Basic Airman.

Marital attitudes. Marital attitudes are interpreted as those responses by husband and wife to the Marriage Success Schedule as devised by Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin. (4; 5; Appendix A; 59-62) The schedule is composed of questions based on various areas of married life. These questions are phrased in such a manner that a graded response is possible. The responses made by the husband and

wife may be identical or variant. It is possible, for example, for a husband to be extremely positive in his responses to a high degree of love in his marriage while his wife is extremely negative in her responses. Thus the wife has one attitude to the love element in the marriage while the husband has a different attitude.

Married couples. Married couples are considered as any husband and wife who each completed the five sections of the Marital Success Schedule under the direction of the investigator and apart from each other.

III. ORGANIZATION OF THESIS

The organization of the remainder of this research includes: (1) a review of the literature and the research done; (2) a presentation of the status groups and the Marital Success Schedule; (3) a description of the two research designs with the resultant statistics; and (4) summary and conclusions as well as future research needed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

Three large bodies of literature and research are available in the areas of (1) marriage and family sociology; (2) status and class; and (3) military sociology. These areas of writings and research provide copious materials until the attempt is made to find materials which specifically include all three areas. At this point, the search reveals little. More is uncovered when any two of these sets of knowledge converge. The paucity of research centers mainly about the military, particularly as it relates to the United States Air Force, and more particularly when a peacetime Air Force is considered rather than a wartime institution.

In brief, no research can be discovered which deals with the marital relationships of Air Force couples in military status groups.

I. LITERATURE AND RESEARCH BASIC TO INVESTIGATION

Citations of literature and research in the field of this investigation are presented in summary:

Burgess and Locke, after a long description of marriage and the family, have approached the subject of the measurement of marriage and class. One method of judging the success of a marriage is in "the expectations of the

social class to which the family belongs." (2; 434). The assumption is that the expectations of social class and marriage would correspond. The criteria are the beliefs of different classes concerning marital life. No research is listed, but a list of the marital class expectations of the upper middle class are given in which inclusion is made of love and compatibility of spouses; the acquiring and socialization of children; the husband as provider for the family; the wife a good housekeeper; that joint marital decisions be made; participation of spouses in outside interests; the wife should have an interest outside the home; at least one project for all members of the family; and a permanent union unbroken by revealing differences publicly. Burgess and Locke add that psychogenic traits of husbands and wives might challenge the results of class and marital research. The impact of the war period on marital relations is treated with class omitted. (2; 432-436, 663-705). The main value of this study is that it outlines areas which could be included in a study of marriage and class with the need of such research noted.

Burgess and Wallin provide the basic instrument for the research under consideration, and have done much work in marital attitudes and expectations. They suggest research in marital attitudes and class, specifically in that their study shows "that idealization varies with education, which

is a rough index of class." (4; 773). They also state that "an outstanding characteristic of social classes and of ethnic groups is the difference among them in the expectations of marriage." (4; 773). Burgess and Wallin say of their Marital Success Schedule that it is free of value judgment, measuring the degree of happiness and satisfaction of husband and wife rather than social class values or regional or ethnic groups. However, they qualify this in the following statement:

Contrary to the statements of critics, and even of the authors of the composite index, it appears from the evidence to be applicable to widely different economic and social classes, to various educational levels, to different regions of the country, to rural as well as urban dwellers, to different races (white, Negro, and Mongolian) and to other countries as Sweden and China." (4; 505-506).

The writings and the research of Burgess and Wallin have been decisive in the preparation of this investigation and will later be dealt with in more detail. (4; 288, 505-506, 773-775).

Morris Janowitz conducted research with the officer professionals of the American military as compared with the military of other nations. He studied historical and documentary materials; the social backgrounds of 760 generals and admirals appointed since 1910; questionnaires submitted to 550 Pentagon staff officers, and personal interviews with 113 officers. While much of his material concerns the upper extreme of the officer class, a few items are pertinent to

this investigation as far as they are concerned with lesser officers in the study. He found that the social behavior of the military in this century is derived from a high level of specialization rather than from a class consciousness. As a specialized force, the professional officer is today showing his authority more in gaining a consensus rather than through the brute force of older days. Officers are not recruited from the higher social classes as once they were. The fact was pointed out that the military molded family life to suit the military with the wife interested enough to work toward the officer's advancement. This the wives did by weakening the barriers of the rank system in varying degrees. Even before World War II, the military was a mixture of the traditional and the companionate family. The combination of this mixture has produced a military family geared to help each other in times of trouble. The tradition of the service has kept romantic love in check. In more recent military activities, official organizations have had to be created for the aid of families due to the enlargement of the military. Recent events have brought a breakdown in the isolation of the military officer family from the civilian family, yet the officer still looks to his tradition in working out his problems. (11; 1-112). The main contribution to the investigation of this paper is the valid description of the officer family, and while the general officer is treated,

much of the line of thought is applicable to lesser officers.

August B. Hollingshead has contributed much to the understanding of the relationship between marital and social theory. He wrote in 1950 that sociologists were aware of the interdependence between the family and social status, but that no studies had been focused on the "analysis of the problem of class differences in family stability." (1, 284). He pointed out that the individual is the product of the family, and in the family is placed in the class system. Although not claiming much research to back his position, he describes various classes with marital content. The upper class stresses "background" in choosing mates equaled only by an interest in the economic situation. A relatively stable family was found in this class. The newly-rich member of the upper-class is unstable by comparison with the top members of the class as proved by the citation of many problems which lead to divorce. The upper-middle class is more stable than the newly-rich class and the working class, holding marriages in check by job pressures, and the need for economic security, and the education of siblings. The lower-middle class is in a fairly stable marital condition. Social mobility, particularly through educational standards, causes some instability. The lower-class demonstrates the most instability. The poor economic condition of the lower-class is a basic cause of marital instability. In this

class there is a breakdown of respect for marriage itself, an acceptance of common law marriages, and a prevalence of the desertion of homes. (1; 284-292). Hollingshead mentioned in another article that many studies indicate that persons marry within their class structure. He studied one thousand marriages occurring in 1948, rating the spouses on socio-economic area in which they lived. Class level marriages were demonstrated since in 58.2 per cent of the cases both spouses were from the same class. In 82.8 per cent of the cases, they were from adjacent classes. Men married women from lower classes more than women from classes above them. (26; 619-27). Again, Hollingshead, in a discussion of age relationship and marriage, says: "Individuals who contract marriages with individuals of a different marital status than themselves are significantly different in age from individuals in their own marital status." (25; 499). This series of articles and studies indicate that there is a relationship between class and marital attitudes in non-military couples. It is thought that the same would hold true for military couples.

Talcott Parsons postulates the theory that the status of the family is that of the occupation of the provider, and that family status is easily differentiated as fact because the occupational roles increasingly absorb the family roles, making the family specialize more and more. He believes

that this situation is a strain on the family, but one it can well sustain, even in its present weakened structure. (17; 3-33). The value of this theory to the research is seen in that military occupational roles should correspond, at least roughly, with the civilian roles described in occupational terms.

William J. Goode in an article on marital satisfaction and marital instability describes the theoretical and empirical evidence of an inverse relationship between social class and divorce rates. Higher divorce rates were observed among lower class marriages. (22; 214-219). Pertinent to the present research is the fact that divorce, the result of deep conflict in marital relations, can be established on a class basis in civilian society.

Julian Roth and Robert F. Peck used Burgess and Cottrell's 526 married couple population as a group of measured marriages with background data in combination with the McGuire-Loeb modification of Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. He found a trend for both husbands' and wives' adjustment score to increase relative to the higher position on the social class scale. The null hypothesis was significant at the .01 level. A mate from one class adjusts with difficulty to a mate from another class. The main aim of this study was social mobility. (33; 478-487). The study adds more emphasis that class position makes for

variant marital attitudes.

Seward Hiltner discusses sex and social classes in relation to military attitudes toward counseling men in the service. He found that sexual permissiveness, particularly in overseas bases, was more pronounced in the lower classes of the military. He suggests that military counselors fit their counseling to this situation. (24; 11-15). If the sexual attitudes vary with class, other marital attitudes may also vary.

Nathan Hurwitz studied the components of marital roles, finding that for research purposes, there is importance in knowing whether the concepts of an individual spouse's roles are similar or different than a group of spouses. Hurwitz compiled his Marital Roles Inventory using it in a study of a random sample of 104 married couples in a middle-class neighborhood in Los Angeles. Role responses were found to be consistent for this middle-class group. (27; 301-308). Middle-class roles are demonstrated to be similar. This raises the possibility that the same similarity would hold in other class groups.

Marvin E. Olsen designed a research project in Omaha, Nebraska, using the 'economic status' portion of the Shewky 'social area' method of urban analysis to stratify the city into ten areas or tracts. These tracts were grouped into five pairs. A total of 391 interviews were made in the

paired tracts of the city. Olsen tested the hypothesis "that distribution of responsibility within the family is related to social status." (31; 62). However, the exact nature of the relation was not predicted. The response was that responsibility for dividing the tasks of the family was not variant "between the second, third, and fourth status levels," (31; 64) but that these levels comprised a large middle class. However, it was found that distribution of responsibility within the family is significantly related to social stratification. Husband responsibility is greatest in the middle-class family. The transition from traditional to companionate type families is less evident in high and low status groups. (31; 60-65). Again, social class and marital responses are related.

Saul B. Sells studied military leadership, including the leadership in the Air Force. He notes the authoritarian military structure, tracing its origin and dynamics. Using Hemphill and Westie's series of scales designed for the purpose of the objective description of group characteristics, he applied them to Air Force groups. The result was that "control," "participation," "polarization," and "stratification" (34; 11) best describe the Air Force structure of leadership. These qualities are carried home to the wife and family, making for frustrations in both job and home, and since the stratification is evident, it should show up by

military class.

The studies presented are unanimous in indicating that a relationship exists between social class and marital life. This material is background to identifying the Air Force status groups and the marital instrument which was used to study the Air Force groups.

CHAPTER III

THE STATUS GROUPS INVESTIGATED AND THE SCHEDULES USED

The data used in this investigation were not originally obtained for research purposes. Nevertheless, they are valid in marriage and Air Force class research for the following reasons: (1) the Marriage Success Schedule used was validated by Burgess and Wallin, through long years of research, for gaining marital responses from couples as to their marital attitudes; (2) the Air Force couples, who completed the schedules in the process of counseling, were distinct members of the Air Force officer, sergeant, and airman classes; and (3) the counselees completed the schedules in an atmosphere of permissiveness and privileged communication. Thus distinct Air Force class members answered questions designed to get at their marital attitudes in complete confidence of knowing their answers would be secret.

In preparation for the presentation of the statistical data, a discussion of the status groups and the schedules used preceeds the statistical presentation. This discussion of the four Air Force status groups will be based on the observations of the investigator as a member of the officer classes over the period of 1941 to 1963.

I. STATUS GROUPS INVESTIGATED

Field grade officers. To comprehend the field grade officer structure as a class system is essential to understanding the field grade population of this research. These men are the virtual rulers of the Air Force. The command line is vertical, and orders are relayed from the highest officer of the class to all echelons of command. The field grade officer class is a closely knit status group with its symbols of rank from stars to leaves worn on its uniforms. No exactly comparable class group exists in civilian society. The closest example is the major corporation with its directors, assistant directors, and managers. Another means of illustration is the Base-Community Councils (36; 1-11). In these organizations, formed for cementing relations between a base and an adjacent community, the ranking officers of each major department are paired for activity with the top officials of major civilian departments.

The field grade officer is expected to find his social life within the officer group, especially his most intimate social activities. There is some social intimacy between officers separated by one or two ranks, but there is almost no social intimacy between a colonel and a lieutenant. The rank of the class must be displayed in symbol, tradition, and in everyday work and life.

More money is drawn in the salary check of the field grade officer than in the status groups below him. He has first call on the best housing on a base and lives in a house better furnished with the finer things of life about him. Rank has its privileges.

The field grade officer's wife must reflect the officer spouse. She is usually selected when the officer is a young lieutenant, as a woman who fits his occupation, and she advances in rank with his every promotion. With her husband, she watches the next rank above, observing it in action for the day when they will both have it. The officer's wife is intelligent, well-groomed, and rank conscious. The formal officer's wives activities, which she presides over, are handled in accordance with her husband's rank. Her social life is his social life.

In the present study, the married couple population, that is, the number of couples completing the Marital Success Schedule in the field grade officer's status group is ninety-eight. This is the smallest population of the four rank groups since there are fewer field grade officers than there are members to be found in the other three status groups. Although no data is available for the numbers of men in each rank on the bases where the investigation took place, the general distribution of rank in the Air Force bears out the fact that the higher the rank, the fewer the number in it.

There are more airmen than sergeants, more sergeants than company grade officers, and more company grade officers than field grade officers. These proportions have bulged at one rank or another at times but never enough to throw the system out of balance. (11; 65-67). Another reason is that the field grade officer is more fearful of the consequences of admitting marital failure than the other groups. He is less easily persuaded to join marital counseling groups than are other ranks. Then too, the members of this group are more established in their marriages, having been married for an average of thirteen years. The age span is thirty-two to fifty-six years. The age span and the average length of marriages for the field grade officers and for all ranks is obtained from data noted on many of the Marital Success Schedules at the time of the completion of the schedule. With others the data was computed from background information available on 57 of the couples.

Company grade officers. Company grade officers are the lower half of the officer class. These officers observe the same command lines as do the field grade officers, but with the exception of operating at a lower level of responsibility face-to-face with the sergeants of the next lower rank. A feature which marks this class from the class above it is a youthful eagerness for advancement. Since many were

not willing to wait for promotions, they left the Air Force for better paying civilian jobs. Thus this group was more transitory. The educational goals for all Air Force officers was the B. A. degree.

As far as the company grade officer's social life is concerned, he has found himself sharing the officer's club with the field grade member's class. While he may eat and drink under the same roof, the company grade class member realizes his subordinate position because the field grade member must be deferred to and addressed with respect, especially when he demands it.

The company grade officer makes less money than the field grade officer. He must defer in housing taking what is left after the field grade officer has chosen.

The company grade officer's wife also carries the rank of her husband into the official women's club affairs, realizing that she has lower status. If her husband has expressed the desire to make a career of the Air Force, she uses her slight position in the hierarchial system to advance her husband's chances for promotion. She is a younger edition of the field grade officer's wife.

In this investigation, the number of couples from the company grade status group taking the Marital Success Schedule is 162. This portion of the population is larger than the field grade status group and much smaller than the

next largest group, the sergeant class. Not only are there more officers in this class group, but there are more who had not yet adjusted to their marriages. The officers and wives of the company grade class came in more easily for marital counseling. Group counseling is all right with these couples if the lower ranks are kept out of it. In fact, group counseling was only successful within each of the four ranks. The only exception is the mixing of ranks when the sentiment for religion and the chapel among the groups is high in each couple. The company group population had been married an average of seven years. The age span is twenty-two to forty-two.

Sergeants. Air Force sergeants make up an unusual status group, and, in effect, run the Air Force. The sergeants receive orders from the officers, and interpret these orders to the airman who do the actual labor of the Air Force. These men know the Air Force and its mission so well that they often are more knowledgeable than the officers directly above them. Often they outline procedures which work better than instructions given them. The only officer group who outsmarts the sergeants is the Warrant Officer. These officers know all the sergeant tricks since most of them had once been sergeants. Crumbling and griping about his job is a trademark of the sergeant class. This

comes probably from knowing so much about the Air Force mission and yet being of a lower class. Yet there is an acknowledgment of the fact that the final responsibility is with the officer classes. The sergeant has a grudging respect for the more educated officer class. The sergeant's English is poorer and his language cruder than the officer commanding him. The official goal is every sergeant with a high school diploma. The civilian counterpart of the sergeant would be the foreman in a factory down to the straw boss. The Air Force scale puts the sergeant on the third rank of the system.

As far as housing went, the sergeant receives adequate livable housing. The average sergeant will not give up his salary for that of a lieutenant, particularly the salary of a top sergeant who has many years in service. Without the officer's financial obligations, the sergeant sometimes had more take-home pay.

The women the sergeants marry are generally of the same educational level, and like their husbands are users of poor grammar with more colorful vocabulary. This is obvious when they are observed in a meeting in the non-commissioned officer's club as contrasted with the same type of meeting in the officer's wives club. These women, too, work at advancing their husbands to higher sergeant's positions and are more obvious in doing so. Perhaps this obviousness made

them to appear more loyal to their husbands than the wives of the upper classes.

In the present study, the number of couples from this class group completing the Marital Success Schedule is 308. These couples came from the next to the largest group, only the airman group being larger. Even though they had an average of 11 years of married life, they required counseling more often than those in the officer classes, demonstrating more turbulent marriages. Perhaps the officers and their ladies are more conscious of their position and tend to withhold public display of their tensions. The age span is twenty-one to forty-four years.

Airman. The airman class in the Air Force constitutes the largest group of men, and makes up the main laboring force. The airman can be observed doing the menial tasks of guard duty, typing, clerking, cooking, cleaning, building, working on aircraft engines, etc. The class is characterized by the fact that the airman is usually in the Air Force for a short tour of duty, counting the days until his discharge. This is seen, not only in airman attitudes, but in the importance the Air Force puts on its program to influence the airman to stay in the service. The airman class is the breeding ground for finding good non-commissioned officers, sergeants. The educational level is low, and as with the sergeant class, the official goal was a high school

diploma. The members of this class are given little responsibility. The sergeant answers for the airman when he makes mistakes in his restricted part of the Air Force mission. The airman class is the lowest class in the Air Force.

With the lowest responsibility went the lowest pay, and also the lowest housing, if any. The peacetime airman is more often married than is usually thought. With his low income, there is hardly ever enough money to live properly, especially when children come into the home. The social activities of this group center about the airman's club, if any, or around the various hobby shops provided in abundance on most bases.

The wives of the members of the airman class are young women; more like high school girls than married women. For the most part, these wives are more loyal to their marriage than to seeing their husbands advance in a career in the Air Force. The airman wives are more naive and, when they liked the Air Force, had a childish delight in the traveling or the prospect of traveling which the Air Force provides. Many of these women are daughters of families living near the base, having met and married their husbands after meeting in the adjacent community.

In this study, the number of couples from this class group completing the Marital Success Schedule is 332. They

had an average of three years of marriage. Much counseling is required for this group due to the newness of their marriages, and their unsound finance structure. The age span is sixteen to twenty-six.

Summary and conclusions. The above delineation of the social class groups of the Air Force has shown four distinct groups. It would have been possible, since it is a matter of general knowledge, to have just listed them as class groups. It was not the intention to present a complete description of the Air Force, but this was given to set the perspective for the groups studied as structure and as functioning role systems. That the classes exist by regulation is obvious; that they exist in practice is clear. This is not to say that exceptions were not in existence. There are wealthy airman and very poor field grade officers. There are refined, educated sergeant couples, and there are crude, uneducated officer couples. As in civilian status margins, the social characteristics of one class blend in with the one above it, so in the Air Force, the difference between a major and a lieutenant colonel can be marginal. The investigator of this research was a member of the field grade class, and may have been biased by that fact even though he was a chaplain and thus the least ranked member of his class, having direct access to all ranks by reason of his

position. However, this possibility is minimized by the use of a common marital form now to be described.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE SCHEDULE USED IN COUNSELING

AIR FORCE RANKS

Origin of the schedule used. From 1936 through 1946, Burgess and Wallin did research in marital relations which resulted in the Marital Success Schedule. (4, viii). Their aim was to discover if it was feasible to predict success and failure in marriage. They began with a population of one thousand engaged couples, and they carefully studied nearly seven hundred of them through the engagement period and the first three years of marriage. Due to various reasons, the final research population consisted of 666 couples. Burgess and Wallin state that the Marriage Success Schedule is reliable since it measures marital happiness in the light of marital satisfaction and dissatisfaction. They add, "In the study of 666 married couples there was a correlation of .82 for the husbands and of .82 for the wives between their reports of happiness and general satisfaction." (4; 503). Burgess and Wallin accepted eight criteria for the measurement of marital success. The first four, having been accepted by those doing pioneer research, were:

- 1) Permanence of the union, namely, the absence of separation and divorce.
- 2) Marital happiness of the couple as reported by husband, wife or both.

- 3) Satisfaction of the husband and of the wife with the marriage as evident by their statements about the marriage and each other.
- 4) Consensus, as indicated by agreements and absence of disagreements. (4; 484).

The second four criteria were added by Burgess and Wallin.

They are:

- 5) Love and affection.
- 6) Sexual satisfaction.
- 7) Companionship, confiding, and common interests.
- 8) Compatibility of personality and temperament of husband and wife. (4; 484).

Burgess and Wallin looked upon the first three of these criteria as primary or general criteria of happiness, and the last five criteria as secondary, rating satisfaction with the given marriage. In other words, criteria four through eight influence criteria one through three. (4; 1-56).

Content of schedule. The Marital Success Schedule is a series of statements and questions arranged under five separate parts: "PART I. MY FEELINGS ABOUT MY MARRIAGE" measures the amount of satisfaction with the marriage being tested as well as the degree of satisfaction with the mate. "PART 2. LOVE" is designed to measure the strength of love between spouses. Reported in this part are the feelings of love one spouse felt for his mate as well as his anticipation of the love the mate had for him. "PART 3. PERSONALITY AND TEMPERAMENT" lists fifteen characteristics or traits. On a sliding scale from "very much so" to "not at all" each spouse

lists a position for himself and also one for his spouse. "PART 4. INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES" tests the degree of participation which spouses enjoy in objective events and in subjective concepts. "PART 5. CONSENSUS" rates spouse reaction to areas of agreement or conflict in the marriage.

The total schedule requires eighty-nine responses for each spouse of a marriage. The responses in the schedule are weighted. A question from the schedule is quoted with the weight entered at each possible checking point:

How does your present love for your mate compare with your love for your mate before your marriage?
 (check): (l) is very much stronger 9; (n) considerably stronger 7; (o) somewhat stronger 6; (p) a little stronger 5; (q) the same 4; (r) a little weaker 3; (s) somewhat weaker 2; (t) considerably weaker 1; (u) very much weaker 0.
 (Appendix A; 60).

The Marital Success Schedule is scored by obtaining the sum of the weighted responses for each question in each part. The total raw score is checked against a table for male and female respectively. Opposite the raw scores in the tables are percentile scores. A percentile score of twenty-five or less indicates the need for counseling and that the marriage is in trouble. A percentile score of 75 or above indicates that the marriage is relatively secure. With a percentile score calculated for each of the five parts, the low scores indicate which area of the marriage requires aid. The scores of the five parts are not summed, but remained separate. In effect, a percentile score of fifty

would indicate that fifty percent of the couples in the original study had marriages better than the one tested and fifty per cent of the same couples had marriages worse than the one tested.

The aim of this chapter has been to present the four Air Force status groups, and to describe the Marital Success Schedule which was used to evaluate their marriages. The four Air Force groups, field grade officers, company grade officers, sergeants and airman, have been described as distinct status groups. They are different classes by Air Force regulations and in their attitudes and activities in implementing those regulations. Class difference is shown in their job responsibility, social life, income, housing, education, and attitude to the Air Force institution. The four classes officially relate to each other in a vertical command line with the field grade officers at the top and the airman at the bottom of the power atructure.

The origin of the Marriage Success Schedule has been seen in the description of Burgess and Wallin's research with married couples. The schedule is composed of five parts, each of which measures an area of marriage by means of weighted responses. The sum of these responses indicate mathematically the attitude of couples to each of the five marital areas. The concern for discussion now is the manner of evaluating the responses of these four groups as seen in the schedules.

CHAPTER IV

THE RESEARCH DESIGNS AND RESULTS

Two research designs were constructed and utilized in studying the data. In order to prevent confusion and to easily compare the results, the first is called design I, and the second is designated design II. The three sections to be presented are: (1) procedures common to both designs; (2) procedures and results of design I; and (3) procedures and results of design II.

I. PROCEDURES COMMON TO BOTH DESIGNS

The investigator had preserved the Marriage Success Schedules completed by Air Force couples of all Air Force ranks, who came to him for marital counseling while he was a chaplain in the United States Air Force. These couples were largely white protestants although a percentage were Negro. The exact Negro percentage is not known since there is an Air Force regulation which prohibits the listing of members of the Air Force by race. The schedules were completed during the years 1959 through 1962.

The largest part of an Air Force chaplain's working time is taken up with counseling. It is axiomatic in the Air Force to think of counseling with the chaplain when in trouble. This is true even for those who have no formal

religious faith. Whether one goes to church every Sunday or never attends, the chaplain is thought of as a counselor in time of any trouble. The majority of the chaplain's counseling time is taken up with marriage counseling. In recognition of this fact, the Air Force has set up a marriage counseling seminar to train chaplains in this area of counseling. Of course, the chaplain charges no fee so that it is possible for the low income members of the Air Force to have any needed counseling. While no data are available, an estimation is that 25 per cent of the couples of this research population came together as husband and wife for marital counseling. In the remaining 75 per cent, either the wife or husband applied for counseling alone with the other spouse coming in later. Mostly, the wife is the first to apply for counseling. An Air Force regulation prohibits Air Force commanders ordering a couple to counsel with the chaplain. However, the commander can order a couple to come to him for counseling. Often he persuades the couple to see the chaplain. In practice, many times the commander offers alternatives that force the couple to see the chaplain. If the couple make the chaplain aware of the involuntary counseling, the chaplain dismisses the couple for professional and regulatory reasons. There is usually no difficulty in comprehending the reluctance of a couple to seek counsel and to offer them an option to counsel or not.

Many times the commander and the chaplain will confer on getting a couple to come to the chaplain for counseling. Persuading one member of a marriage to follow a mate into marital counseling is a necessary art on the part of the chaplain counselor. Many methods are used in this process. One of the most successful is to somehow get the word to the absent mate that one has a test which can be scored and that the responses are secret from the other mate. When the chaplain cannot get the other mate to come in voluntarily, counseling procedures are geared for this situation. No data are available on the frequency of one mate counseling situations but it is estimated at ten per cent.

As soon as a husband and wife are present in the chaplain's office for marital counseling, the schedule is explained to them together, and they are given the option of completing it or not. If the decision is made to complete the schedule, the man is assigned one room and the woman another room where they answer the questions without benefit of discussion with each other. Upon completion of the schedules, the investigator checks them to make sure no item is omitted. The schedule is filed as the property of the investigator with the implicit and explicit understanding that no revelation of the contents will be made which will be revealing of the marital situation to any other person.

A total of 1162 couples had completed the schedules

and from this number nine hundred couples were selected as the population. Those schedules not used were rejected for various reasons, including the physical condition of the schedule; some schedules were completed under group marital conditions rather than in individual counseling, and omissions of answers to individual items. The nine hundred couples are broken down by Air Force rank:

<u>Air Force Rank</u>	<u>Number of Couples</u>
Field Grade Officers	98
Company Grade Officers	162
Sergeants	308
Airman	332

II. PROCEDURES AND RESULTS OF DESIGN I

Sample. The Marital Success Schedules for each couple were assigned serial numbers. A sample of approximately twenty per cent was drawn from each rank by use of a random sample table. Selected for examination were twenty field grade officer couples; thirty-two company grade officer couples; sixty sergeant couples; and sixty-five airman couples.

Data extracted from the sample. The responses of husband and wife to eight questions of the Marital Counseling Schedule were extracted for the sample of the

four Air Force ranks. The particular questions were selected because the investigator had noted in counseling that many problems circulated about the areas of these questions. The questions concerned; (1) the present love of spouse for mate as compared with love before marriage; (2) agreement or disagreement on activities outside the home; (3) intelligence rating of spouses; (4) sexual agreement as to intimate relations; (5) religion, attendance and affiliation; (6) religion, degree of agreement or controversy; (7) handling of family finances; (8) desire of couple for children in the home. Table I, (Appendix B), pages 64-66, contains the code which was used for extracting the raw data from the Marital Success Schedules completed by the couples of the sample population.

The data extracted was punched on International Business Machine cards which were in turn sorted by code, 1 through 28 and by the four ranks. The sorted data was presented to a programmer who programmed it for computer calculations.

Hypotheses for research design I. For each of the eight areas listed above, the hypotheses to be tested are that there is no significance variance in male and female marital responses in any of the four Air Force status groups. The test was made at the .01 level.

Computer data for design I. To test the differences among the four Air Force ranks, the decision was made to use the paired results within each test item to establish an array, with the vertical coordinate representing the male response, and the horizontal coordinate representing the female response. It would then be determined if patterns within this array differed significantly among the ranks.

Since there are eight test items and four rank groups, a total of 32 arrays were formed. The lines represent male responses coded, beginning with one at the top, and the columns represent female responses coded, beginning with one at the left. Thus a seven in the second line and third column of an array represents seven couples in which the husband's response would be coded as two, and the wife's response as three. As the sample had been chosen proportionally to the caseload, total arrays were constructed within each test item, and were used as a standard. The distribution patterns of each rank were then compared to that of the standard by applying the chi square criterion.

Arrays were then computed which showed the source and direction of differences found in the distribution patterns. These computer calculations are basic to figuring chi square. They show the source value of each cell for one rank, and the direction of that cell in relation to the identical cell in each of the other three ranks.

The computer total data is listed at the end of each of the eight series of the source and direction arrays. These totals, used in the calculations of the arrays, are the sums of each cell by rank in the first arrays.
(Appendix C; 70-94)

Mathematical bases of calculations. The arrays of totals are scaled to the four ranks by multiplying each cell by the proportion of cases falling in the rank under consideration. These scaled values are then used as expected values, and an ordinary chi square for goodness of fit is calculated:

$$x^2 = \frac{(O-E)^2}{E}$$

Field Grade	20/177 = .112
Company Grade	32/177 = .180
Sergeant	60/177 = .338
Airman	65/177 = .367

Thus each of the eight arrays of totals are scaled to each of the four ranks, giving the thirty-two chi square values. Table II, page 36 presents the chi square values.

Since it is impossible to calculate a value for cells whose total is zero, these are subtracted from the number of degrees of freedom. The assumption is made that no degrees of freedom are lost in calculating the totals, since they depend on data not involved in the particular chi square distribution. The correlation which exists between the individual frequency and the total was compensated for by considering the totals as the entire population, and the

TABLE II
CHI SQUARE VALUES BY MARITAL AREA AND RANK

Marital Area	Field Grade Officers	Company Grade Officers	Sergeants	Airman
Present love of spouse	55.24	50.51	43.82	39.57
Participatory activities	35.24	15.03	13.02	15.17
Intelligence of mate	9.80	9.12	5.37	7.97
Sexual agreement	25.85	36.33	30.93	19.89
Religious attendance	14.54	5.39	5.25	4.54
Religious agreement	44.18	25.82	15.25	13.77
Family finances	35.40	23.61	12.27	20.73
Children in the home	17.62	9.19	10.80	9.74

individual array as a sample from the population. Small population theory gives the adjustment for standard error:

$$\sqrt{\frac{N-n}{n-1}} \quad \begin{array}{ll} N & \text{population size} \\ n & \text{sample size} \end{array}$$

Since chi square functions as the square of the standard error, division is by the square of the above expression; for this problem chi square values were multiplied by .886, .825, .666, and .637 for the four ranks respectively. The chi square results are adjusted because of the nature of the sampling distribution. As has been noted, the sample had been chosen proportionally to the caseload. Therefore there were differences in the number of samples taken from each rank. The samples, not being equally distributed in each rank, had to be considered in its proportion to the population size, thus giving the adjusted chi square values.

Table III, page 38 shows the adjusted chi square values.

The number of non-zero cells in each of the totals and therefore the degrees of freedom are in order: sixty-four, twenty-two, nine, thirty-two, twelve, twenty-seven, thirty-one, and eighteen. For all but the first test, Fisher's table of chi square was used. (10) Since this table includes only degrees of freedom less than thirty, it is clearly not applicable for the first test. An extrapolation is made for tests four and seven. Test results are based on the statistic:

$$z = 2X^2 - 2df-1$$

TABLE III
ADJUSTED CHI SQUARE VALUES BY MARITAL AREA AND RANK

Marital Area	Field Grade Officers	Company Grade Officers	Sergeants	Airman
Present love of spouse	62.4	60.8	65.9	62.1
Participatory activities	39.8	18.2	19.6	23.8
Intelligence of mate	11.1	11.1	8.1	12.5
Sexual agreement	29.2	44.0	46.5	31.2
Religious attendance	16.4	6.5	7.9	7.1
Religious agreement	49.9	31.3	22.9	21.6
Family finances	39.9	28.6	18.4	32.6
Children in the home	19.9	11.1	16.2	15.3

Results of design I. In the main the results are not significant. In general, .10 is doubtful or barely significant; .05 is fairly conclusive, and .02 and .01 are highly significant. Table IV, page 40 shows the only significant results. Only two items are highly significant: (1) Field grade officers, activities outside the home, .02; and (2) field grade officers, religious agreement, .01. Of lesser significance are: (1) company grade officers, sexual agreement, .10; and (2) sergeants, sexual agreement, .05.

The difference in sexual agreement, company grade officers, appears to indicate that these men were slightly more disposed than the average toward a high rating. There was a strong tendency for the husband and the wife to disagree in their evaluation of this matter, and it appears that at least one spouse usually finds the relationship unsatisfactory. There was some reason to doubt the .05 significance of sexual agreement, sergeants. A large part of the significance came from an exceptional value in the first line, second column. The difference may be due to the tendency to give a stock response, that is, for the husband to favor #1, always agree or #6, always disagree, and for the wife to favor #2, almost always agree or #6, always disagree.

The two highly significant values among the field grade officers are much more satisfactory than the differences

TABLE IV
SIGNIFICANCE OF CHI SQUARE RESULTS

	Field Grade	Company Grade	Sergeant	Airman
Present Love of Spouse	_____	_____	_____	_____
Activities Outside Home	<u>.02</u>	_____	_____	_____
Intelligence of Mate	_____	_____	_____	_____
Sexual Agreement	_____	<u>.10</u>	<u>.05</u>	_____
Religious Attendance	_____	_____	_____	_____
Religious Agreement	<u>.01</u>	_____	_____	_____
Family Finances	_____	_____	_____	_____
Children in the Home	_____	_____	_____	_____

just explained. The .02 significance for activities outside the home shows a marked shift toward a lower rating by the wives of the officers. The result of .01 significance, religious agreement, reflects primarily a high correlation between the responses of husband and wife. This indicates a good understanding of each other's views. There is also an avoidance of the middle responses, indicating that the couples are highly opinionated. These two tendencies are more pronounced than for any other grouping in the study.

The results of the experiment indicate that the null hypothesis is proved conclusively for present love for spouse, intelligence of mate, religious attendance, family finances, and children in the home. The null hypothesis is proved for activities outside the home with the exception of one rank, field grade officers. For sexual agreement, the hypothesis is proved because of faint significance and the question discussed above concerning the responses. Religious agreement is null except for the highly significant field grade officer attitude toward religion.

The task set in this study is to determine whether among the stratification levels found on an Air Force base, there are significant differences in attitudes and values relative to marriage such as allegedly have been found among various status levels in civilian society.

In design I, the effort was made to determine whether there were any significant differences among the grade levels with respect to the extent to which husbands and wives agreed or disagreed with one another relative to certain critical matters of marital adjustment.

Reducing the answers of 177 couples to eight questions to statistical form, using the chi square technique, statistical values were obtained for the four ranks on each of the eight questions. From these data, a chi square test of significance was computed for each rank and each question.

These figures indicate that in all instances but four, there were no differences between ranks that could not have been attributed to chance factors in the selection of the couples to be included. Thus on such matters as: present love of spouse, intelligence of mate, religious attendance, family finances, and children in the home, there was no more nor no less disagreement between husband and wife among the four ranks.

Only in the following situations did any differences appear which could not be attributed to chance, and which seem to indicate actual differences reflecting, possibly, the factor of rank. These were: activities outside the home, sexual agreement, and religious agreement.

III. PROCEDURES AND RESULTS OF DESIGN II

Population and sample. The same population of couples was used as well as the same sample of design I, except one sergeant couple and one airman couple were restored to the sample after being lost in the mechanics of the computer operation. The total raw scores for each of the five sections of the Marital Success Schedule were extracted from the sample of 179 couples. A sample of the sample was then taken from each of the four categories with the use of a random sample table. (6). Ten male and ten female scores were chosen from each of the four Air Force ranks, making a total of eighty scores. Although the data had been extracted by couples, couples were ignored when the sample of the sample was obtained. Therefore, husband was not paired with wife. Each of the eighty scores was converted by adding a positive twenty since the scores were both positive and negative. The converted scores were then squared.

Hypothesis for research design II. For each of the five sections of the Marital Success Schedule, My Feelings About My Marriage, Love, Interests and Activities, Personality and Temperament, and Consensus, the hypotheses to be tested is that there is no significant variance in male and female marital responses in any of the four Air Force status groups. The test was made at the .05 level.

The analysis of variance. The analysis of variance was computed for each of the five sections of the Marital Success Schedule. In the computation of the analysis of variance, the one variable is the responses to the questions of the schedule. These responses are taken from the four Air Force status groups in two classifications, the two sexes or spouses.

The F ratio was computed to determine whether significant variance existed. Table V, Appendix B, pages 67-68 shows the mathematical computations for each of the five parts of the schedule. The formulas used for computing the F ratio are: (7, 163-168)

Critical region: $F_{\alpha} (k-1, n-k)$ $F_{.95} (7, 72)$

$$F_{.95} (7, 72) = 2.13$$

Therefore if the mean square of the "between" is divided by the mean square of the "within", and the result is greater than 2.13, there is reason to believe that there is a significant difference between the male and female cells. If the result is less than 2.13, no significance exists.

The F ratio for the five sections of the Marriage Success Schedule are:

"PART 1. MY FEELINGS ABOUT MY MARRIAGE"----	1.80
"PART 2. LOVE"-----	1.03
"PART 3. PERSONALITY AND TEMPERAMENT"-----	.61
"PART 4. INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES"-----	1.54
"PART 5. CONSENSUS"-----	.98

Demonstration is made that the variances are not significant, and that the null hypotheses are proved.

The task of design II was to determine whether there were significant male and female differences among the ranks in the matter of attitudes on five areas of marital life. From the eighty scores obtained, data were gathered reflecting, statistically, the extent of agreement and/or disagreement as between the sexes on feelings concerning marriage, love in the home, personality and temperament, interests and activities, and consensus of activities in marriage.

The results indicate that for each of the areas of marital life, what differences were found were actually below the critical level: that the variations were due to the chance factors in the selection of the sample, and that in no case did they reflect an actual difference between males and females in their attitudes.

Statistical summary. The chi square computation of design I and the analysis of variance computation of design II indicate that the Air Force status groups of this study do not significantly vary in their attitudes to the marital questions answered. However, this does not mean that there is no variance among Air Force ranks.

In design I, as seen above, only two chi square values are significant with two others of some significance. The significance of the other chi square values is negligible and so scattered that other computations based on them is not

indicated. This position is strengthened by the analysis of variance computations. Whereas only one question is measured under the section on consensus in design I, the entire section is measured in design II with no significance variance noted. Thus the isolated significance of design I is lessened by the almost total lack of significance of design II.

In design II there is no individual status cell significant enough to warrant other investigation. There is no significant difference between the status cells. If any one of the five parts of the schedule had been significant, other computations would be indicated. These computations would indicate which status cell was responsible for the significance. However, it is obvious that $F_{ratio} 1.80$, feelings about marriage, is larger than $F_{ratio} .61$, personality and temperament, and that the former has more significance than the latter. Thus status is a factor in each category, but more in one than in the other. But since neither category approaches 2.13, much less surpassing it, there is no valid reason to doubt the validity of the null hypotheses.

The results of the two designs are not in accord with the results of other research in this area. This is the next concern to be discussed.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The exploration of the subject matter thus far has sought to give a clear statement concerning four Air Force status groups and their marital attitudes as expressed in answers to the Marital Success Schedule. The status groups have been shown to have distinct boundaries with differential role values. Two research designs have been described, based on the same population, with the result that no significant variance by Air Force status group exists. The review of the literature has shown that other research demonstrates a positive correlation between civilian status and marital attitudes. Although no predictions were made, the investigator felt from close observation of the couples counseled that variance would exist. The obvious fact is that the present investigation is in opposition to the accepted generalizations on the marital attitudes of status groups. The present aim is to seek the reasons for the negative response shown in this research.

There is an Air Force ethos, shared by all Air Force status groups, which expresses pride in belonging to the Air Force. The civilian life, according to this thinking, is nothing in comparison with Air Force life and livings. How pervasive is this spirit of unity in making for unity of

concepts in other areas? Could the Air Force man and his wife, living, working, playing, worshiping, and buying on a base apart from a civilian community, have developed like marital attitudes? The answer is not known, yet there is an Air Force spirit of conformity which allows emulation. The Air Force completely orders the existence of its members. No phase of life is without its written rules. A man's conduct is prescribed, and the conduct will be honorable if the status member is to remain in the status position. Even minor violations are quickly judged for fitness to remain in the Air Force. Each man is expected to control his wife to the same standard. The Air Force couple is told how Air Force housing is to be used, how it is to be cleaned, and what alterations may or may not be made. Dress, at work and at play, is strictly prescribed. The wife is told what type of clothing she may wear to the base exchange. This ordering of the way of life could conceivably set a common marital attitude. Nevertheless, a sergeant, who is in marital difficulty, would not consciously emulate the marital attitudes of his commander. But both would conform to the rules of marital life as the Air Force wants them in order to retain their status positions. However, under the system, the commander reprimands the sergeant for marital discord; the sergeant does not reprimand the commander. With this, the rank situation is thrust forward again as opposed to

emulation among ranks. The conclusion is that marital emulation among the ranks is not enough to account for the negative response in this research.

Closely related to the above is a question in the area of the marital institution. Would Air Force couples believe that marriage is an entity which is universal, more universal than belonging to a huge, ranked war machine? In other words, did the couple respondents place marital life on a higher plane than job or profession, believing that marriage was the general and the military class the particular? To assume a positive response would be to believe that the Air Force marriages studied are wonderful areas of strength and that these couples could hardly wait to get together at the end of the working day to find solace and strength with each other against the vicissitudes of the day. Nothing is further from the truth. These couples were in varying states of despondency over their marriages, if not all marriages. Marriage is not an institution which answers the problems of their lives. True, the couples are attempting to save their marriages or else they would not have come for help. This might indicate that the marriage institution still held some hope in their lives, but unhappiness, at least with a particular marriage, is the prevalent theme. The conclusion is that these couples did not express like marital attitudes because of a general regard for

marriage as an institution.

A third area of concern is in reference to the marital schedules used in the research. Are they not good indexes of social class? The answer is in the affirmative if the schedules had been given to an indiscriminate population with the object of discovering status groups. However, when the social classes are chosen carefully and responses are compared, the presumption is that there is some revealing of class in those responses. One consideration is that the questions in the schedule are free of value judgments, and this alone insures more class responses. The educational level of the respondents did not make a difference in the responses. In the actual completion of the schedules, the less educated had more trouble in comprehending some questions, but after the questions were explained, responses were made easily. The research shows that the couples in ranks did not differ in their answers, demonstrating that one Air Force class did not interpret the questions differently from another class.

A more serious matter in relation to the schedule is aimed at the composition of the questions. Are the questions of the schedule sensitive enough to measure the status difference? Burgess and Wallin scaled their questions between 1936 and 1946. (4; vii). Louis Guttman presented his scaling refinements over the period of 1944 to 1950

(18; 161, 276; 35, 617-618). Thus there is a probability that Burgess and Wallin did not have the advantage of Guttman's techniques. The investigator is not competent in the area of scaling and is not presuming to express a technical opinion at this point. However, college graduate couples have often remarked that another category, in some questions, would be closer to the truth in their marital situation. For the most part, the questions have been scaled well enough to gain adequate marital information, especially when the schedules of two spouses are compared for variances of opinion.

A fourth area of interest is the degree of representativeness of the research population. How well did the couples, voluntarily coming to the investigator, represent a cross section of the base personnel? There is no doubt that they were representative of those Air Force personnel who were having marital difficulties. No data is available on the number and the Air Force rank of those who came for counseling without their spouses and whose spouses never came in for counseling. The figure would not be more than ten per cent of the research population.

There were couples who were having marital difficulty and who did not come for counseling. The question is, did they have marital difficulties which were different from those who did come for counseling, and would their marital

attitudes have varied enough to have changed the research results? The answer is in the negative, because the problems and the responses of those coming for counseling include every problem known to all ranks. The problems ranged from polite, educated, cultured couples, who didn't speak to each other, to boorish, uneducated couples, who cut each other with knives.

There were many couples who did not have marital problems requiring counseling. No data is available on the number of these couples. Whatever, the number, the question is, would their better marital circumstances have changed the results of the research if these couples had been part of the research population? Would they have expressed their marital attitudes according to their status position? The answer is not known, but the possibility of there being more status attitudes in maritally successful couples than in maritally unsuccessful ones is rather remote. This reasoning is based on the concept that marital problems are common to all marriages, and that only a thin line divides the ones coming for counsel and those not coming.

The speculation on the research results does not change the outcome or fully explain the demonstration of the null hypothesis. If the null hypotheses had not been proved, and the results of the research coincided with other research in civilian areas, generalizations could be made. However,

since this is not true, it is unfruitful to attempt generalizations or to continue with more computations which use this data. The answer is in other research projects. The following suggestions are made.

One, design a sensitive instrument for measuring marital attitudes, using carefully selected Air Force couples, from the various Air Force ranks, as the basic population for the designing of scales. The Air Force would more than likely be pleased to cooperate, with funds and manpower, if convinced that sociologists with the proper skill for doing this work are available.

Two, use the instrument devised on a sample from every Air Force rank and from every squadron on a base. After the test is administered, do a complete case history on each couple to determine social background, personality characteristics, and any other areas which would be conclusive.

Three, study a civilian community to determine status groups which closely conform with the Air Force status groups. An instrument for measuring samples from these status groups on marital attitudes can be made. Compare the results of the two studies, Air Force and civilian, for variances in marital attitudes.

Four, use the results gained in the experiments listed above to advise marital counselors on valid marital counseling according to the status group from which the couple comes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

1. Bendix, Reinhard, Seymour Martin Lipset (ed.), Class, Status and Power. Free Press of Glencoe, 1953. 723 pp.
2. Burgess, Ernest W., Harvey J. Locke, The Family. New York: American Book Company, 1945. 800 pp.
3. _____, and Leonard Cottrell, Predicting Success Or Failure in Marriage. New York, Prentice Hall, Inc., 1939.
4. _____, and Paul Willin, Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1953. 819 pp.
5. _____, Paul Wallin, Gladys Denny Shultz, Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1954. 444 pp.
6. Burington, Richard Stevens, and Donald Curtis May, Handbook of Probability and Statistics With Tables. Sandusky, Ohio: Handbook Publishers, Inc., 1953. 332 pp.
7. Dixon, Wilfred J., Frank J. Massey, Jr., Introduction to Statistical Analysis. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1957. 488 pp.
8. Dobriner, William M., Class In Suburbia. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963. 166 pp.
9. Ferguson, Leonard W., Personality Measurement. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1952. 457 pp.
10. Fisher, R. A., Y. Yates, Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural, and Medical Research. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boys, 1943.
11. Janowitz, Morris, The Professional Soldier. The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1960. 464 pp.
12. Kahl, Joseph A., The American Class Structure. New York; Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962. 310 pp.

13. Kinsey, Alfred C., and others, Sexual Behavior In The Human Male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1953. 921pp.
14. ———, and others, Sexual Behavior In The Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1953, 841 pp.
15. Lenski, Gerhard, The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., Anchor Books Edition, 1963. 414 pp.
16. Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure. The Free Press of Glencoe, Illinois, 1963. 645 pp.
17. Parsons, Talcott, and others, Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. The Free Press, Glencoe, Illinois, 1960. 411 pp.
18. Roucek, Joseph S., Readings in Contemporary American Sociology. Patterson, New Jersey: Littlefield, Adams & Company., 1961. 716 pp.
19. Stouffer, Samuel A., and others, Studies in Social Psychology in World War II. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949. Vol. I, pp. 599.
20. Warner, W. Lloyd, and others, Social Class in America. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Harper Torchbooks, 1960. 298 pp.

B. PERIODICALS

21. Ackoff, Russel L., Leon Pritzker. "The Methodology of Survey Research," International Journal of Opinion and Attitude Research, Volume 5 (Fall 1951) Number 3, 313-334.
22. Goode, William J., "Marital Satisfaction and Instability, a Cross-cultural Analysis of Divorce Rates," International Social Science Journal, Volume 37, 1962. 214-219.
23. Hill, Reuben, "Review of Current Research of Marriage and the Family," American Sociological Review, 16:694-701, October 1951.
24. Hiltner, Seward. "Sex and Social Classes," The Chaplain, June 1955, 11-15.

25. Hollingshead, August B. "Age Relationships and Marriage," American Sociological Review, Volume 16, 499.
26. Hollingshead, August B. "Cultural Factors in the Selection of Marriage Mates," American Sociological Review, XV (October 1950) 619-27.
27. Hurvitz, Nathan. "Components of Marital Roles," Sociology and Social Research, Volume 45 (April 1961), 301-308.
28. Hutchinson, Charles E. "Meanings of Military Sociology," Sociology and Social Research, July-August 1957.
29. Mack, Raymond W. "The Prestige System of an Air Base, Squadron Rankings," American Sociological Review, Volume 19: 281-287, June 1954.
30. Mudd, Emily H. "test on Marriage Adjustment, 200 Unadjusted, 100 Adjusted" Psychological Abstracts, Volume 37, 1963.
31. Olsen, Marvin E. "Distribution of Family Responsibilities and Social Stratification," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (February 1960), 60-65.
32. Reiss, Ira L. "Toward a Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship," Marriage and Family Living, XXII (May 1960) 139-145.
33. Roth, Julian, and Robert F. Peck. "Social Class and Social Mobility Related to Marital Adjustment," American Sociological Review, Volume 16 (August 1951), 478-487.
34. Sells, Saul B. "Military Leadership -- A Research Oriented Approach.

C. OTHER SOURCES

35. Gould, Julius, William L. Kolb (ed.) A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964 761 pp.
36. Base Community Council, Air Force handout, Carswell Air Force Base.

APPENDIX A

MARRIAGE SUCCESS SCHEDULE

PART I. MY FEELINGS ABOUT MY MARRIAGE

Write in Column 1 the number (1, 3, etc.) of any of the statements from 1-20 and the appropriate letter from 21-26 which represent your feelings about your marriage or your mate. *Put down as many or as few as describe your feelings.*

- 1) ____My marriage is successful but not extraordinarily so.
- 2) ____My mate and I are well mated.
- 3) ____If it weren't for fear of hurting my mate, I would leave him (her).
- 4) ____Frankly, our marriage has not been successful.
- 5) ____My marriage has given me a new enthusiasm for life.
- 6) ____Although my marriage has its good points, they are outweighed by its bad ones.
- 7) ____My marriage could be worse and it could be better.
- 8) ____On the basis of my marriage at least, I think a person is a fool to marry.
- 9) ____My marriage is less successful than the average.
- 10) ____My marriage is perhaps a little less successful than most marriages.
- 11) ____I wouldn't call my marriage a perfect success, but I'm pretty well content with it.
- 12) ____I feel that as time goes on my marriage will mean less and less to me.
- 13) ____Although my marriage has been only moderately successful, its good elements more than compensate for the bad.
- 14) ____My marriage is not a great success but it could be much worse.
- 15) ____My marriage could not be more successful.
- 16) ____My marriage has been a great disappointment to me.
- 17) ____I've gotten more out of marriage than I expected.
- 18) ____My friends mean more to me than my mate.
- 19) ____Marrying my mate was the biggest mistake I ever made.

[illegible]

FROM COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE BY Burgess, Wallin
Shultz. Copyright 1953, 1954 by J.B.Lippincott Company.
Published by J.B.Lippincott Company.

6

- [illegible]

FROM COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE by Burgess, Wallin and Shultz. Copyright 1953, 1954 by J.B.Lippincott Company. Published by J.B.Lippincott Company.

1) Write in Column 1 the letter which most nearly represents the love you feel for your mate, in this range between "extraordinarily in love" to "somewhat in love."

*Somewhat
in love*

- 2) Write in Column 1 letter which indicates the extent to which you think your mate is in love with you.
- 3) How does your present love for your mate compare with your love for your mate before your marriage? (check):
(*l*) is very much stronger____; (*n*) considerably stronger____; (*o*) somewhat stronger____; (*p*) a little stronger____; (*q*) the same____; (*r*) a little weaker____; (*s*) somewhat weaker____; (*t*) considerably weaker____; (*u*) very much weaker____.
- 4) Has your mate ever doubted your love? (check): (*a*) never____; (*b*) once____; (*c*) rarely____; (*d*) occasionally____; (*e*) often____.
- 5) Have you ever doubted your mate's love for you? (check): (*a*) never____; (*b*) once____; (*c*) rarely____; (*d*) occasionally____; (*e*) often____.

[illegible]

FROM COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE by Burgess, Wallin
and Shultz. Copyright 1953, 1954 by J.B.Lippincott Company.
Published by J.B.Lippincott Company.

HOW SUCCESSFUL IS YOUR MARRIAGE?

PART 3. PERSONALITY AND TEMPERAMENT

Compare on the scale which follows the personality traits of *your mate and yourself*. Place letters portraying your mate's personality traits under M, your own under Y, in left-hand column. Write score for each in right-hand column when you reach scoring stage. Add both scores together to get total score for this section.

BE SURE TO RATE YOURSELF AND MATE ON EACH TRAIT

		<i>Very much so</i>	<i>Consid- erably</i>	<i>Some- what</i>	<i>A little</i>	<i>Not at all</i>	M	Y	M	Y
1	Angers easily	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
2	Takes responsi- bility willingly	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
3	Stubborn	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
4	Selfish	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
5	Irritable	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
6	Dominating	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
7	Sense of duty	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
8	Sense of humor	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
9	Easily hurt	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
10	Makes friends easily	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
11	Moody	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
12	Likes belonging to organizations	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
13	Easily depressed	<i>g)</i>	<i>h)</i>	<i>i)</i>	<i>j)</i>	<i>k)</i>				
14	Easy-going	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
15	Easily excited	<i>c)</i>	<i>d)</i>	<i>e)</i>	<i>f)</i>	<i>g)</i>				
TOTAL										

FROM COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE by Burgess, Wallin and Shultz. Copyright 1953, 1954 by J.B. Lippincott Company. Published by J.B. Lippincott Company.

PART 4. INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES

	1	2
1) In leisure time do you both prefer to be "on the go" (u) all the time____; (v) most of the time____; (w) some of the time____; to "stay at home" (x) some of the time____; (y) most of the time____; (z) all of the time____; (h) or do you differ, one preferring to be on the go, the other to stay at home_____.		
2) Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together: (a) all of them____; (b) most of them____; (c) some of them____; (d) a few of them____; (e) none of them_____.		
3) Do you kiss your mate: (a) every day____; (b) almost every day____; (c) frequently____; (d) occasionally____; (e) rarely____; (f) almost never_____.		
4) Do you confide in your mate about: (a) everything____; (b) most things____; (c) some things____; (d) a few things____; (e) nothing_____.		
5) Does your mate confide in you about: (a) everything____; (b) most things____; (c) some things____; (d) a few things____; (e) nothing_____.		
6) Are you satisfied with amount of demonstration of affection in your marriage: (a) yes____; no (d) desires less____; (e) desires more_____.		
7) Is your mate satisfied with demonstration of affection: (a) yes____; no (d) desires less____; (e) desires more_____.		
8) Do you think you understand your mate's feelings: (a) very well____; (b) considerably____; (c) somewhat____; (d) a little____; (e) only slightly_____.		
9) Do you think your mate understands your feelings: (a) very well____; (b) considerably____; (c) somewhat____; (d) a little____; (e) only slightly_____.		
10) Do you in general talk things over with your mate: (u) almost never____; (v) sometimes____; (w) occasionally____; (x) frequently____; (y) almost always____; (z) always_____.		
11) Do you feel that your intelligence as compared with that of your mate is (u) higher____; (w) lower____; (y) equal_____.		

HOW SUCCESSFUL IS YOUR MARRIAGE?

- 12) Check any of the following which you and your mate both enjoy: (d) going to church____; (j) reading____; (t) radio____; (v) music____; (d) parties____; (j) television____; (t) theater____; (d) motion pictures____; (v) public lectures____; (t) symphony concerts____.

T	
---	--

PART 5. CONSENSUS

- 1) Do you and your mate both desire children:
- a) very much.....
 - b) a good deal.....
 - c) somewhat
 - d) a little.....
 - e) not at all.....

Or does one of you desire children very much or a good deal and the other:

- u) not at all.....
 v) a little.....
 w) somewhat

- 2) Do you and your mate attend (check): (*z*) the same church or temple____; (*u*) different ones____; (*v*) only one attends____; (*w*) neither attends____.

- 3) How many serious quarrels or arguments have you had with your mate in the past twelve months? (check):
(u) 4 or more____; (v) 3____; (w) 2____; (x) 1____;
(y) 0____.

- 4) Indicate your approximate agreement or disagreement with your mate on the following things. Do this for *each item* by putting a check in the column which shows extent of your agreement or disagreement.

[illegible]

FROM COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE by Burgess, Wallin
and Shultz. Copyright 1953, 1954 by J.B. Lippincott Company.
Published by J.B. Lippincott Company.

COURTSHIP, ENGAGEMENT AND MARRIAGE

Write in Column 1 letter for each item below	Al- ways agree z)	Al- most always agree a)	Occa- sion- ally dis- agree b)	Fre- quent- ly dis- agree c)	Al- most always dis- agree d)	Al- ways dis- agree e)	1	2
Handling family finances								
Matters of recreation								
Religious matters								
Demonstration of affection								
Friends								
Table manners								
Matters of conventionality								
Philosophy of life								
Ways of dealing with your families								
Wife's working								
Intimate relations								
Sharing of household tasks								
Politics								
5) When disagreements arise between you and your mate they usually result in (check): (u) neither giving in ____; (v) you giving in ____; (x) mate giving in ____; (z) agreement by mutual give and take ____.								
							T	

APPENDIX B

TABLE I
CODE USED FOR EXTRACTING DATA FROM MARITAL
SUCCESS SCHEDULES

<u>Column</u>	<u>Information</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Serial number (case)	Coded sequentially from 001
4	Military rank	Coded: 1 Field Grade Officer 2 Company Grade Officer 3 Sergeant 4 Airman
5	Present love of spouse for mate as compared with love before marriage --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Very much stronger 2 Considerably stronger 3 Somewhat stronger 4 A little stronger 5 The same 6 A little weaker 7 Somewhat weaker 8 Considerably weaker 9 Very much weaker
6	Same as 5 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
7	Measure of agreement of spouses as to strength of love at present as compared with before marriage	Coded in eight progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement
8	Participatory activi- ties outside the home --Male spouse viewpoint	1 All activities 2 Most activities 3 Some activities 4 Few activities 5 No activities
9	Same as 8 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
10	Participatory activi- ties --agreement of spouses	Coded in four progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement

TABLE I (continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Information</u>	<u>Code</u>
11	Intelligence of mate --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Intelligence higher than mate 2 Intelligence lower than mate 3 Intelligence equal to mate
12	Same as 11 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
13	Measure of agreement on intelligence	Coded in two progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement
14	Sexual agreement as to intimate relations --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Always agree 2 Almost always agree 3 Occasionally disagree 4 Frequently disagree 5 Almost always disagree 6 Always disagree
15	Same as 14 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
16	Measure of agreement on sexual intimacy between spouses	Coded in five progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement
17	Religion, attendance and type of affiliation --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Attends same church or temple 2 Attend different ones 3 Only one attends 4 Neither attends
18	Same as 17 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
19	Religion, agreement of spouses on attendance and affiliation	Coded in three progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement

TABLE I (continued)

<u>Column</u>	<u>Information</u>	<u>Code</u>
20	Religion, degree of agreement or controversy --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Always agree 2 Almost always agree 3 Occasionally disagree 4 Frequently disagree 5 Almost always disagree 6 Always disagree
21	Same as 20 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
22	Religion, measurement of agreement between spouses	Coded in five progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement
23	Handling family finances --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Always agree 2 Almost always agree 3 Occasionally disagree 4 Frequently disagree 5 Almost always disagree 6 Always disagree
24	Same as 23 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
25	Measurement of agreement between spouses on finances	Coded in five progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement
26	Agreement and disagreement on having children in the home --Male spouse viewpoint	Coded: 1 Both desire children very much 2 Both desire children a good deal 3 Both desire children somewhat 4 Both desire children a little 5 Both desire children not at all
27	Same as 26 except --Female spouse viewpoint	
28	Measure of agreement between spouses on children	Coded in four progressive steps from complete agreement to maximum disagreement

TABLE V

COMPUTATION OF F RATIO

The F ratio is shown for the five parts of the Marriage Success Schedule:

"PART 1. MY FEELINGS ABOUT MY MARRIAGE":

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between 8 means	2,032.9	7	$s_m^2 = 290.4$	$s_m^2 = \frac{290.4}{159.6} = 1.80$
Within	11,489.3	72	$s_p^2 = 159.6$	s_p^2

"PART 2. LOVE":

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between 8 means	407.3	7	$s_m^2 = 58.1$	$s_m^2 = \frac{58.1}{55.9} = 1.03$
Within	4,026.7	72	$s_p^2 = 55.9$	s_p^2

"PART 3. PERSONALITY AND TEMPERAMENT":

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between 8 means	1,052.5	7	$s_m^2 = 150.4$	$s_m^2 = \frac{150.4}{185.6} = .61$
Within	13,362.9	72	$s_p^2 = 185.6$	s_p^2

TABLE V (continued)

"PART 4. INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES":

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between 8 means	1,295.8	7	$S_m^2 = 185.1$	$S_m^2 = \frac{185.1}{119.7} = 1.54$
Within	8,615.2	72	$S_p^2 = 119.7$	S_p^2

"PART 5. CONSENSUS":

	Squares	df	Mean Square	F ratio
Between 8 means	739.5	7	$S_m^2 = 105.6$	$S_m^2 = \frac{105.6}{108.1} = .98$
Within	7,785.5	72	$S_p^2 = 108.1$	S_p^2

APPENDIX C

PRESENT LOVE OF SPOUSE

FIELD GRADE

3	1	1					
			1	1			
	1	1		1		1	1
					2	1	
			1		2		
							2

COMPANY GRADE

				1	1	1	1
				2			
1		1	1		1		
1					1		
	1	1	1	3			
				1	1		1
1				2	1	1	
					1		1
					1	1	2

SERGEANTS

2	1		1	1			1
	1		1		1		
		1	1		1		
		1	2	3			
	1		1	9		1	1
	1		1	1	3	2	1
1			1	1		1	2
				4		2	1
			2				3
							1

AIRMEN

1	1						
		1	1		1	2	1
		2	1	1		1	1
1				2	1	2	
		1	2	9	5	1	2
			2		1	2	2
	1				1	2	1
					2	1	1
1					1	1	1
					1	1	4

ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE THE HOME

FIELD GRADE

	1		
3	2		2
	2	3	1
			2
	1	3	

COMPANY GRADE

3	1		
	7	2	3
1	1	3	2
1		2	1
		1	3
			1

SERGEANTS

2	2		1	
3	17	7	6	
1	2	5	1	1
		2	2	3
			4	1

AIRMEN

4		1		
1	12	7	3	
3	4	7	5	1
	4	3	3	3
		1	3	

INTELLIGENCE OF MATE

FIELD GRADE

2		2
		1
1	1	13

COMPANY GRADE

1	1	1
1		
1	3	24

SERGEANTS

2	2	7
2	2	1
1		43

AIRMEN

	2	1
1	3	
2		56

SEXUAL AGREEMENT

FIELD GRADE

5	1	2		1
		1		
	2	1	1	
			1	1
	1			
		1	1	1

COMPANY GRADE

8		2	1	1
1	1	1		1
	1	4	1	
	2		2	2
			1	
1	2			

SERGEANTS

12	7	1			1
	7	5		1	
2		6	4		
		2	2	2	
		1	1		2
					4

AIRMEN

16					1
2	7	5	2	1	
	3	7	1	1	
1	1		3	3	2
	1	1	1	1	1
			2	2	

RELIGIOUS ATTENDANCE

FIELD GRADE

7		1	
	1		1
	1	4	
			5

COMPANY GRADE

12			1
----	--	--	---

	4		
--	---	--	--

		4	
--	--	---	--

		3	8
--	--	---	---

SERGEANTS

19		2	1
----	--	---	---

	7	2	
--	---	---	--

		7	1
--	--	---	---

		2	19
--	--	---	----

AIRMEN

23			1
----	--	--	---

	7		
--	---	--	--

1	1	7	2
---	---	---	---

		2	21
--	--	---	----

RELIGIOUS AGREEMENT

FIELD GRADE

12 1

1

1

1

1

3

COMPANY GRADE

17 1 1 1 2

1 2 2

-1

-1

1

1

1

SERGEANTS

31 3 1 1 1

4 4 1

1 1 2

1 3 1

1 2

1

AIRMEN

37	3		1		
1	2	3			
	3	3	3		1
		1	3	1	
				1	2

FAMILY FINANCES

FIELD GRADE

3		2	1		
	3	2	1		1
				1	
	1	1			
	1		2		
		1			

COMPANY GRADE

8	1		1	2	
	3	3	1	1	
			1	2	1
1	1			2	1
	1				
	1				1

SERGEANTS

14	2			1	
1	5	3	4	1	
	3	4	2	1	1
1		1	4	3	1
	2		3		1
		1			1

AIRMEN

9	1	1			
3	5	4	5		
	3	3	6	3	1
	2	1	3	4	3
		2	1	2	2
				1	

CHILDREN IN THE HOME

FIELD GRADE

11	2	
2		1
1	2	
1		

COMPANY GRADE

20	1		
2	2	1	
1	1		
2			1
			1

SERGEANTS

39	6	1	
1	3	5	
1			
1		1	
1			1

AIRMEN

46	2	1	1
4	4	1	
	2		
	1	1	
			1 1

20 FIELD GRADE
 32 COMPANY GRADE
 60 SERGEANTS
 65 AIRMEN
 177 TOTAL

PRESENT LOVE OF SPOUSE

FIELD GRADE

2.3	.6	.8	-.1	-.2	-.1	-.1	-.0	-.2
.0	-.1	-.1	.6	.6	.0	-.2	-.2	-.1
-.1	.0	-.4	-.3	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1	-.1
-.2	.0	0.1	-.2	-.5	-.2	-.2	.0	.0
.0	.6	.6	-.4	-1.4	-.5	.7	-.3	.7
.0	-.1	.0	-.3	-.2	1.3	-.5	.6	-.2
-.2	-.1	.0	-.1	-.3	-.2	-.4	-.3	-.1
.0	.0	.0	.8	-.4	1.4	-.3	-.2	-.5
-.1	.0	.0	-.2	.0	-.2	-.2	-.1	.9

COMPANY GRADE

-1.0	-.5	-.1	-.1	.6	.8	.8	.0	.6
.0	-.1	-.1	-.5	1.4	.0	-.3	-.3	-.1
.8	.0	.2	.4	-.1	.8	-.1	-.1	-.1
.6	.0	-.1	-.3	-.9	.6	-.3	.0	.0
.0	.4	.4	.2	-.9	-.9	-.3	-.5	-.3
.0	-.1	.0	-.5	.6	-1.0	.1	-.5	.6
.6	-.1	.0	-.1	1.4	.6	.2	-.5	-.1
.0	.0	.0	-.1	-.7	.1	-.5	-.3	.1
-.1	.0	.0	-.3	.0	.6	.6	-.1	.3

SERGEANTS

-.0	-.0	-.3	.6	.3	-.3	-.3	.0	.3
.0	.6	-.3	-.0	-1.0	.0	.3	-.6	-.3
-.3	.0	-.3	-.0	-.3	-.3	.6	-.3	-.3
-.6	.0	.6	1.3	1.3	-.6	-.6	.0	.0
.0	-.0	-1.0	-.3	1.5	-1.6	-.6	-.0	.3
.0	.6	.0	-.0	.3	.9	.3	-1.0	.3
.3	-.3	.0	.6	-.0	-.6	-.3	.9	.6
.0	.0	.0	-.3	2.6	-1.6	.9	.3	1.3
-.3	.0	.0	1.3	.0	-.6	-.6	-.3	-2.0

AIRMEN

-1.2	-.1	-.3	-.3	-.7	-.3	-.3	.0	-.7
.0	-.3	.6	-.1	-1.1	.0	.2	1.2	.6
-.3	.0	.5	-.1	.6	-.3	-.3	.6	.6
.2	.0	-.3	-.7	.1	.2	1.2	.0	.0
.0	-1.1	-.1	.5	.9	3.1	.2	.8	-.7
.0	-.3	.0	.8	-.7	-1.2	.1	.8	-.7
-.7	.6	.0	-.3	-1.1	.2	.5	-.1	-.3
.0	.0	.0	-.3	-1.4	.1	-.1	.2	-.8
.6	.0	.0	-.7	.0	.2	.2	.6	.6

TOTAL

6	3	1	1	2	1	1		2
	1	1	3	3		2	2	1
1		4	3	1	1	1	1	1
2		1	2	5	2	2		
	3	3	4	22	5	2	3	2
	1		3	2	6	5	3	2
2	1		1	3	2	4	3	1
			1	4	5	3	2	5
1			2		2	2	1	9

PARTICIPATORY ACTIVITIES

FIELD GRADE

-1.0	-.3	.7	-.1	.0
-.4	-1.3	-.0	-1.3	1.7
-.5	-.7	.0	1.9	.4
-.1	-.4	-.7	-.6	1.1
.0	.0	.7	1.7	-.5

COMPANY GRADE

1.3	.4	-.3	-.1	.0
-.7	-.0	-1.2	.8	-.3
.1	-.2	-.0	-1.6	1.1
.8	-.7	.7	-.0	-1.4
.0	.0	.6	1.0	.1

SERGEANTS

-1.0	.9	-.6	.6	.0
1.6	3.8	.9	1.9	-.6
-.6	-.3	-.7	-2.0	-.6
-.3	-1.3	-.3	-.0	.2
.0	.0	-.6	.2	-.6

AIRMEN

.6	-1.1	.2	-.3	.0
-.4	-2.3	.3	-1.4	-.7
1.1	1.4	.7	1.6	-.8
-.3	2.5	.4	.7	.0
.0	.0	-.7	3.0	1.1

TOTAL

9	3	2	1	
4	39	18	12	2
5	7	17	9	5
1	4	7	6	8
		2	11	5

INTELLIGENCE OF MATE

FIELD GRADE

1.4	-.5	.7
-.4	-.5	.7
.4	.5	-2.2

COMPANY GRADE

.1	.1	-.9
----	----	-----

.2	-.9	-.3
----	-----	-----

.1	2.2	-.4
----	-----	-----

SERGEANTS

.3	.3	3.2
----	----	-----

.6	.3	.3
----	----	----

-.6	-1.3	-2.9
-----	------	------

AIRMEN

-1.8	.1	-3.0
------	----	------

-.4	1.1	-.7
-----	-----	-----

.1	-1.4	6.0
----	------	-----

TOTAL

5	5	11
---	---	----

4	5	2
---	---	---

5	4	136
---	---	-----

SEXUAL AGREEMENT

FIELD GRADE

.4	.1	-.3	1.6	-.1	.6
-.3	-1.6	-1.2	.6	-.3	.0
-.2	-.4	-.1	.2	.7	.0
-.1	-.3	-.2	-.7	.3	.4
.0	-.1	.6	-.3	-.1	-.3
-.1	-.2	.0	.6	.6	.4

COMPANY GRADE

.6	-1.4	1.4	.4	.8	-.5
.4	-1.7	-.9	-.5	.4	.0
-.3	.2	.5	-.2	-.3	.0
-.1	1.4	-.3	.7	-1.0	1.1
.0	-.1	-.5	.4	-.1	-.5
.8	1.6	.0	-.5	-.5	-.9

SERGEANTS

-1.8	4.2	-.0	-1.0	-.3	-.0
-1.0	1.9	1.2	-1.0	-.0	.0
1.3	-1.3	-.4	1.6	-.6	.0
-.3	-1.0	1.3	-.3	-.0	-1.6
.0	-.3	-.0	-.0	-.3	.9
-.3	-.6	.0	-1.0	-1.0	2.3

AIRMEN

.9	-2.9	-1.1	-1.1	-.3	-.1
.8	1.4	.9	.8	-.1	.0
-.7	1.5	.0	-1.5	.2	.0
.6	-.1	-.7	.4	.7	.1
.0	.6	-.1	-.1	.6	-.1
-.3	-.7	.0	.8	.8	-1.8

TOTAL

41	8	3	3	1	3
3	15	11	3	3	
2	4	19	7	2	
1	3	2	7	6	5
	1	3	3	1	3
1	2		3	3	5

RELIGIOUS ATTENDANCE

FIELD GRADE

.1	.0	.6	-.3
.0	-1.1	-.2	.8
-.1	.7	1.5	-.3
.0	.0	-.7	-.9

COMPANY GRADE

1.0	.0	-.5	.4
.0	.5	-.3	-.1
-.1	-.3	.0	-.5
.0	.0	1.7	-1.5

SERGEANTS

-1.6	.0	.9	-.0
.0	.5	1.3	-.3
-.3	-.6	-.4	-.0
.0	.0	-.3	1.0

AIRMEN

.6	.0	-1.1	-.1
.0	.0	-.7	-.3
.6	.2	-1.0	.8
.0	.0	-.5	1.5

TOTAL

61		3	3
	19	2	1
1	2	22	3
		7	53

RELIGIOUS AGREEMENT

FIELD GRADE

1.1	.2	-.2	-.3	-.2	-.2
.6	-.8	-1.0	.0	-.1	.0
.0	-.4	-.5	-.5	-.1	-.1
.8	-.1	-.2	-.6	-.2	.8
.0	.0	-.1	.8	-.2	.0
.0	.0	.0	2.5	-.1	-.4

COMPANY GRADE

-.4	-1.2	.6	.4	.6	1.6
.4	.5	.3	.0	-.1	.0
.0	-.7	.1	-.9	.8	-.1
-.1	-.1	.6	-1.0	-.3	-.1
.0	.0	-.1	-.1	-.3	.0
.0	.0	.0	.2	-.1	.2

SERGEANTS

-1.7	.6	.3	-.0	.3	-.6
-1.0	1.2	.9	.0	.6	.0
.0	-.3	-.6	.3	-.3	-.3
-.3	.6	-.6	.9	.3	-.3
.0	.0	.6	-.3	1.3	.0
.0	.0	.0	-1.3	-.3	-.3

AIRMEN

1.4	.4	-.7	-.1	-.7	-.7
-.1	-.9	-.3	.0	-.3	.0
.0	1.5	1.1	1.1	-.3	.6
-.3	-.3	.2	.7	.2	-.3
.0	.0	-.3	-.3	-.7	.0
.0	.0	.0	-1.4	.6	.5

TOTAL

97	7	2	3	2	2
3	8	9		1	
	4	5	5	1	1
1	1	2	6	2	1
		1	1	2	
			4	1	4

FAMILY FINANCES

FIELD GRADE

-.8	-.4	1.6	.7	-.3	.0
-.4	1.2	.6	-.2	-.2	.8
.0	-.6	-.7	-1.0	.2	-.3
-.2	.5	.6	-.7	-1.0	-.5
.0	.5	-.2	1.3	-.2	-.3
.0	-.1	.7	.0	-.1	-.2

COMPANY GRADE

1.8	.2	-.5	.6	1.4	.0
-.7	.1	.8	-.9	.6	-.1
.0	-1.0	-1.2	-.6	.7	.4
.6	.2	-.5	-1.2	.3	.1
.0	.2	-.3	-1.0	-.3	-.5
.0	.8	-.3	.0	-.1	.6

SERGEANTS

2.5	.6	-1.0	-.6	-.0	.0
-.3	-.4	-1.0	.2	.3	-.3
.0	.9	1.6	-1.0	-1.3	-.0
.3	-1.3	-.0	1.6	-.0	-.6
.0	.6	-.6	.9	-.6	-.0
.0	-.3	.3	.0	-.3	.3

AIRMEN

-3.4	-.4	-.1	-.7	-1.1	.0
1.5	-.8	-.4	.9	-.7	-.3
.0	.7	.4	2.6	.4	-.1
-.7	.5	-.1	.4	.6	1.1
.0	-1.4	1.2	-1.2	1.2	.8
.0	-.3	-.7	.0	.6	-.7

TOTAL

34	4	3	2	3	
4	16	12	11	2	1
	6	7	9	7	3
2	4	3	7	9	5
	4	2	6	2	3
	1	2		1	2

CHILDREN IN THE HOME

FIELD GRADE

-1.9	.7	-.2	-.1	.0
.9	-1.0	-.7	.8	.0
.6	1.4	.0	.0	.0
.5	-.1	-.2	.0	-.1
-.1	.0	.0	-.1	-.3

COMPANY GRADE

-.8	-.9	-.3	-.1	.0
.3	.3	-.2	-.1	.0
.4	.1	.0	.0	.0
1.2	-.1	-.3	.0	.8
-.1	.0	.0	-.1	.4

SERGEANTS

-.2	2.2	.3	-.3	.0
-2.0	-.0	2.6	-.3	.0
-.0	-1.6	.0	.0	.0
-.3	-.3	.3	.0	-.3
.6	.0	.0	-.3	-.0

AIRMEN

3.4	-2.0	.2	.6	.0
.6	.6	-1.5	-.3	.0
-1.1	.1	.0	.0	.0
-1.4	.6	.2	.0	-.3
-.3	.0	.0	.6	-.1

TOTAL

116	11	2	1	
9	9	7	1	
3	5			
4	1	2		1
1			1	3