Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1975

A Descriptive Study Regarding Perceptions of Sex Roles in Cooperative Households

Emily Fultz

Portland State University

Billie Huntwork

Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

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

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Fultz, Emily and Huntwork, Billie, "A Descriptive Study Regarding Perceptions of Sex Roles in Cooperative Households" (1975). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1879.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1878>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY REGARDING
PERCEPTIONS OF SEX ROLES IN
COOPERATIVE HOUSEHOLDS

by

Emily Fultz
Billie Huntwork

A practicum submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK

Portland State University

1975

Approved by Lewis H. Curtis,
Associate Professor of Social Work

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We wish to express our appreciation to those who made this study both possible and enjoyable. Our advisor, Lew Curtis, spent many long hours helping us through all phases of our research. His patience and good humor were greatly appreciated. Without the cooperation, friendliness and openness of residents in the groups visited, this study would have been impossible. Their warm responsiveness was a source of great pleasure. Appreciation is also expressed to Frank Miles, School of Social Work, for his aid in several technical aspects of the study. Our typist, Candy Genhelmer, combined competence and cheerfulness to make the final work of completing this study a pleasant task. Fellow students were also helpful in providing suggestions for groups to visit and content for investigation. Our respective households, who have now become "experts" on cooperative households, have sustained us with good-natured support and cooperation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	i i i
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
I I REVIEW OF LITERATURE	5
I I I METHODOLOGY	33
I V FINDINGS	47
V INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	66
V I DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	76
V I I EPILOGUE	88
BIBLIOGRAPHY	91
APPENDIX	
A COMMUNE/RESPONDENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRES - PRE-TEST	98
B COMMUNE/RESPONDENT INFORMATION QUESTIONNAIRES	115
C INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH TO GROUPS	131
D LIST OF VARIABLES	134
E CODING CATEGORIES	135
F TABLES	142
G DESCRIPTION OF GROUPS IN SAMPLE	223
H FINAL LETTER TO SAMPLE GROUP	245

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The roles of men and women are among the many elements of contemporary American society which are in a process of rapid and sometimes disruptive change. The more or less traditional ways in which men and women have viewed themselves and each other are being openly challenged by a number of significant factors. Although there have always been those exceptional persons who questioned the inevitability of seemingly given role differentiation, today's social climate makes such questioning more common and acceptable.

A few specific factors may be mentioned as being of particular interest. With modern communication and mobility, the options for varied educational and employment opportunities and life styles available to both men and women have vastly increased. In a world threatened with overpopulation, there has appeared a marked decrease in family size expectations. Further, increasingly open challenges are being offered to the idea of the inevitability and/or desirability of the nuclear family as the ideal life style for all persons.

The modern Women's Movement has spoken to all of the above issues and has added the unique dimension of heightened awareness of past and present role allocation for women and its associated critique of what society has apportioned to men as well.

Cooperative households provide one form of intimate social organization in which sex roles, in some form, will be expressed. It is the intent of this study to focus upon perceptions of sex roles within contemporary cooperative households. Generally, we wish to know whether or not certain group or individual factors are associated with the development of sex role patterns. If they are associated, in what ways? If they are associated, will this enable us to develop more focused questions which could be investigated in similar settings outside the population of this sample? Finally, we will examine whether our data and observations raise questions for further inquiry regarding sex role patterns within the nuclear family and/or society in general. As social workers we hope to gain some understanding of ways in which life in a cooperative household may provide one alternative among many for those seeking to develop roles which reflect their uniqueness as persons.

A brief note on terminology is required at this point to avoid confusion in the narrative to follow. We began our study using the designation "commune" for the groups we wished to include. However, a number of respondents in several different groups remarked on their dissatisfaction with this term. The basic reason for the concern expressed lies in the popular use of "commune" in ways which elicit a negative emotional response from persons in the larger society. Although recognizing that this response

often reflects a lack of information and understanding, they still felt its use could detract from whatever helpful results might come from this study. With this in mind we have selected the term "cooperative household"¹ as an alternative and will use this phrase throughout most of the narrative and in the summary which will be returned to participants. However, in the Findings and Tables we will continue to use the word "commune" as these sections relate to data drawn directly from the questionnaires where this term is used. Our decision to use the broader term "cooperative household" is one way to emphasize the very great variety, uniqueness and flexibility we discovered in the course of this research.

Footnotes for Chapter I

1. For a more precise working definition of this term, please refer to the chapter on Methodology, p.34 - 35.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In reviewing literature relevant to the topic of sex roles in cooperative settings, effort was made to move from a general framework of reference to a focus upon the specific issue under study. This approach involved first a consideration of general societal trends in American culture, with particular attention to the family and to changing sex role expectations. Literature dealing with cooperative living arrangements both in historical perspective and as existing today was reviewed to provide general background for the examination of sex roles in that type of setting. A small sample of literature was found dealing with specific aspects of sex roles in cooperative living situations.

General societal trends

Many authors have dealt with the phenomenon of rapid change in American culture. Philip Slater¹ subtitles his Pursuit of Loneliness, "American Culture at the Breaking Point". He sees American society as ready for a major transition from an old culture based on scarcity, with an emphasis on competition, production and private property to a new culture based on abundance, emphasizing cooperation, distribution and community.

Slater sees the new culture as one in which the values of equality, personal expression, and group sharing are primary. He sees such a climate as conducive to communal living arrangements and to increased equality between men and women within these.

Several authors present critiques of society from the stance of the counterculture. In some cases they see the breakdown of old patterns as an opportunity for the incorporation of values and qualities which in the past have been resisted or dismissed as youthful excesses. Yablonsky² emphasized the need for American society to take seriously the emphasis on compassion and love of the drop out or "hippie" movement. For him this does not mean wholehearted adoption of all the characteristics of any particular members of this group. However, he feels the presence of a few less widely acceptable attributes should not be made a stumbling block in the path of recognizing and appropriating genuinely valuable qualities. As Davis³ points out, these young persons may already be rehearsing new forms of cultural evolution which will deal with problems central to our future society. Among those he mentions are their resolution of the problems of compulsive consumption and passive spectatorship. The patterns which they have developed in response to these issues provide real options to the traps into which middle class Americans, in particular, are rapidly becoming entangled. Yablonsky

draws a parallel between modern "hippies" and Christians in the Roman Empire, suggesting that tolerant understanding rather than persecution would be the more appropriate response, incorporating the values and persons of these groups into society to their mutual benefit.

Richard Flacks⁴, who has participated in the radical student movement, reflects upon it and upon the confusing and rapid change in the midst of which young adults must establish their identity. Family life has become less rigid, allowing youth to develop a sense of personal uniqueness and potential. At the same time he sees the incoherence resulting from a lack of standard, accepted mores as leaving the same youth without guidelines for the expression and development of those qualities. Youth are therefore unwilling to slip into old forms while at the same time being frustrated with the lack of change following their sacrifices and involvement. The student movement of the Sixties epitomizes this situation. Flacks suggests that only the formation of small parallel structures within society will enable disillusioned youth to continue in a meaningful challenge to established institutions. His premise is that by actualizing in microcosm the type of society they seek, they will gradually prepare more people to take power for themselves. In Flacks' view, this provides them with forms which may continue to be appropriate as they move into older age groups and

also demonstrate a practiced alternative to the established system for that time when the larger society will either be willing to change or be forced to do so.

By way of introduction to a consideration of literature dealing with sex roles in American society, it may be useful to look briefly at Arlie Russell Hochschild's⁵ evaluation of the field of sex role research.

Hochschild states that "the issue of sex roles is the biggest blind spot in existing sociology". (p.1023) In discussing the four types of research usually carried on she points out the underlying assumptions of each and most importantly the implicit models of inequality underlying the perspectives. Further points of significance are the biased use of language in descriptive studies and the obvious lack of attention to women of ethnic minorities and lower economic class. Although she recognizes the contributions of modern feminists, Hochschild sees the need for a major change in approach to the sociology of sex roles.

Keeping in mind the limitations suggested above, we may proceed to sketch an overview of sex role literature. Much of this literature is intimately tied to cultural understandings of family life. Assumptions regarding what is natural and good have tended in the past to relate closely to the roles of husband, wife, father, mother. Single adults, especially women,

have tended to move into roles resembling those played out in the nuclear family. For many women, this has meant taking on tasks resembling the nurturing, conserving function, almost as if this were to be a direct substitute for literal mothering.⁶ In order to understand the pervasiveness and power of society's role expectations, it is necessary to remember how early role training begins. Bardwick and Donovan⁷ describe in some detail the processes through which men and women develop their images of themselves and of each other. Perhaps it is this feeling of inevitability resulting from such socialization of men and women which makes such eminently rational proposals as Jessie Barnard's⁸ "shared roles" and Olof Palme's⁹ description of Swedish objectives seem so very revolutionary on the emotional level. The basic idea in Barnard's article is that a truly equalitarian distribution of roles will never be possible until men and women share all roles. In a family setting this would mean that the male provider would be fully involved in child rearing and household functions and would also be relieved of part of his responsibility to give economic support. Practically speaking, this would involve part time jobs for both husband and wife and part time responsibility for home duties. Palme's article makes a similar suggestion. However, in his case what he describes represents official social policy, although as yet imperfectly implemented.

He further emphasizes the loss of privilege to a man who has too little time to share in the care of his children, suggesting that especially when children are very young, fathers should be encouraged to cut back sufficiently to have meaningful responsibility and satisfaction in this area.

The vocal aspect of recent feminist literature leads one to forget how recent a phenomenon the insights represented in this literature are for the modern American woman. As recently as 1964 Alice Rossi¹⁰ was making her "immodest proposal" for equality between the sexes in a climate in which women were generally seen as satisfied or at least quiescent in their traditional roles and where full time motherhood was increasingly a reality, at least in the middle class. Although much current literature would reflect her underlying approach more widely, the practical considerations she raises of father involvement, of adequate day care and "practical mother" child care persons have still not been dealt with realistically by American society. Impatience with such slow progress in the implementation of equalitarian ideals may be seen to provide ample impetus for the seeking out of alternative forms of social organization to embody these new understandings.

Historical and contemporary cooperative living

Background on utopian ideology

The idea of utopia seems always to have co-existed with humankind. Of the many philosophers, poets, political thinkers, artists and others who

have considered and written of this ideal, only a few can be mentioned here.

Buber¹¹ describes utopias as pictures of something not actually present, but only represented, of what "should be", what the visionary wishes to be. He sees the achievement of this absolute "rightness" as never possible for the individual alone, but only for the individual in human community. He goes on to say that such a picture is not in isolation from the existing human condition, but is in relationship to the suffering and misery of humankind, standing over against it in contrast. He quotes Victor Hugo as calling utopia "the truth of tomorrow". That which today is seen an inopportune clears the way for a society to be.

Another emphasis which Buber makes and which is pertinent to any consideration of practical communal experiments is that the essence of community is the presence of a "center". For Buber this involves a unifying philosophy, force or goal to which members are committed. Whether or not this center is recognized or acknowledged, he views it as that element with which all members have a common relationship. He uses the metaphor of the wheel to illustrate this idea, remarking that it is described by the radii, not by points on the circumference (p. 135).

Tillach¹² in Utopias and Utopian Thought provides an excellent summary of some of the positive and negative characteristics of Utopia. The first positive aspect he mentions is the emphasis on the fulfillment of both the individual and society. The personal and social elements cannot be separated without destroying the truth of the utopian ideal. Tillach uses an illustration familiar to social workers of the lament of an analyst who seeks to deal with a person's private troubles without simultaneous attention to the public issues present in the world to which the troubled person must return. He sees the utopian ideal as one which tries to place a whole person in a whole environment. The second positive characteristic which Tillach identifies is the "fruitfulness" of utopia. By this he means the way in which this ideal opens up possibilities which might otherwise remain hidden to society. Power, the third positive quality, Tillach identifies as "the power of man in his wholeness" (p.299). This power is one which has been seen to transform reality.

For each of these positive qualities Tillach then offers a corresponding negative element. In the case of the first he calls attention to the finiteness and estrangement of persons which is often forgotten by the utopian. He sees human existence as separating the person from his/her true and unattainable being. In place of fruitfulness Tillach sees the danger of wishful thinking,

of the utopian deeming the impossible as possible. This tendency to unrealism has been the cause for the dissolution of many experiments in utopia. Where the two first negative aspects exist they lead naturally to the third, which Tillach sees as the powerlessness which grows out of disillusionment.

Tillach does not see the negative aspects of utopia as necessarily negating the positive. When the element of transcendence is added it becomes possible to hold the pairs in balance and to make some moves forward. He describes transcendence as that quality of the living which always strives to move beyond itself. The element of risk, of reaching out which exists along with the natural motion for conservation places every utopia in a state of "hovering, a suspension, between possibility and impossibility" (p.302). Finally, Tillach declares the need of the utopian to recognize that the commitment to be made is not to an absolute, but to an ambiguous beginning, to a reaching forward.

One author who has considered both ideological and practical questions of the utopian ideal is B.F. Skinner³ in his novel Walden Two. He describes the building of an ideal community through the use of behavioral engineering. He sees one generation as sufficient time to completely transform social priorities and to produce a group of happy, productive persons, without

any of the weak and selfish characteristics of most societies.

Skinner, in his novel, was following in the tradition of such early utopians as Thomas More¹⁴ and Etienne Cabet¹⁵. However, he differs in that the process by which Walden Two was built uses those tools of behavioral science which are actually available. More and Cabet offered philosophical challenges to the evils of their times. Skinner's challenge was both philosophical and practical, even though he did not describe a community in actual existence. Other social idealists did seek to incarnate their utopian models, however. Among the best known are Charles Fourier¹⁶, and Robert Owen¹⁷. Fourier (1772 - 1837) proposed a system of cooperative settlements based on production and called phalanxes. Among the communities based on his design were the North American Phalanx in New Jersey, phalanxes in Wisconsin and Iowa, and Brook Farm in the latter stages of its existence. None of these communities lasted very long and are seen by Kanter¹⁸ as among the unsuccessful of the nineteenth century. Robert Owen (1771 - 1858) began as a mill owner in Wales. Out of his concern to avoid human subordination to machinery and other considerations, he eventually left manufacturing and turned to social criticism. His New Harmony community in Indiana is also seen as unsuccessful, however, his thought was undoubtedly influential, as was Fourier's in the development of new forms of social organization and protest.

Brief notes on historical communities

There is a rich and varied literature dealing with American utopian experiments, particularly of the nineteenth century. As early as 1875 Charles Nordhoff¹⁹ described The Communistic Societies of the United States. He provides a fascinating first hand glance into a number of the most interesting communities of the last century. Nordhoff²⁰ also provides excerpts from group literature and a good number of illustrations to give an added feeling for the life of the groups described.

Many of those who were active in the founding of utopian communities were prolific in their written expression of their ideas and activities. John Humphrey Noyes²¹ left assorted books and papers on the Oneida experiment. Adin Ballou²² left an account of the fortunes and misfortunes of the Hopedale Community.

A number of books have been written by persons who were related to early leaders of specific communities or who had personal contact as children. One of the most ambitious is a two volume work by Constance Noyes Robertson²³, a granddaughter of John Humphrey Noyes, founder of the Oneida Community. She has drawn on a good deal of original material as well as her acquaintance with Oneida members to provide a thorough and sympathetic account of this group. John Humphrey Noyes' son,

Pierrepoint Noyes²⁴, also wrote an account of his early life in the community. Robert Dale Owen²⁵, son of the founder of New Harmony, has described both his father and the efforts at community which he attempted.

In addition to those who enjoyed first or second hand experience with nineteenth century communities, a number of modern authors have made careful study of these groups. The one who has been most helpful to the authors of this study is Rosabeth Moss Kanter²⁶. Her Commitment and Community deals with an issue that is at the heart of the utopian ideal. Her analysis of the nature and process of commitment as a key to an understanding of success in communal experiments provides excellent background for any consideration of long-term aspects of collective life. The bulk of her study focuses on characteristics of nineteenth century groups, but she also draws parallels with modern communities.

Raymond Muncy²⁷ is another scholar who has given attention to nineteenth century communities. His focus is on Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities. He also draws on a wide variety of original and secondary sources for his description of sexual practices and relationships.

In the course of examining earlier utopian ideas and experiments, we gained perspective for our current study. The types of issues and character-

istics described have provided ideas of factors to look for in modern communities. Specifically, insight has been gained in the ways women have been involved in such experiments and the impact on sex roles which has resulted.

Modern communities

As is true in the case of historical material, literature dealing with modern communal experiments ranges from the scholarly²⁸ to popular presentations of communal life in books, articles, and journals of personal experience.²⁹

Numerous comparisons can be made between earlier communities and groups of more recent origin. The ideals which Richard Fairfield³⁰ lists as being present in varying degrees among today's communards are echoes of those espoused by leaders of the past.³¹

At the same time, Kanter comments, "The major difference between establishing a new community in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries is the degree of difficulty a group encounters in constructing strong boundaries and creating a coherent group".³² Modern mobility, mass communication and rapid social change reduce the possibility of isolation and the expectations of relative permanence which were more characteristic of the nineteenth century. Additional internal strength is needed to maintain boundaries and

cohesion in the face of these pressures. Also, she sees the level of focus as having changed from attempts to create alternative societies to scaled-down efforts at alternative families.³³ Other modern authors bear out this view in describing the smaller, more decentralized forms of community seen today.³⁴ A few exceptions to this may be seen in the more formalized networks of religious communities.³⁵

Certain authors give special emphasis to the emergence of a communal life style as an intricate part of the phenomenon variously referred to as the counterculture, youth culture or hip culture.³⁶ They see the values emphasized by youth as finding a natural flowering in such arrangements, whether the focus be on personal development removed from society or on personal sacrifice for societal change. While recognizing the unique climate of modern society, Odets³⁷ also points out that communal emphases, a position readily supported by the historical material cited earlier, are not alien to American society. He expresses the idea that the dismissal of such groups as somehow outside the American tradition is an attempt by some in the larger society to deny their relevance and potential permanence.

Much of current literature points out the great variety and continuing change within the modern communal movement. Fairfield³⁸ delineates seven general categories of communes in existence currently while Herbert Otto³⁹ makes a distinction between sixteen varieties, although admitting to

some overlap. One of the major dichotomies seen by many modern writers is that between the groups whose focus is on personal growth and fulfillment, usually with as little contact with the larger society as can be managed, and those communities who form with the express intent of working to change the larger society. While persons in the extreme camps see these two positions as irreconcilable⁴⁰, others suggest that they are really complementary facets of the same overall struggle.⁴¹ In the latter point of view, the more retreat oriented groups are seen as offering models toward which those who are actively seeking change can point. By living the kind of society for which others strive, they offer support to the cause of the socially and politically involved. At the same time they make oases of refreshment possible for persons immersed in social action, particularly in urban centers.

Considerable attention has been given to factors contributing to success and failure in the modern communal movement. First of all, even the use of those terms require explanation by anyone seeking to analyze group life. Some communards contend that longevity is no measure of success if those who have participated have grown and been able to move on to increasingly valid personal experiences. At the same time, there do seem to be some elements which effect how well a group is able to be that which it sets out to be.

Some⁴² have remarked that the high emphasis given to openness and personal fulfillment has left some groups exploited to the point of near extinction by those who have taken without giving in return. The rapid movement in and out of groups which this characteristic also fosters has also stood in the way of the development of a sense of "family" which has been a goal in formation.⁴³ Roberts⁴⁴ maintains that group failure or dissolution usually centers around one of four issues. These include lack of leadership, lack of means for handling internal disputes, lack of ideology and external repression. Kanter, Fairfield, and Melville⁴⁵ all mention lack of leadership as a common source of difficulty. Kanter's studies have emphasized the role of commitment and the need for some sense of a purpose or goal outside of the individual. Patrick Conover⁴⁶ suggests a relaxed and responsible approach to the questions around communal success. He emphasizes realistic values and a sense of responsibility among those who would live closely together. Perhaps his down-to-earth but optimistic approach would be an appropriate standard for those desiring to enter a truly cooperative life together.

Sex roles in cooperative households

Most discussion of sex roles in cooperative households falls into four overall areas of concern. Consciousness of sexual identity, emotional roles, practical division of labor and child rearing may be used as terms to describe these four foci.

In the first area, that of sexual identity, a number of authors write of the increased awareness which comes to communards of their own maleness and femaleness. At the same time they become more sensitive to the ways in which they have been socialized into narrow roles within each sex. Women from several communes in discussing their experiences point out that for the first time they have the space and time to deal with sexism.⁴⁷ They also credit the atmosphere of trust and mutual caring common to such an arrangement with making possible understanding and respect for others' feelings about themselves as men and women. Kanter⁴⁸ points out that in communal living women are not defined by their marital status as is the case in the larger society. They are therefore free to define themselves on their own terms, apart from men. The natural corollary is that men are also released from their constricted roles in relation to women and children. The practical outcome of such increased consciousness is seen in the other three areas of concern.

Although it is more difficult to achieve and harder to measure, as described in current literature, emotional growth and equality are major goals of persons living in cooperative households. Both men and women seek an atmosphere in which they may express emotional qualities usually considered to be exclusive to one or to the other. Marnie Oats of Twin Oaks focuses on

what is probably the key to achieving progress in this area when she defines the group goal "to be nonaggressive, noncompetitive, and non-exploitive"⁴⁹. As Oats goes on to point out, in this setting men and women can serve as models for one another, both in the expression of emotional qualities which each possesses and in the practical learning of new skills and behaviors. One summary of this issue may be seen in an excerpt from the statement of purpose of a group visited by the authors.

" We live in a community as men and women because we appreciate that the diverse gifts of vision, wisdom, and beauty given to each sex offer fuller dimension to our humanness. We complement each other, we learn from each other and in our differences there is strength."

While this statement may imply distinction between the sexes, the actual emphasis is more upon the completeness they each find as they learn human qualities from persons of the opposite sex.

Probably the most discussion centers around the practical implications of desired equalitarian goals. This issue is not as new a concern as might be imagined. "When the partition between the sexes is taken away, when man ceases to make woman a propogative drudge, when love takes the place of shame, men and women will be able to mingle in all their employments."⁵⁰ These words, a century old, describe the philosophy of the Oneida Community. In this group men and women shared work, responsibility and decision making. Even such social restrictions as dress style were cast aside to allow women

fuller personal expression.⁵¹ Within the nineteenth century utopian communities there was much variety in the amount of freedom and equality available to women. Even in a few situations where some practical tasks were shared, power was not always similarly shared. Nordhoff⁵² describes in some detail the life styles of a number of communities. He notes that in Amana both boys and girls were required to learn knitting, but at the same time all leadership was male and only males could vote. Attitudes toward physical sexual activity were not always a measure of women's status in a group. Both celibacy and free love as practiced in different communities resulted in varied levels of freedom and equality for women members. Nordhoff also describes Shaker society which was celibate but where women had major leadership roles from the time of Ann Lee on. Muncy⁵³ also points out the great diversity present in relation to rights of women. He mentions the Mormons as one group in which no pretense at equality is made, women being seen as totally in subjection to men in all areas. Muncy's treatment of this subject is somewhat more sceptical than some, his view being that the supposed equality of some communities leads to uncertainty and frustration for many women unused to this ideal. Although there have always been strong feminists (sometimes both female and male) in American society, they represented a very limited force in nineteenth century utopian communities.

The impact which they had was therefore quite different from what is possible in today's society, as will be seen as we briefly examine literature related to task distribution in modern communities.

Articles and studies dealing with task distribution in modern cooperative households indicate a widespread will on the part of both men and women to engage in tasks which have previously been designated as sex related. This will, however, is not always sufficient to overcome years of conditioning and practical pressures both from inside and outside the household. Kanter and Halter's⁵⁴ excellent paper on changing sex roles in urban communes summarizes much that is to be found in other sources. They comment on the new emphasis on the value of nurturant activities and tasks related to the maintenance of environment. Ecological awareness emphasizes humankind's dependence upon the natural world and the responsibility all have in using its gifts and caring for its resources. The ritual qualities of preparing food and eating are being revived in some present day households. Similar emphasis can be seen in descriptions of "back to the land" groups. In spite of this view, others mention the lack of value placed on traditional women's work. In an informal conference of women from a number of communities,⁵⁵ participants discussed the special problems of women who are anxious to learn male tasks but fear they will not come up

to standard. On the other hand, women's work is seen as something that anyone can do, as lacking any need for expertise and therefore any value. They raise the question of whether such work is intrinsically of less value or whether this has been arbitrarily determined by society. They further point out the difference in the level of self confidence between men and women as each sets out to learn the tasks of the other. They see their greater lack of confidence as a major impediment. Minturn⁵⁶ in a somewhat nondefined, informal study, focuses her attention on the noncompetitive nature of communal living as compared to that of the larger society. She finds that commune members do more cross sex chores than her sample of students and also that men do more of this than women. She finds some connection between the breakup of communes and the exploitation of women. Overall she indicates that the noncompetitive nature of commune life allows for much more flexible work patterns and self perceptions.

Closely related to the issue of task allocation, but somewhat unique, is the area of child-rearing. Several authors indicate this to be a central testing point for the ideals and styles of communal groups. Kanter and Halter⁵⁷ point out that this is the one area where significant difficulty exists, even in those groups which have been able to deal with almost all other male-female issues. Twin Oaks in Virginia, modeled after Skinner's Walden Two, is one

community which has taken a long-range, problem solving approach to this matter. Early experience with children as described by Kincade⁵⁸ demonstrated the unreadiness of Twin Oaks to engage in a truly equalitarian program of child-rearing. She lists four elements which contributed to conflict and lack of success. These factors are parent worries, parental jealousy, community theory and community inexperience. In the face of these difficulties the members of Twin Oaks set out to prepare themselves for the task of incorporating children. Within a two year period they had developed a plan, begun work on a children's house and generally laid the groundwork for including children. A follow-up article in Communities magazine⁵⁹ indicates that this preparation yielded valuable results. Three children had been born at that point, with another expected shortly. Eight " metas " (p.11) had been chosen, men and women, biological parents and non-parents. In addition to this responsible group, all community members are free to spend time with the children. Biological parents have no special privileges over other members, except for the nursing mother's particular task. Communities in which such careful planning has not taken place show very different results. In several of the very flexible groups described⁶⁰ a special problem exists where fathers move in and out of relationship with the mothers of their children. Numerous examples are given where fathers just take off,

leaving the women to support and care for their children alone or with such other help as the community members are ready to give. If the experience of Twin Oaks, the Israeli kibbutzim⁶¹ and other fairly structured communities is representative, it would appear that there is considerable risk in attempting to incorporate children into cooperative households where provision for stable and long term responsibility is not built into community organization. All the evidence of the hip communes of rural areas and such urban experiments as described by Weiss and Kanter and Halter⁶² point to major difficulty in sharing child rearing under more fluid conditions.

Footnotes for Chapter II

1. Philip Slater, The Pursuit of Loneliness, Boston, Beacon Press, 1970.
2. Lewis Yablonsky, The Hippie Trip, New York, Bobbs - Merrill Co., Inc., 1968 esp. Chapter 15.
3. Fred Davis, "Why All of Us May Be Hippies One Day", Trans-action, vol. 5, no. 2, December, 1967.
4. Richard Flacks, Youth and Social Change, Chicago, Markham Pub. Co., 1971, esp. Chapters 2 and 5. Flack's position is succinctly summarized in "Intelligencia in Revolt", Trans-action, vol. 7, no. 8, January, 1970, pp. 46 - 55.
5. Arlie Russell Hochschild, "A Review of Sex Role Research", American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 4, January, 1972, pp. 1,011 - 1,029.
6. Margaret Adams, "The Compassion Trap", Women in Sexist Society, ed. by Vivian Gernick and Barbara K. Moran, New York, Basic Books, 1971, pp. 555 - 575.
7. Judith M. Bardwick and Elizabeth Donovan, "Ambivalence: The Socialization of Women", *ibid.*, pp. 225 - 239. See also Mirra Komarovsky, "Learning the Feminine Role", The Family and the Sexual Revolution, ed. by Edwin M. Schur, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1964, pp. 213 - 223.
8. Jessie Barnard, "Changing Family Life Styles: One Role, Two Roles, Shared Roles", The Future of the Family, ed. by Louise Kapp Howe, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1972, pp. 235 - 246.
9. Olof Palme, "Lesson from Sweden: The Emancipation of Man", *ibid.*, pp. 247 - 258.
10. Alice Rossi, "Equality of the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal", The Woman in America, ed. by Robert Jay Lifton, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965, pp. 98 - 143.
11. Martin Buber, Paths in Utopia, Boston, Beacon Press, 1949, pp. 7 - 15, 129 - 138.

Footnotes for Chapter II
(continued)

12. Paul Tillach, "Critique and Justifications of Utopias", Utopias and Utopian Thought, ed. by Frank Manuel, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966, pp. 296 - 309.
13. B.F. Skinner, Walden Two, New York, MacMillan, 1948.
14. Moritz Kaufman, Utopias; or Schemes of Social Improvement, London, C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1879, pp. 1 - 13.
15. Ibid., pp. 123 - 142.
16. Charles Fourier, Encyclopedia Britannica, 15th. edition, vol. IV, pp. 254 - 255.
17. Robert Owen, ibid., vol. VII, p.643.
18. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Commitment and Community, Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1972, pp. 247 - 248.
19. Charles Nordhoff, The Communistic Societies of the United States, New York, Hillary House Pub. Ltd., 1960 (originally published 1875).
20. Ibid., pp.81 - 84, 170 - 179, 266 - 268.
21. John Humphrey Noyes, History of American Socialisms, New York, Hillory House, 1961 (originally published 1870).
22. Adin Ballou, History of the Hopedale Community, ed. by W.S. Heywood, Philadelphia, Porcupine Press, 1972 (Reprint of 1897 edition).
23. Constance Noyes Robertson, Onedia Community: An Autobiography, 1851 - 1876, Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1970 and Oneida Community: The Breakup, 1876 - 1881, Syracuse University Press, 1972.
24. Pierrepont Noyes, My Father's House: An Oneida Boyhood, New York, Farrar and Rinehart, 1937.
25. Robert Dale Owen, The Life of Robert Owen, By Himself, London, G. Bell, 1920.

Footnotes for Chapter II
(continued)

26. Kanter, op.cit.
27. Raymond Lee Muncy, Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities, Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1974 .
28. Kanter, op. cit.; pp. 163 - 237; Benjamin Zablocki, The Joyful Community , Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1971 .
29. Stephen Diamond, What the Trees Said, Life on a New Age Farm , New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1971; Robert Houriet, Getting Back Together, New York, Coward, McMan and Geoghegan, Inc., 1971; Weiss, Living Together: A Year in the Life of a City Commune, New York, McGraw Hill, 1974.
30. Richard Fairfield, Communes, USA, Baltimore, Maryland, Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 361 - 367 .
31. Nordhoff, op. cit., pp. 399 - 418 .
32. Kanter, op. cit., p. 169 .
33. Ibid., p. 166 .
34. Houriet, op. cit.; Richard Fairfield, ed., Utopia, USA, San Francisco, Alternatives Foundation, 1972 .
35. Fairfield, ed, Utopia USA, pp. 57 - 60, 66 - 73; Kanter, op. cit. p.227; Mary White Harder et al, "Jesus People", Psychology Today , vol. 6, no. 7, December, 1972, pp. 45 - 50, 110 - 113 .
36. Keith Melville, Communes in the Counter Culture, New York, William Morrow and Co., Inc. 1972; Fairfield, Communes, USA; Flacks, Youth and Social Change , Yablonsky, op.cit.
37. Fairfield, Utopia, USA , pp. 3 - 4 .
38. Fairfield, Communes, USA , p.2 .

Footnotes for Chapter II
(continued)

39. Fairfield, Utopia USA , pp. 9 - 13 .
40. Ibid., pp. 132 - 133 .
41. Movement for a New Society, "New Society Packet", available from The Movement - Building Collective, 4722 Baltimore Ave. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19143 [n.d.] ; Fairfield, Utopia USA, pp. 102 - 105 .
42. Houriet, op. cit., pp. 131 - 187 ; Yablonsky, op. cit.
43. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, ed. Communes , Creating and Managing the Collective Life, New York, Harper and Row , 1973, p. 400 .
44. Ron E. Roberts, The New Communes , Englewood - Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice - Hall, Inc. , 1971 .
45. Kanter, Commitment and Community; Fairfield, Communes, USA ; Melville, op. cit.
46. Fairfield, Utopia USA , pp. 227 - 229 .
47. "Some Views from Women in Communes", Communities, no. 7, March - April, 1974, pp. 11 - 13 .
48. Kanter, Communes, Creating and Managing the Collective Life , p.300 .
49. Marnie Oats, "Twin Oaks", Women: A Journal of Liberation, vol. 2, no. 4, 1972, pp. 28 - 30 .
50. John Humphrey Noyes, quoted in Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Communes for All Reasons", MS, vol. 3, no. 2, August, 1974, p. 62 .
51. Ibid.
52. Nordhoff, op.cit.
53. Muncy, op.cit.

Footnotes for Chapter II
(continued)

54. Rosabeth Moss Kanter and Marilyn Halter, " De - housewiving Women, Domesticating Men: Changing Sex Roles in Urban Communes", Unpublished paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August, 1973.
55. "Women in Community", Communities, no. 8, May - June, 1974, pp. 2 - 6.
56. Leigh Minturn, "Sex Role Differentiation in Contemporary Communes", Unpublished paper.
57. Kanter and Halter, op. cit.
58. Kathleen Kincade, "A Walden Two Experiment", Psychology Today, vol. 6, no. 9, February, 1973, pp. 71 - 82.
59. "Twin Oaks and Little Folks", Communities, no. 9, July - August, 1974, pp. 10 - 12.
60. Houriet, op. cit.
61. Bruno Bettelheim, Children of the Dream, New York, Avon Books, 1969.
62. Weiss, op. cit. and Kanter and Halter, op. cit.

CHAPTER I I I

METHODOLOGY

Because of the exploratory nature of this study, it was the intent of the authors to begin with a very general statement of the focus of our attention, accompanied by a list of variables which were seen as potential sources of data. Knowing the limitation of time which would require us to narrow our study even further, we selected a number of specific areas from which to draw tentative guiding hypotheses for more detailed examination. Specific suggestions for future study were seen as a goal for the conclusion of this preliminary research.

Statement of general focus of study

As noted in the Introduction, the general focus of this study is on perceptions of sex roles in contemporary cooperative households. In order to gather data related to questions derived from this focus, a survey instrument was constructed around a wide range of variables. These variables as related both to individual respondents and cooperative households are included in Appendix D.

Tentative guiding hypotheses

The tentative guiding hypotheses which follow are those upon which we will concentrate our attention.

1. There is a difference in how men and women report levels of satisfaction with decisions (if there were decisions) or with development of sex roles (if there were no decisions).
2. There is a difference in how men and women perceive task division (household by household) .
3. There is a difference in how men and women report perceptions of whether sex roles were discussed at formation.
4. There is a difference between rural and urban cooperative households in perceived task division (divided by sex).
5. There is a difference between rural and urban cooperative households in new activities undertaken by members since joining (divided by sex) .
6. There is a difference between rural and urban cooperative households in members' satisfaction level (divided by sex) .
7. Satisfaction level is associated with frequency of discussion of similar issues (divided by sex) .
8. Satisfaction level is associated with perceived task division (divided by sex).

Sample

In order to make a selection of groups to be included in the sample, it was necessary to clarify what we considered a cooperative household to be. Our definition is quite broad; however, this can be justified by the nature of our study. Our intent was descriptive and exploratory only, with no expectation that we would be able to generalize beyond the actual sample population. Any more focused issues which might emerge at the completion of the research will be presented as questions for future study, where a more precise definition and more scientifically drawn sample might be required.

We thus defined cooperative household as a group of people voluntarily living together in an intentional community. Such a community can be identified as an entity with both physical and social boundaries. It must include persons not related by kinship, who share resources and responsibilities and are bound together by common values and interpersonal commitment. It must also include more than three adults. This definition includes groups who refer to themselves as extended families, collective households, living collectives, communes, intentional communities or just people living together.

It was impossible to draw a random sample because an inclusive list of such groups does not exist. It was also unnecessary since we were not purporting to be able to generalize from our data. We therefore set out to draw a purposive and accessible sample.

We decided to include both urban and rural groups of as varied a nature as possible; groups with families, singles, married couples without children, and combinations; political and nonpolitical; and religious and non-religious groups. We hoped that such a varied sample would provide enough differences so that comparisons could then be made.

Within this framework, geographical accessibility, willingness to participate, and our knowledge of the groups' existence determined our sample. We began by asking friends, fellow students and professors. As we began

visiting groups, they often told us of others. Listings of communal groups in Communities magazine and Open Northwest Network also guided us to a few groups. One group was found through an ad we placed in the Scribe, a Portland alternative newspaper. Before deciding to include each group we measured them by our definition.

Most groups we heard about and contacted agreed to participate. Some were initially reached by phone, some in person, and some by letter.¹ All were told of the nature of the study before deciding to participate. In many cases the group was allowed to examine the questionnaire before their decision. One group declined, saying they had become a private family and were not open to visitors and researchers. A few groups simply did not respond to our request even after follow-up phone calls or letters. Generally though, we encountered less difficulty in drawing a sample than we had originally anticipated.

Within each group we visited, availability and willingness to participate determined who actually served as respondents. We reached 100% in some groups, down to as low as 43 % in one group. Although 100% in every group would have been desirable, it seemed counterproductive to push participation too strongly. Also, in a number of groups, several visits would have been required to catch everyone at home, which was not possible.

Our final sample included nineteen groups, eighteen scattered throughout the Pacific Northwest and one in the midwest. The total number of respondents was ninety-four.

Research instrument

The research instrument was designed to provide specific data related to the focus of the study, while being flexible enough to allow respondents to expand in areas of particular interest to them. We recognized that this flexibility would undoubtedly result in much data which would be difficult to code and interpret. However, we felt that a more restricted approach would tend to force respondents into answers which might be an inadequate expression of their perceptions and feelings, thereby causing us to miss information which might be of genuine value.

The process of construction of the final questionnaire covered a number of steps.

1. We examined material in certain relevant literature. The interview schedule used by Kanter² was especially helpful. We also looked at scales related to the measurement of attitudes.³ These latter were for the purpose of gaining general ideas and were not incorporated into our design.
2. We delineated certain base information about cooperative households as groups and about individual respondents. Effort was made to eliminate material which could not be seen as of possible relevance to the major topic.

3. Consultation with advisors and informal conversation with persons involved in or familiar with such living arrangements were used to check out perceptions of what might be most helpfully included.
4. Questions were formulated out of the above steps. This resulted in a pretest instrument of two parts. (see Appendix A) One, focusing on information relative to the group as a whole, consisted of thirty-four questions. These were to be answered by one person familiar with the group's history, allowing for cross checking by other persons. This cross checking was expected to be of an informal nature, generally in a group setting. Both factual questions and questions dealing with perceptions were included. The second questionnaire was prepared for individual members of each group to answer. It consisted of thirty-three questions covering both personal identifying facts (exclusive of name), questions related to household formation and participation, and those specific to sex role development. Both structured and open-ended questions were used. They were designed to elicit information and response on three levels.
 - a. the person's ideals and expectations
 - b. actual perceived experience in the group
 - c. feelings about how roles had developed or were developing
5. For administration of the pretest, we selected one rural and one urban cooperative household which had indicated willingness to participate in the study. We explained to each that this was a pretest questionnaire and would therefore be somewhat more time-consuming than we expected the final instrument to be. We requested feedback on both the content and administration of the questionnaire. Both of us were present for each interview. We began the first interview prepared to adapt our procedures on the basis of members' responses. The pretest questions were designed as a standard interview schedule with the researchers asking questions and writing down responses. After a very brief beginning in this way (about 1 1/2 questionnaires), both of us felt this was just too stilted and pretentious a technique and would further require much too long a time to be practicable. Therefore, after sharing

5. (continued)

with the group some of our feelings of discomfort and receiving support from those present, we switched immediately to allowing individuals to fill out their own questionnaires while we participated in one or more of the following ways:

- a. clarifying questions, without offering any indication as to optional answers or giving examples,
- b. listening to discussion between respondents over questions, and taking inconspicuous notes on these,
- c. pursuing related issues and feelings as these were expressed by respondents.

For the second group we explained our change of idea as to procedure and all responded positively to the choice of writing their own answers, again with time allowed for clarification and discussion.

6. The final questionnaire incorporated changes resulting from pretest experience. The questions were reorganized with improved sequences and more of an outline form. Questions relating to children were placed together to allow groups without children to omit them when appropriate. Race and religion were removed. Race had been seen as a researcher observation not to read to the respondent and therefore became inappropriate for a questionnaire to be filled out in person. Religion raised many questions and it appeared that religious elements would be covered by other questions where they were at all pertinent. Marital status was removed from the respondent questionnaire to be replaced by a more broadly defined category.

The final instrument consisted of twenty-seven questions related to information from the group and thirty respondent questions (see appendix B).

Data collection

The cooperative households in our sample were visited between May 31 and November 4, 1974. In fifteen of the groups both authors were present for the administration of the questionnaire, in three cases one was present and in

one group with a very difficult schedule questionnaires were left and picked up after all had finished. Appointments were set usually a week or two before our visit. The length of time spent with each group varied from two and a half hours to an entire day depending on one or several of the following factors: 1) how quickly the group got together (in rural groups, especially, there was a lot of coming and going because of chores), 2) how much discussion occurred during and after filling out the questionnaires, 3) how much time was spent touring property, 4) how long individuals took to complete the questionnaires, and 5) how much time we had available. We did not press for any particular time limit, as our method was to adapt to the mood and situation of each group.

Data collected from each group included a commune information questionnaire filled out by one or two persons with consultation from the group, individual respondent questionnaires completed by all those who were available and willing and observations made by us on the basis of discussions between group members and tours of the property where appropriate.

Our method of administering the questionnaire was first to explain our rationale for doing this study. We explained that we were graduate social work students who chose this topic because we believe that social workers need to know more about alternative life styles in order to be most helpful to people who may be dissatisfied and searching. We further explained that we originally

wanted to study cooperative households as an alternative to the nuclear family but found this too broad and unmanageable. Then we continued to relate that we narrowed our study to sex roles as this is a topic of current interest and we were interested in seeing what is actually happening in this aspect of shared living. We acknowledged that we will not be able to make any generalizations to other similar groups and that our research is primarily exploratory. We reiterated the confidential nature of all responses.

After this introduction, we asked individuals if they wished to participate. If they did wish to, we handed them a questionnaire, let them know we were available for clarification and questions and suggested that they read the questionnaire carefully, as there were some questions they would not need to answer. When questions did arise, we attempted to clarify without offering any indication as to possible answers. Questionnaires were usually filled out in one room but occasionally a person would retire to another area with the questionnaire. As individuals finished we expressed our appreciation for their help. We also left copies for persons not available at the time but whom group members seemed to think would be interested. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes were also left, but very few (3) of these were returned. As will be noted in the Descriptions of Groups in Sample (see appendix G) group number seven did not formally answer the questionnaires. Respondent information from this group is not included as data in the Findings but is used only for general discussion.

Observations which we made were based on previously determined categories. These categories included impressions of the physical setting, tenor of group relationships, their response to us and the questionnaire and whatever else seemed interesting and pertinent. Group members offered many, many comments that would fall into the last category.

We attempted to avoid biasing factors as much as possible, but nevertheless, many such may have been present. The fact of two women doing the research may have raised questions regarding our stance on sex roles. Also, just the choice of sex roles perhaps alerted respondents that we might have had opinions in that area. We did observe some joking among respondents regarding "how well" they would do. Also, several explanations were offered, some defensive, of why groups often were not able to reach their ideals in terms of the roles of men and women. Our response in such instances was to remark that we did not have a set idea of how things "should be" but wanted to discover what was actually happening.

Another possible biasing factor is that respondents were often curious about other members' answers or could not remember certain background details. In such cases a discussion would often ensue. We attempted to keep this to a minimum and encourage respondents to relate their own ideas and feelings on the questionnaire. However, we did not entirely block these discussions. For one thing, it would have been impossible to do so. Furthermore, we felt it

would have been counterproductive because these brief discussions seemed to increase interest in the questionnaire and to encourage real examination of thoughts and feelings. It was our feeling that these discussions resulted in no significant change of answers.

Our observations in the category or "whatever seemed pertinent or interesting" were probably biased by discussions with the groups and individuals subsequent to completion of the questionnaires. For example, at that point we allowed ourselves to relate our own views and general impressions of what other groups were doing. It should be noted in this regard that care was taken to deal only in generalizations to avoid identification of any other group visited. This more open discussion may have influenced the quality and quantity of their responses and thus influenced our observations. Whenever these types of observations are related, this possible bias should be taken into consideration.

Subsequent to each visit a thank you letter was sent to each group. Also, all were promised feedback in the form of a summary of our findings and conclusions (see appendix H). Many groups requested this and others responded positively when it was offered.

Coding

Before we began administering the questionnaire we prepared a list of coding categories into which we hoped to be able to place all responses.

The major problem experienced in this process was establishing precisely what would be included in each category. Although we are generally satisfied with the results, we would have preferred terminology which would have been more obviously self-explanatory. We recognize that the nature of the questions asked elicited data which could not be easily and exclusively coded.

The original coding categories for responses to each of the open-ended questions are included in Appendix E.

During the course of collecting data we perceived that a number of changes would be necessary in order to reflect responses more adequately and also to avoid an unwieldy number of "other" items, where obvious new categories would be appropriate.

We therefore made the coding changes and clarifications listed in Appendix E.

The coding process consisted of both authors coding every response separately, either directly from the questionnaires or from cards onto which the answers had been copied. The coding was then compared and where there were differences of opinion these were negotiated until consensus was reached. Generally, both authors feel comfortable with this process and with the resultant classification. Most disagreements came more from individual interpretation of the limits of a particular category than from difference in perception related to the responses. Changes made were divided fairly evenly between the two

authors. On occasion simple errors of reading or mixing questions were responsible for differences. In these cases our mutual checking identified and corrected such lapses.

Footnotes for Chapter III

1. A summary of information used in initial contacts is included in Appendix C.
2. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Commitment and Community , pp. 251 - 269.
3. Delbert C. Miller, Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, 2nd. ed., New York, McKay, 1970; Marvin E. Shaw and J. M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

A summary of data obtained from the questionnaires is included in this section. This data will be considered in three parts, one for each of the questionnaires and one for data specific to our guiding hypotheses.

Commune information

Data obtained from the "Commune Information" questionnaire is contained in Tables 1 - 40 in Appendix F. Most of the tables are self-explanatory. The group questions provide general background information against which to view individual perceptions and feelings regarding sex role development in the respective groups. A few comments are appropriate to call attention to particular data.

Table 1, dealing with the life span of each group indicates 77% of urban and 50% of rural groups in the sample have been in existence between one and three years. Only two urban and no rural groups were of more recent origin. Of those over three years in duration, three (50%) of the rural groups were included and only one (8%) of the urban groups. As will be noted in Table 2 all groups have been in continuous existence since their formation. Membership has fluctuated somewhat in several groups as will be observed in Tables 3 - 7. However, Table 4 indicates that no urban group has lost more than six persons and only two rural groups have lost more than six persons.

Groups with a large number of new members (Table 5) are also few, with only one urban and two rural groups reporting more than six new members since formation. In terms of current membership 85% of urban and 100% of rural groups report four or more members as having been residents for more than six months (Table 6).

Tables 10 and 11 show the number of children resident in the groups. Only five urban groups (38%) had children under 14 and no urban group had older children. In terms of actual numbers this represents nine younger children in urban groups and 12 younger and 2 older children in rural groups. Because of the very small total of children in the sample, the questionnaire data related to them has not been included in the findings.

Nine urban (69%) and two rural (33 1/3%) groups report two to four members in ongoing couple relationships. Six urban (46%) and two rural (33 1/3%) report two to four members legally married.

Among the groups in this sample most were separate entities rather than being part of any larger network. Table 15 shows 77% urban and 83% rural to be separate entities.

Table 16 indicates considerable divergence between urban and rural groups in relation to criteria for membership. Over half (62%) of the urban groups listed similar values as of highest priority whereas 50% of rural groups listed personal interest in joining as of primary importance. It should be

noted, however, that these categories are not mutually exclusive as many groups offered multiple criteria as important. Table 17 indicates more rural (83%) than urban (62%) groups interested in new members. In Table 18 availability of space is seen as the major factor (54%) affecting urban groups' acceptance of new members. This factor was of significance for only one rural group (17%). On the other hand two rural groups (33 1/3%) listed usefulness to the group as the primary factor.

Tables 19 and 20 show one of the major differences between urban and rural groups. In all cases where response was made, all urban members live together in a single house and all rural members have separate dwelling spaces. This difference disappears when facilities for general use are examined in Table 21. An overwhelming majority of both urban (85% to 100%) and rural (83% to 100%) groups indicate that group facilities are generally communal for all.

Ownership of property also varies between urban and rural groups. Only 38% of urban groups own property whereas 100% of the rural groups do. (Table 24) No single factor seems to predominate for either urban or rural groups in relation to how property was obtained (Table 25), how it is held (Table 26), or how it would be disposed of if the group were to disband (Table 27). Although Table 24 indicated that only 38% of urban groups currently own property, it will be noted in Table 28 that an equal number

(38%) plan to do so if possible.

Contributions for group support vary somewhat between urban and rural groups. Table 29 shows 62% of urban and 33 1/3% of rural groups being supported by equal contributions from all, whereas only 15% of urban and 33 1/3% of rural groups base contributions on members' ability to pay. Although the above indicates that more urban than rural members pay equal shares, Table 30 indicates that slightly more urban (31%) than rural (17%) may be exempted from financial contributions. Most (23%) of these would appear to be for service outside the group (Table 31). When sources of income are reported, Table 32 would appear to indicate that paid jobs in the outside community provide the largest source of such income for both men and women in both urban and rural groups.

The final section of the group questionnaire dealt with group meetings. Although no clear overall pattern emerged in this data, some trends may be noted. Table 36 shows that 38% of urban and 17% of rural groups held meetings weekly, the most frequent choice. Expectations for member attendance at such meetings was high in both groups (85% urban and 67% rural) as shown in Table 37. Where frequency of meetings has changed over time, the general tendency has been to become less frequent (31% urban and 67% rural) as Table 38 indicates. No clear information is gained in Tables 39 and 40 to explain these changes, although in explaining decrease in frequency in rural

groups 33 1/3% replied that things got organized and the same number of rural groups said that meetings were negative (Table 39).

Respondent information

Tables 41 - 82 contain data obtained from the "Respondent Information" questionnaire. Many of these tables, located in Appendix F, are also self-explanatory.

Base information

Tables 41 and 42 show the sample as fairly evenly divided between men and women (51% male, 49% female) and concentrated in age between twenty-one and thirty years. 77% of men and 76% of women are in this range.

Table 45 shows a slightly higher percentage of men (60%) than women (54%) to be in ongoing couple relationships. 52% of men and 46% of women have partners who are also resident in their group.

Educational level attained is fairly even between men and women and concentrated in the range of some college to college completed. 56% of men and 57% of women respondents fall in this range, with slightly more women having completed college (Table 47). It will be noted that slightly more men than women have graduate degrees.

Tables 48 and 49 represent a composite picture of the ways in which occupations have changed for members since their joining the cooperative household. Forty-five professional and semi-professional occupations were

held by members before joining compared to twenty-four after, with slightly more women than men before and after. The student category also changed considerably, the total of twenty-seven who were students before joining dropping to twelve after. The other major occupational change was away from the "clerical service" category (from twenty-six before to eight after).

Men and women gave fairly similar answers when questioned about the reasons for group formation. Answers "focusing on group support and/or strengthening of relationships" were the largest group (sixteen for men , fourteen for women), with "living as a group with compatible people", "value system" and "economics" also receiving many responses. (Table 50). Personal reasons for joining followed similar emphases (Table 51), with the added category of "a specific personal relationship" accounting for thirty-five responses (twenty-two men and thirteen women).

Time lived in the current group was spread over a wide range, with 48% of the respondents resident fifteen months or less and 34%, sixteen months or more (Table 52). A fairly large number (41%) have had previous group experience, mostly in only one or two groups (30%). 29% had two years or less experience in other cooperative households (Tables 53, 54, 55).

Over a quarter (30%) of the reasons listed for people leaving cooperative households fall into the category of interpersonal conflicts, with other responses spread over a wide range of reasons (Table 56). Current members

of groups seemed fairly stable in that over half (51%) indicated they planned to remain indefinitely and only 9% specified intent to leave within the next six months (Table 57).

Sex role information

The balance of the tables in the respondent information section contain data derived from sex role questions. It will be noted in the questionnaire (Appendix B) that certain questions pertained to mutually exclusive groups of respondents. However, because a few persons answered questions designed for both groups, some overlap in data resulted. All of the data represents perceptions of men and women regarding various aspects of sex role development as they have experienced these.

Table 58 concerns data considered by Hypothesis three and will be discussed in the next section. According to Table 59, these discussions centered heavily around the issue of household responsibility (39% of all issues) with women somewhat more concerned than men (sixteen to eleven). Table 60 shows that men perceive that similar issues are discussed more frequently than women do. When a Yule's Q is computed for this data it indicates a moderate positive association ($+ .38$) between sex (male) and answering occasionally to very often rather than never or rarely. This means that we would do 38% better than chance in predicting that men in our sample would respond occasionally to very often rather than never or rarely. The central

issue in such ongoing discussion is seen again to be household responsibility (Table 61). 38% of issue responses were in this category.

Table 62 (consisting of those respondents who moved in after formation) indicates the same trend as seen in Table 60 , with men perceiving that sex roles are discussed more frequently than women do but without so large a difference. A Yule's Q of $+.21$ reveals a low positive association between sex (male) and answering occasionally to very often rather than never or rarely. This means that we would do 21% better than chance in predicting that men in our sample would respond occasionally to very often rather than never or rarely. Again (as in Tables 59 and 61) household responsibilities (37%) accounts for the largest porportion of the issues discussed (Table 63).

Since Table 64 concerns data considered by Hypothesis one, it will be discussed in the next section. Table 65 shows that women list somewhat more dissatisfactions than men do. A Yule's Q of $+.32$ means that there is a moderate positive association between sex (male) and listing more satisfactions than dissatisfactions. This means that we would do 32% better than chance in predicting that men in our sample would list more satisfactions than dissatisfactions.

Table 66 seems to indicate upon first glance that there is little, if any, difference between the extent to which men and women feel group decisions

regarding sex roles have become reality. Nevertheless, when a Yule's Q is computed ($+ .25$), a low positive association is revealed between sex (male) and answering not at all (1) to the middle point (3) rather than answering (4) or very much (5). This means that we would do 25% better than chance in predicting that men in our sample would answer on the low end of the scale. Table 67 shows that "commitment" (18% of the responses), "interpersonal support" (21% of the responses) and "group expectations or agreement" (25% of the responses) are thought to be the principle factors aiding the process of group decisions regarding sex roles becoming reality. Women especially see "commitment" (22% of the women's responses and 13% of the men's responses) and "interpersonal support" (27% of the women's responses and 13% of the men's responses) as being more important than the men do. The factor seen as most important in hindering the process of group decisions becoming reality (Table 68) is "previous life experience" (36% of the responses) with men and women listing this response an equal number of times. 18% of the responses were in the category of "internal practical difficulties" with that response again equally divided between men and women.

Again, since Table 64 concerns data considered by Hypothesis one it will be discussed in the next section. Table 70 also shows a trend similar to Table 65 in that men have a tendency to list satisfactions regarding development of sex roles rather than dissatisfactions. A Yule's Q of $+ .34$

indicates a moderate positive association between sex (male) and listing satisfactions rather than dissatisfactions. This means that we would do 34% better than chance in predicting that men in our sample would list satisfactions rather than dissatisfactions.

Regarding whether or not respondents see communes as potentially having a unique influence on the development of sex roles in the larger society (Table 71), response was overwhelmingly in the affirmative with 78% of the women and 77% of the men responding "yes ". Table 72 shows that 81% of the responses regarding how this influence will be made are in the category of "as an alternative". Men and women responded fairly evenly in this and all other categories.

Table 73 again shows household responsibilities to be a major concern of respondents, especially of women. 30% of the responses to the question of what kinds of differences respondents expected in sex roles from the traditional nuclear family were in the " household responsibilities " category. This included 36% of the women's responses and 20% of the men's responses. The next most common response was in the category of "general roles" with 24 % of the responses (41% of the men's responses , but only 10% of the women's responses) in this category. It can be seen further from Table 73 that respondents overwhelmingly expected differences to be in the direction of less differentiation in sex roles (93% of the responses).

From Table 74 it can be seen that respondents list "assertive" (29% of the responses) and "passive-withdrawal" (29% of the responses) equally as their most common responses to conflicts existing between the larger society and their values regarding sex roles. These responses are almost evenly divided between men and women. Table 75 shows that respondents (both men and women) are almost evenly divided between reporting "yes" or "no" to the question of whether their ideals regarding sex roles have changed as a result of communal living. Of those who responded "yes", 77% see their ideals regarding sex roles as having become more equal with responses almost equally divided between men and women (Table 76). "Personal growth and maturation" (30% of the responses) and "interpersonal support" (23% of the responses) were most often seen as leading to these changes in ideals (Table 77). Again these responses were almost equally divided between men and women.

Table 79 shows that 57% of those who responded see responsibility for the activities listed on the grid (Question 21 in Appendix B) as having changed over time. It can also be seen that men are more likely than women to see the activities as having changed. Regarding how the pattern of responsibility for these activities has changed over time, Table 80 shows that the categories of "activities cross traditional sex lines" and "activities are neutral" are used about equally with the category of "activities follow traditional sex

lines" used much less. Almost twice as many men as women see activities crossing traditional sex lines. No particular pattern emerges from Table 81 regarding why the pattern of activities has changed, although "individual preferences" and "practical considerations" receive the most number of responses of those that were specified and codable.

Table 82 indicates that there is very little difference between men and women in the direction of new activities done since joining the commune, but that there is a tendency to list activities which cross traditional sex lines. 46% of the responses were "activities cross traditional sex lines", 22% were "activities are neutral" and 32% were "activities follow traditional sex lines".

Hypotheses

This section will summarize the data tabled to test our tentative guiding hypotheses. The data is contained in Tables 58,64,69 and 83 - 111 in Appendix F.

Hypothesis one

The first hypothesis states that there is a difference in how men and women report levels of satisfaction with decisions (if there were decisions) or with development of sex roles (if there were no decisions). It can be seen from Tables 64 and 69 that there is not a great deal of difference between men and women on these two factors. Collapsing the data as was

done in Tables 83 and 84 yields similar results. Table 83 clearly shows that there is no purpose in doing a Yule's Q as there is only a difference of one response between men and women. It can be seen that the results would be negligible. Table 84 demonstrates a slight difference which when put to the Yule's Q statistic yields a Q of $+0.24$. This means that for our sample we would do 24% better than chance in predicting that the most satisfied are males and the least satisfied are females. In other words there is a low positive association between being male and having a high level of satisfaction.

Looking further into hypothesis one by computing percentages of those who responded in each category (see Tables 85 and 86) we see that in Table 85, 15% of the women who responded to the question answered in the two least satisfied categories (1 and 2) while 3% of the men responded similarly. There was a tendency for men to respond in the middle category (3) more than women. 15% of the men and 3 % of the women responded with a (3). Also on the same table , 79% of the women and 84% of the men responded on the satisfied end (4 or 5).

A similar pattern occurs on Table 86 with 20% of the women responding in the two least satisfied categories in contrast to 0% of the men. The middle category (3) included 25% of the women and 33% of the men. Finally,

the trend continues to the two most satisfied categories including 55% of the women and 66% of the men.

Hypothesis two

The second hypothesis states that there is a difference in how men and women perceive task division (household by household) . Tables 87 through 104 deal with this hypothesis . The total number of male and female respondents in each household must be taken into consideration in order to look at the figures in a meaningful way . Therefore , percentages of the totals (as done in Table 109 for a different hypothesis) need to be computed before any sense can be made of the data . We computed percentages of the totals where there was a sufficient number of answers in a given category and where there was considerable difference between male and female perceptions . Percentages for the "e" category (done equally by men and women) were computed for almost all of the tables . This is because the most responses were in this category and because the category seems a significant one to us .

In Table 87 , 37% of the women's answers are e's in contrast to 67% of the men's answers . It can be computed from Table 88 that 21% of the women's answers and 11% of the men's answers were d's (mostly done by women) . There is also difference between men and women on the percentage of e's , with 44% of the women's responses and 60% of the men's responses being e's .

In Table 89 the percentage difference is less and in the opposite direction with 60% of the women's responses and 56% of the men's responses being e's. Table 90 had no men respondents so no comparison can be made; however, 40% of the women's were e's which is close to the percentages in Tables 87, 88, and 89.

It can be computed from Table 91 that there is a difference between men's and women's responses in several categories. To name a few, 0% of the women's responses were a's (done entirely by men), but 8% of the men's responses were a's. 10% of the women's responses were d's (mostly done by women) in contrast to 0% of the men's responses. The percentage of "e" responses followed a pattern also found in Table 89 with women responding with 48% e's and men responding with 42% e's. In Table 92 the significant differences between men's and women's responses are found in the "b" and "e" categories. 30% of the women's responses are b's (mostly done by men) in contrast to 17% of the men's answers, while 30% of the women's responses are e's and 45% of the men's responses are e's.

From Table 93 it can be computed that there is a difference between men's and women's perceptions in that 15% of the women's responses but only 8% of the men's responses are d's (mostly done by women). Also only 20% of the women's responses are e's in contrast to 40% of the men's responses. There is much less difference and the difference is in the opposite direction

in Table 94 where 69% of the women's responses and 65% of the men's responses are e's. This trend continues but in lesser magnitude in Table 95 where 38% of the women's responses and 27% of the men's responses are e's. Table 96 also shows this trend but less difference between men and women with 48% of the women's responses and 45% of the men's responses being e's. Table 97 indicates the same small difference between men's and women's perceptions as Table 96 but in the opposite direction again, 63% of the women's responses were e's and 66% of the men's responses were e's.

The difference between men's and women's perceptions diverges a little more and changes direction again in Table 98 where 60% of the women's responses and 49% of the men's responses are e's. It can be computed from Table 99 that there is a difference between men's and women's responses in that 9% of the women's responses in contrast to 0% of the men's responses are e's (done entirely by women). Also in Table 99, 29% of the women's responses are e's but only 5% of the men's responses are e's. In Table 100 the percentage of e's rises drastically again but in the same direction with 78% of the women's responses being e's in contrast to only 44% of the men's responses.

Going on to Table 101, the percentage of e's drops again but the difference between men and women is apparent with 35% of the women's responses as e's contrasted to only 15% of the men's responses. Table 102 has no male respondents and comes from a group with no male residents so the results are different but self-explanatory. Table 103 shows a difference in perception between men and women but only a slight one, with 43% of the women's responses and 50% of the men's responses as e's. In Table 104 the smallest difference between men's and women's perceptions in category "e" is found with 33% of the women's responses and 35% of the men's responses being e's. However, 18% of the women's responses were d's (mostly done by women) in contrast to 8% of the men's responses.

Hypothesis three

The third hypothesis states that there is a difference in how men and women report perceptions of whether sex roles were discussed at formation. The data contraindicates the validity of this hypothesis as can be seen from Table 58. Also when a Yule's Q is computed it is $-.07$ indicating only a negligible correlation. Further, a use of percentages as in Table 105 demonstrates the same lack of any strong difference between men and women on this question.

Hypothesis four

The fourth hypothesis states that there is a difference between rural and urban groups in perceived task division (divided by sex). Information

from Tables 106 and 107 was used to compile Table 108 which will be addressed here. From Table 108 it can be seen that there really is not very much overall difference between the perceptions of rural and urban groups. Most of the percentages are just a few points apart. The most difference shows up in categories "e" (done equally by men and women) and "i" (not applicable) with urban women having 41% of their answers as e's, urban men 46%, rural men 52%, and rural women the highest with 54%. Still this is only a range of 13%. The "i" category contains a range of 11%, from 17% for urban women to 6% for rural men.

Hypothesis five

The fifth hypothesis states that there is a difference between rural and urban groups in new activities undertaken since joining (divided by sex). The raw data from Table 109 needs to be put into percentages to be meaningful. In cross-sex activities (+) there is a slight difference but not purely between urban and rural because 42% of the rural women's answers, 39% of the urban men's answers, 33% of the urban women's answers, down to 32% of the rural men's answers are in this category. The data shows slightly more same-sex activities (-) done in rural groups with 29% of the rural men's answers, 21% of the rural women's answers, 15% of the urban women's answers and 8% of the urban men's answers. Neutral activities (o) also show a variance but one fairly heavily weighted with urban responses.

Hypothesis six

The sixth hypothesis states that there is a difference between rural and urban cooperative households in members' satisfaction level (divided by sex). Tables 110 and 111 deal with this and do show a trend for urban groups to answer more readily on the dissatisfaction end of the scale with women responsible for most of the dissatisfaction responses.

Hypothesis seven

Hypothesis seven is not tabled for reasons discussed in the next section.

Hypothesis eight

Hypothesis eight states that satisfaction level is associated with perceived task division (divided by sex). Data to test this hypothesis was not tabled for reasons listed in the next section. Nevertheless, some effort was made to test it anyway by comparing satisfaction level percentages from Tables 87 through 104, but no clear trend could be seen at all.

CHAPTER V

INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Commune information

The dominant feature of the data obtained from the commune questionnaire seems to be the reflection of greater stability evidenced by rural households as compared with urban groups. Rural groups were generally of somewhat longer duration and were more likely to own their property than were urban members of the sample. One possible explanation for this apparent greater stability might be the major investment of time and energy required for survival in a rural environment. Where months of hard physical labor are required just to provide a minimum of food and shelter, much commitment and adaptability are demanded of group members. In fact, the period of letdown which follows the initial phase of building and land reclamation was mentioned in one group as the point at which some members lost their sense of purpose and even moved out of the community.

In contrast to the difficult physical conditions present for rural groups, urban households face stresses particular to their setting. Generally, less privacy is available for members, more intense contacts with the outside society exist, and more rapid changes bombard the urban group. This may be one explanation for the presence of more formal means for maintaining group solidarity. For example, a number of urban groups listed "similar values" as a basic criterion for membership, as opposed to the less stringent "personal

interest in belonging" which was mentioned most often by rural respondents. Also, urban groups tended to feel the need for more frequent regular group meetings to talk over problems and maintain communication and sensitivity.

The difference in space available may be one simple but important factor in group organization and stability. Urban groups were mainly confined to large single houses, where rural groups were able to provide space for larger numbers and still maintain areas of privacy for those who desire them.

One other interesting piece of data relates to members' financial support of the group. We expected to find that rural groups would more easily absorb a few persons unable to contribute financially. However, this provision is seen more often in the urban part of the sample. A fairly high proportion of the urban groups are oriented to community service and political action. In this context, members engaged in such activities are sometimes freed of financial obligations and supported by the rest of the group. This factor may account for the above trend.

Respondent information

Base data

The profile of the research sample reflects what might have been expected on the basis of our reading. Most respondents were fairly young, well educated white persons. Many had dropped out of professional pursuits or other occupations to be involved in jobs related to their search for

community and new personal meaning. We did not observe any regret over the loss of income or vocational satisfactions which might have resulted in some instances. This was especially noticeable among rural respondents, where a more radical break with past life styles was usually represented.

The orientation reflected in reasons for group formation and individual decisions to join was personal more often than ideological. This emphasis may reflect Kanter's¹ observation that modern cooperative groups have moved away from efforts at large social alternatives to more intimate family alternatives.

Although many respondents have tried more than one group, this does not seem to have caused disillusionment. At the time of response very few planned to leave their groups soon and many commented on their doubt that they could ever again live happily without the stimulus and support afforded by cooperative living. Most seem to recognize that interpersonal relations are the point of greatest stress in group life, but they seem able to accept this and to continue working for improved relationships.

Sex role data

Data seems to support the interpretation that persons living in cooperative households are fairly well aware of sex role issues as an area of considerable social importance. In a number of groups respondents expressed surprise at our studying this question in cooperative households, remarking that equality of sex roles or lack of stereotyping was an underlying assumption in their group life. They did not consider the subject an issue any longer in

their setting.

In spite of these disclaimers there were differences in perceptions as to consideration of and resolution of questions related to sex roles. Overall, men had somewhat more neutral or satisfied responses, whereas women seemed to feel more dissatisfactions with both decisions and sex role development. As indicated by the data for Hypothesis six there is some tendency for urban groups to indicate more dissatisfactions than rural groups. Again it will be noted that women's responses account for most of this trend.

In formulating Hypothesis three we anticipated a difference in awareness by men and women of early sex role discussions. We expected that men might tend to forget such discussions as the issues would probably not seem so personally central to them. The data does not support this expectation. When responses regarding ongoing discussions are considered, it will be noted that men actually perceive more frequent discussions of such issues. Differing interpretations can be given this tendency. On the one hand, it may be interpreted that men are equally sensitive to sex role issues and therefore are aware of discussion in both early and ongoing stages of group life. On the other hand, especially in relation to ongoing discussion, it is possible that men really feel overly sensitive about these issues, being placed somewhat on the defensive.

When perceptions of the process of ideals becoming reality are compared, we find what might be characterized as rather traditional feminine and masculine responses. Women's responses focus on relational elements, "commitment" (to the group) and "interpersonal support", where men's responses show some concentration in the more external category of "group expectations and agreements". Since men's responses are more scattered, the interpretation is not as strong as that for the women respondents. Men and women are both very aware of the role of "previous life experience" in hindering the realization of equalitarian goals. This sensitivity to early socialization and its impact on many facets of cooperative life was very evident in informal conversations in almost all groups visited.

From an examination of questions dealing with comparisons between cooperative group life and the larger society, it can be seen that respondents seemed very aware of contrasts and of their stance as cooperative households. Most respondents see cooperative group life as having some impact on society. Usually this influence is seen in terms of providing an alternative to the isolated nuclear family. This is not so much as a model for society as a whole, but as a workable option for those persons seeking alternatives for themselves. In terms of expected differences in life style women tended to focus on the highly visible practical areas of household responsibilities. This reflects the same tendency noted among female respondents in relation to types of

issues raised in group discussion. With regard to expected differences between cooperative living and the nuclear family, men's responses clustered around general roles. This greater generality among men could represent either a broader approach or a lack of precise thought regarding specific implications. However differences are defined, both men and women definitely expect cooperative living to produce movement toward less differentiation between sexes. This strong response would seem to imply that this is an important value for persons joining cooperative households, although it is not so listed by respondents. As mentioned earlier, perhaps the feeling of this being an implied assumption kept it from being seen as a conscious reason.

When members' response to outside social conflicts regarding sex roles is examined, most responses are seen as either positive or relatively neutral. This may mean that members do feel some sense of responsibility for interpreting their way of life to the larger society or at least of seeking to avoid negative impressions. Consistent with this approach is the objection of some respondents to the term "commune".² The emotional overtones associated with this term were seen as likely to produce an automatic negative response to the study. A sense of responsibility would be a reasonable stance in view of their understanding of themselves as demonstrating alternatives to traditional forms of family organization. A number of groups have seen

their constructive approach to the community result in relationships of trust and support with persons who began by viewing them with suspicion and hostility.

When task division is considered, the only meaningful way to deal with the resultant data is in terms of male and female perceptions in each household. In nine groups there was a variation of 10% or more in the degree to which men and women saw tasks as equally divided. This variation is considerably more prevalent in groups with a loose structure for defining responsibilities. Four out of the six³ rural groups in the sample demonstrated this wide variation. All but one of these are quite loosely structured. The more organized household is one living temporarily in a town. In this group the women see the men as doing more to equalize responsibilities in the current transitional phase, but expect this to balance out when the move to their farm is accomplished. When rural and urban groups are completely separated, the difference seen is a very slight trend toward rural respondents seeing tasks somewhat more equally divided. When placed alongside other data and observations this trend appears consistent with rural responses in related areas.

Overall in the rural groups we received the impression that women felt men had made a greater adjustment in taking on traditional female tasks and roles than had been true for them in regard to traditional male tasks. In some

cases they expressed self consciousness about this. The lack of need for special skills required for household chores was seen as one reason for ease of crossover. Also, women felt that they were not under pressure from men to learn equipment repairs and other traditional male skills unless they were especially interested. Men may feel especially obligated to engage in the often less interesting and more regular tasks of cleaning and cooking.

In urban groups men occasionally expressed frustration at not being able to maintain a flexible schedule of outside employment and internal responsibility. It would seem that external employment demands are a major barrier to sex role goals becoming reality, especially in the areas of child rearing and household tasks. In spite of this, the divergence in urban households shows men as seeing work more equally divided than women do in three of the five urban groups reflecting a variation of 10% or more in male/female perceptions related to task division. This may reflect one interesting factor which was mentioned in several urban groups, that women seem more apt to take initiative in general cleaning and picking up where men may be satisfied with a lower level of ongoing maintenance.

When they were asked to identify new task experiences, both men and women appeared to see themselves as moving into increased numbers of cross sex tasks. As was noted in the discussion of data for Hypothesis five, it is impossible to associate either the rural or urban setting with a larger number of increased cross sex activities. However, in terms of increase of same

sex tasks, it can be said that the rural groups demonstrate more of this tendency than do urban groups. This may reflect the need for all to learn new tasks which may be traditionally sex linked, but are specific to the rural environment. Canning, care of livestock, construction and large scale gardening are some examples that were observed. Generally, the question on this subject left so much latitude for response that any interpretation must be seen as very tentative. Responses to this question also pointed out one of the areas which our study was unable to explore adequately and one in which many respondents expressed interest. By limiting our questions to task type roles we hoped to gain some objective view of the practical outworking of ideals. At the same time this excluded the whole range of emotional roles in which a great deal of experimentation is going on. One woman respondent sent a followup letter in which she discussed the importance of her group to those who were learning to be freer to express emotional qualities which have been traditionally associated with the opposite sex. In spite of the limitations of the questionnaire in this regard, we feel we gained a great deal of understanding of some of the dynamics involved in the expression of emotional roles.

Footnotes for Chapter V

1. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Commitment and Community , p. 166.
2. See pages 2 - 3 of this study .
3. One of the two remaining had no male residents so cannot be compared.

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

As we discuss our findings, the reader should realize that there are certain limits to this study. These limits may have introduced bias or skew in the data collected and should be taken into consideration when evaluating the discussion and conclusions.

We encountered limits in defining our population since we wanted to draw a sample which was heterogeneous enough to make some comparisons and homogeneous enough to be considered reasonably definitive. We are satisfied with our definition and think each group in the sample is appropriate, but we recognize there could be some room for disagreement regarding "common values and interpersonal commitment". Some bias also may have been introduced in drawing the actual sample, as we were limited to groups which were accessible and known to us. Again, it must be emphasized that we are not attempting to generalize beyond our actual sample since it could not be selected randomly.

The questionnaires also have certain limits which were discovered through questions asked by respondents and through attempting to code and compile the data. Specifically, respondents had trouble following the format on Questions 16 and 22 on the Commune Information (Appendix B). On the Respondent Information (Appendix B) Questions 13b, 13d and 14b were ap-

parently not clear enough as respondents often did not pair the issue they listed with the decision relating to that issue or simply did not list the issue or decision. This resulted in the necessity of adding the coding categories "issue not listed" and "decision not listed". Questions 15b and 16b also could have been more specific as we did not get the information we were seeking. It probably would have been better to ask the areas in which their satisfactions and dissatisfactions were and the nature of these satisfactions and dissatisfactions. Question 21 (the grid) also has some shortcomings. The task of who speaks for the group to outsiders stimulated some respondents to question whether it would have been better to distinguish between who actually does the speaking and who decides what is said. Many respondents wrote in "consensus" as a method of assignment for some tasks. Perhaps others would have used that alternative if it had been included in our list of possible answers. Also on Question 21, many respondents missed the fact that "mostly mothers ", "mostly fathers" and "both parents equally" could be used as answers for the questions relating to children, possibly making the validity of responses on those tasks questionable. More generally, we also discovered during administration of the questionnaires that the questions somehow did not elicit expression of emotional areas of functioning nearly as much as we had expected. Many respondents wanted to discuss such things afterwards but stated that they did not see the question-

naire as asking for that kind of information.

The process of collecting the data also had certain limits and revealed others. Some of these were discussed previously in the Methodology section. Again, as in drawing a sample of groups, availability and willingness determined who actually participated from each group. The change in administration of the instrument from doing interviews to having respondents fill out their own questionnaires resulted in some of them not following directions as carefully as we would have in interviewing them. Thus, some answered both Questions 13 and 14 and/or 15 and 16 on the Respondent Information (Appendix B) when the questions were labeled as mutually exclusive. Several questions regarding the meaning of "ongoing couple relationship" lead us to question the usefulness of the information gathered in that area as there was so much confusion and room for self-definition. Our presence while the questionnaires were filled out also seems an important factor. The rapport we were able to achieve with most groups seems an advantage to the study. Nevertheless, the inability to develop the same degree of rapport with all groups may cause some skew in the data.

When the open-ended questions were coded, other limits of the study emerged. As stated previously in the Methodology section, we found it necessary to change some of the coding categories to reflect responses more adequately and to tighten and clarify meanings of some categories (see Appendix

E for actual changes). Since this was done after the data was gathered, some bias may be reflected. Our negotiations in the coding process, also discussed in the Methodology section, may also have introduced bias, although we do not think so. A specific limit which emerged during the coding process was our difficulty in coding Question 20a from the Respondent Information (Appendix B). Seven responses reflected changes in practice rather than changes in ideals and were thus seen as "uncodable".

In compiling the data, certain limits also emerged. Questions 15 and 16 in the Respondent Information (Appendix B) are not parallel so must be considered separately. Further, those who answered Question 15 did not have an opportunity to report how satisfied they were with the development of sex roles rather than just with the decisions regarding sex roles. Limits were also discovered while compiling data to test the hypotheses. Hypothesis seven states that satisfaction level is associated with frequency of discussion of similar issues. It was not feasible to test this hypothesis because the frequency of discussion question was divided between those present at formation and those joining after formation, while the satisfaction question was divided between those answering concerning decisions regarding sex roles and those answering concerning development of sex roles. Hypothesis eight also was not feasible to test. It states that satisfaction level is associated with perceived task division. When attempting to compile the information to test this hypothesis, it became clear that we only gathered

information on satisfaction with decisions regarding sex roles and satisfaction with development of sex roles but not on satisfaction with perceived task division. Therefore to test how satisfaction level is associated with perceived task division is meaningless. The reader will note that we gathered considerable information which was not used in specific hypotheses statements. When we embarked on this study we were uncertain regarding what information would be most useful to study further. Our final decision of which data to study thus was made on the basis of time, focus of interest and observations made while gathering the data. Thus, although base information is tabled and discussed, we chose to use sex role information to test in our hypotheses. Further, it became readily apparent that there were not enough children in the sample to make it worthwhile to compile and interpret the data relating to them. Therefore, we excluded it from our consideration.

Conclusions

We have reflected on our reading, data and interpretations and on observations made during the course of this study in order to come to some conclusions.

The literature alerted us to be sensitive to the distinction between groups which are retreating from society and those which are seeking, directly or indirectly, to change society. Our sample generally reflects the latter category of group; however, it may be somewhat skewed because of certain

factors involved in the sample selection. Because of the nature of our questionnaire we wanted groups who had been in existence for several months. We relied heavily on personal friendship connections for location of several groups and often a group visited would refer us to others. The last two reasons especially might tend to result in groups being somewhat similar. Respondents in our sample impressed us with their sense of responsible relationship to the larger society even though reasons for joining were largely personal. This sense of relationship is in some cases embodied in direct effort to change society and its institutions; however, a more prominent focus is on the development of viable options to the nuclear family, which may be seen as an indirect way of effecting societal change.

Carl Rogers¹ points out that the nuclear family, as we know it in the Western world, has a history of only five or six decades. Many students of the modern family have discussed the problems faced by such family organization, especially the isolation and exclusive interdependence of the family unit and its alienation from any larger social context. In addition to what can be found in the literature, it seems to us that the nuclear family in its most isolated form is largely a phenomenon of the white middle and upper classes. The term "isolated" is meant to convey a lack of readily available support groups such as relatives, neighbors and ethnic groups. A brief survey of lower economic and ethnic groups indicates tendency toward a wider network of family and neighborhood ties related to less mobility and other factors,

which may in some cases reflect cultural preferences and in other situations, lack of opportunity for social movement. With this background, it may be significant to note the high proportion of white, generally well-educated, middle class, mobile persons in our sample. Most of these persons have been raised in isolated nuclear families and expressed feeling a deep lack of the kind of support and stimulus that might be available in a larger family system.

From some of the data collected one could conclude that many respondents are seeking some form of larger family system. Personal rather than ideological reasons for joining, especially reasons implying desire for group involvement, were emphasized. Further support of the above conclusion is found in their intent to remain in the group setting despite their seeing interpersonal difficulties as a major point of stress. Also, the tendency to see their effect on the larger society as being primarily an alternative to the isolated nuclear family gives additional credence to this conclusion. Comments made during our visits also reflected desire for inclusion of more older people to enrich the family atmosphere. Thus, we see the search for a more extended type of family organization as a major thrust of our respondents.

One of the basic assumptions for persons entering this more extended form of family organization appears to be less differentiation between the sexes than is present in the nuclear family. Even with this assumption, the data indicates that there are still many unresolved problems surrounding this

issue. These may be considered as related to those unique elements which men and women bring to any family organization. Historically, in the Western world, men have occupied a position of power and privilege in many areas in relation to women. This position has resulted in more acute sensitivity on the part of women of the disadvantages of their role and less necessity for men to examine their own status in relation to women. Even in segments of the society in which equalitarian goals have been revered, this power relationship has not basically changed without women organizing to address this issue. An example of this can be seen in the awareness of women in the anti-war movement of their automatic relegation to organizational "housekeeping" as when they ran the mimeograph machine made the coffee while men organized and gave the speeches.² Emergence of the modern Women's Movement has challenged that basic power relationship and has enabled women and in some cases men, to be sufficiently free of prior role definitions to engage in more nearly equal opportunities for defining their own roles. For example, one male respondent stated that his sex role ideals had changed not as a result of cooperative living but as a result of the Women's Movement.

In spite of progress seen from the Women's Movement, a legacy of socialization into traditional male and female roles still persists. Respondents conveyed a very realistic awareness of the constraints imposed by this social-

ization. This socialization produces ideal role expectations for men and women. The ideal role for a women is to become a wife and mother and the ideal role for a man is to gain a wife and children and to provide for them. Illustrating this socialization is the observation made by many women respondents that they found themselves automatically responding to clues such as dirty dishes or clutter because of their conditioning, while men often did not even perceive these as potential tasks.

In addition to the more personal conditioning which men and women undergo, there are structural elements in society which impede progress toward equalitarian goals. One of the most significant of these is the pattern of employment opportunities. There are few satisfying job opportunities for persons who desire a flexible work schedule. This places men in the position, as mentioned by several male respondents, of being forced to take full-time positions at the expense of not being able to share more equally with women in household tasks and child rearing. In addition, a number of respondents noted that many of the jobs available to women provide lower salaries than similar ones available to men. The economic needs of the cooperative household thus sometimes require that the men seek outside employment. Another significant structural element in society is the absence of day care provisions to meet the needs of the changing role of women. A model which might be examined is the program developed in some other nations, especially Sweden

where day care is provided at the actual work locations of parents. This was not a current need for many of the respondents who do not have children, but was seen as a factor which hinders realization of equalitarian goals.

The presence of the historical, socialization and structural factors which have been discussed above provide a background for understanding the respondents' perceptions of issues surrounding sex roles. We see these factors providing a partial explanation for role dissatisfactions and varying perceptions related to sex role issues and task division found among the respondents.

Thus, our study supports much of what we have seen in our reading, suggesting that in spite of the progress made, there are still real barriers to the realization of equalitarian goals in cooperative living and in society in general. Increasing numbers of viable options for life-styles are becoming available to both men and women, although the mode of cooperation which many of these options imply still faces the dominant spirit of competition prevalent in most of American society. As discussed in the literature review, in the more rigidly structured and less mobile society of an earlier period, many of these options were not really viable for most people. In the context of modern American society, which reflects disillusionment with the nuclear family and a general breakdown of intimate social ties, a loosening of previously accepted strictures has occurred. This can result in either movement toward a more cooperative society or more authoritarian forms. Both of these

trends can be readily seen in contemporary American society. We think the success of cooperative households, such as those seen in our study, could have far reaching impact in contributing to a determination of the direction in which American society may go.

Footnotes for Chapter VI

1. Carl Rogers, On Becoming Partners ; New York, Dell Pub. Co., 1972, p. 72.
2. Jane Alpert, " Forum - Mother Right - a New Feminist Theory ", Ms. , vol. 11, no. 2, August, 1972.

CHAPTER VII

EPILOGUE

As we reflect on our study, we have a natural inclination to wonder what further exploration in this area might produce. Some of the following ideas for future study were suggested to us by respondents in our research, some come from our curiosity about how certain factors we did not include in our study might effect sex roles in cooperative households and some involve longitudinal research which was not feasible for us to do.

As mentioned in both the Interpretation of Findings and Discussion and Conclusions sections, the area of emotional roles was of concern to our respondents and seems of importance if one is to understand the full effect of cooperative living on the development of sex roles. We think it might be interesting and illuminating to select specific emotional roles which have been traditionally repressed by each sex and determine to what level these have been freed up to allow all persons (male and female) to have the full range of human emotions at their disposal. For example, have men found it easier to cry, to relate more sensitively to other persons, to nurture others and to develop intuitive capacities, etc. ? Have women found it easier to be assertive about their wishes and ideas, and to be comfortable in assuming positions of leadership, etc. ?

In addition to the study of emotional roles, we see the areas of structure and leadership and how they effect the development of sex roles in cooperative

households as interesting topics for future study. We discovered that the presence of varied levels of structure for task division, decision making, etc., has an influence on how sex roles developed in our sample, but our own research in this area was not precise enough to make strongly supported conclusions. We did not collect any formal data on leadership patterns in our sample, but also see this as an area which might reveal some interesting effects on sex role development. Our observations and reading seem to indicate that the presence of a strong male leader may inhibit the development of an equalitarian group, but also that the absence of any leadership and/or structure may result in the lack of focus, direction, and consciousness necessary to achieve equalitarian goals. Thus, further study might yield some explanation in these areas.

Further study might also be enhanced by three rather limited, but possibly illuminating, suggestions made by our respondents. These were that changes in the mode of relating to the opposite sex, changes in stereotypes of the opposite sex and changes in expectations for couple relationships as a result of cooperative living might be interesting to research.

All of the above suggestions could be carried out in studies similar to ours; however, the following ones would require research of a longitudinal nature. Changes in expectations of couple relationships could be expanded into a longitudinal study designed to explore what happens in terms of sex roles to those with experience in cooperative households who later go on to

form isolated nuclear families. Another area which would require longitudinal study and which is very interesting to us is the issue of child-rearing for more equalitarian sex roles. A comparison over time of groups which make conscious effort for socialization into equalitarian roles and those where no conscious effort is made might yield some illuminating and useful material.

Thus, as can be seen, we have ended our research with more questions than we had when we began; however, now our questions are somewhat more focused and are based on actual experience with our topic rather than on arm-chair philosophizing and the reading of related literature.

Books

1. An Intentional Community Handbook, Community Service, Inc., Box 243, Yellow Springs, Ohio, 45387, 1974.
2. Ballou, Adin, History of the Hopedale Community, from Its Inception to Its Virtual Submergence in the Hopedale Parish, ed. William S. Heywood, Philadelphia, Porcupine Press, 1972 (Reprint of 1897 edition).
3. Bell, Norman W. & Vogel, Ezra F., A Modern Introduction to the Family, Rev. ed., New York, Free Press, 1968.
- *4. Bettelheim, Bruno, Children of the Dream, New York, Avon Books, 1969.
5. Buber, Martin, Paths in Utopia, Boston, Beacon Press, 1949.
6. Diamond, Stephen, What the Trees Said, Life on a New Age Farm, New York, Dell Publishing Co., 1971.
- *7. Fairfield, Richard, Communes, U.S.A., Baltimore, Md., Penquin Books, 1972.
8. _____, ed., Utopia, U.S.A., San Francisco, Alternatives Foundation, 1972.
9. Farber, Seymour M. and Wilson, Roger, H.L., The Challenge to Women, New York, Basic Books, 1966.
10. Flacks, Richard, Youth & Social Change, Chicago, Markham Publishing Co., 1971.
11. Goldberg, Steven, The Inevitability of Patriarchy, New York, Morrow, 1973.
12. Gordon, Michael, ed., The Nuclear Family in Crisis: The Search for an Alternative, New York, Harper & Row.
13. Gornick, Vivian & Moran, Barbara K., eds., Woman in Sexist Society, New York, Basic Books, 1971.
14. Hedgepeth, William & Stock, Dennis, The Alternative: Communal Life in New America, New York, MacMillan, 1970.

15. Houriet, Robert, Getting Back Together, New York, Coward, McCann & Geoghegan, Inc., 1971.
16. Howe, Louise Kapp, ed., The Future of the Family, New York, Simon & Schuster, 1972.
- *17. Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, Commitment and Community, Communes and Utopias in Sociological Perspective, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1972.
18. _____ ed., Communes, Creating and Managing the Collective Life, New York, Harper and Row, 1973.
19. Kaufman, Moritz, Utopias; or Schemes of Social Improvement, London, C. Kegan Paul and Co., 1879.
20. Keyes, Ralph, We the Lonely People: Searching for Community, New York, Harper and Row, 1973.
21. Kincade, Kathleen, A Walden Two Experiment: The First Five Years of Twin Oaks Community, New York, William Morrow and Co., Inc., 1972.
22. Lifton, Robert Jay, The Woman in America (The Daedalus Library), Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.
23. Live it! Communalism, Canyon, Calif., 94516, Vocations for Social Change, 1971.
24. Manahar Cooperative Fellowship Handbook, Sierra Route, Oakhurst, Calif., 93644, Broodan Center of Inquiry, 1970.
25. Manuel, Frank E., Utopias & Utopian Thought (The Daedalus Library) Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966.
26. Marks, Paul J., A New Community — Format for Health, Contentment and Security, Questers' Project, Cathedral City, Calif., U.S.A.: Youth Resources, Inc., 1969.
27. Melville, Keith, Communes in the Counter Culture, New York, Wm. Morrow and Co., Inc., 1972.
28. Miller, Debbert, C., Handbook of Research Design and Social Measurement, second ed., New York, McKay, 1970.

29. Muncy, Raymond Lee, Sex and Marriage in Utopian Communities, Baltimore, Penquin Books, 1974.
30. Nordhoff, Charles, The Communistic Societies of the United States, New York, Hillary House Publishing, Ltd., 1960 (originally published 1875).
31. Noyes, John Humphrey, History of American Socialisms, New York, Hillary House, 1961 (originally published 1870).
32. Noyes, Pierrepont, My Father's House: An Oneida Boyhood, New York, Farrar & Rinehart, 1937.
33. Owen, Robert Dale, The Life of Robert Owen, By Himself, London, G. Bill, 1920.
34. Rabin, A.I., Growing Up in the Kibbutz, New York, Springer Publishing Co., 1965.
35. Roberts, Ron E., The New Communes, Englewood-Cliffs, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
36. Robertson, Constance Noyes, Oneida Community: An Autobiography, 1851-1876, Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1970.
37. _____, Oneida Community: The Breakup, 1876-1881, Syracuse, New York, Syracuse University Press, 1972.
38. Rogers, Carl, Becoming Partners: Marriage & Its Alternatives, New York, Dell Publishing Co., 1972.
39. Safilios - Rothschild, Constantina, ed., Toward a Sociology of Women, Lexington, Maine, Xerox College, 1972.
- *40. Schur, Edwin M., ed., The Family and the Sexual Revolution, Bloomington, Ind., Indiana University Press, 1964.
41. Seward, Georgene, and Williamson, Robert C., eds., Sex Roles in a Changing Society, New York, Random, 1970.
42. Shaw, Marvin E. and Wright, J.M., Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1967.

43. Skinner, B.F., Walden Two, New York, MacMillan, 1948.
44. Skolnick, Arlene S. and Jerome H., Family in Transition, Boston, Little Brown and Co., 1971.
45. Slater, Philip, The Pursuit of Loneliness, Boston, Beacon Press, 1970.
46. Weiss, Michael, Living Together: A Year in the Life of a City Commune, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- *47. Weshues, Keith, Society's Shadow: Studies in the Sociology of Counter-Cultures, Toronto, McGraw-Hill Ryerson, Ltd., 1972.
48. Yablonsky, Lewis, The Hippie Trip, New York, Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1968.
49. Zablocki, Benjamin, The Joyful Community, Baltimore, Penguin Books, 1971.

*Books marked contain extensive bibliographies.

Articles

50. Alpert, Jane, "Forum: Mother Right - A New Feminist Theory", Ms., vol. 2, no. 2, August, 1973, pp. 52-55, 88-94.
51. Angrist, Shirley S., "Role Conception as a Predictor of Adult Female Roles", Sociology and Social Research, vol. 50, no. 4, July, 1966, pp. 448-459.
52. Brown, L. Dave and Jane C., "The Struggle for an Alternative: A Case Study of a Commune", Human Organization, vol. 32, no. 3, Fall, 1973, pp. 257-66.
53. "Child Rearing in the Age of Aquarius", Human Behavior, vol. e, no. 2, May, 1974, p. 14.
54. Davis, Fred, "Why All of Us May Be Hippies One Day", Trans-action, vol. 5, no. 2, Dec., 1967, pp. 10-18.
55. Des Camp, Michael, Unpublished research paper on "extended families" in Portland, Ore., 1974.

56. Flacks, Richard, "Young Intelligentsia in Revolt", Trans-Action, vol. 7, no. 8, June, 1970, pp. 46-55.
57. L'ootte, Nelson N., "New Roles for Men and Women", Marriage and Family Living, vol. 23, no. 4, Nov., 1961, pp. 325-29.
58. "Fourier, Charles", Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th ed., vol. IV, pp. 254-255.
59. Harder, Mary White et. al., "Jesus People", Psychology Today, vol. 6, no. 7, Dec., 1972, pp. 45-50, 110-113.
60. Hochschild, Arlie Russell, "A Review of Sex Role Research", American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 4, Jan., 1972, pp. 1011-29.
61. Johnson, Mirium M., "Sex Role Learning in the Nuclear Family", Child Development, vol. 34, no. 2, June, 1963, pp. 319-33.
62. Jordan, June, "A Church Without Walls", Ms., vol. 3, no. 2, Aug., 1974, p. 95.
63. Kando, Thomas, "Role Strain: A Comparison of Males, Females and Transsexuals", Journals of Marriage and the Family, vol. 34, no. 3, August, 1972, pp. 459-68.
64. Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, "Communes for All Reasons", Ms., vol. 3, no. 2, August, 1974, pp. 62-67.
65. Kanter, Rosabeth Moss, and Halter, Marilyn, "De-Housewifing Women, Domesticating Men: Changing Sex Roles in Urban Communes", unpublished paper presented at the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August, 1973.
66. Kincade, Kathleen, "A Walden Two Experiment", Psychology Today, vol. 6, no. 9, Feb., 1973, pp. 71-82.
67. Kopkind, Andrew, "The Way We Lived Then", (Review article - Weiss, Living Together) Ramparts, vol. 13, no. 3, October, 1974, pp. 51-53.
68. Komarovsky, Mirra, "Cultural Contradiction and Sex Roles: The Masculine Case", American Journal of Sociology, vol. 78, no. 4, Jan., 1973, pp. 873-84.

69. Mead, Margaret, "Beyond the Household", Dialogue, (U.S.I.S.), vol. 3, no. 4, 1970.
70. Minturn, Leigh, "Sex Role Differentiation in Contemporary Communes", unpublished paper.
71. Movement for a New Society, "New Society Packet", The Movement - Building Collective, 4722 Baltimore Ave., Philadelphia, Pa. 19143 (no date).
72. Oats, Marnie, "Twin Oaks", Women: A Journal of Liberation, vol. 2, no. 4, 1972, pp. 28-30.
73. "Owen, Robert", Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th ed., vol. VII, p. 643.
74. Papanek, Mirium L., "Authority and Sex Roles in the Family", Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol. 31, no. 1, Feb., 1969, pp. 88-96.
75. Perkins, Roberta Price, "Libre Rising", Ms., vol. 3, no. 2, August, 1974, p. 96.
76. Podell, L., "Sex and Role Conflict", Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol. 28, no. 2, May, 1966, pp. 163-65.
77. Pratt, Lois, "Conjugal Organization and Health", Journal of Marriage and the Family, vol. 34, no. 1, Feb., 1972, pp. 85-95.
78. Raymon, Paula, "The Commune Movement: The Need to Revolutionize", Win, Dec. 6, 1973, pp. 8-9.
79. Roy, Beth, "Human Ecology", Ms., vol. 3, no. 2, Aug., 1974, p. 94.
80. Slater, Philip, "Cultures in Collision", Psychology Today, vol. 4, no. 2, July, 1970, pp. 31-32, 66-68.
81. "Some Views From Women in Communes", Communities, no. 7, March - April, 1974, pp. 11-13.
82. Trilling, Diana, "Culture, Biology and Sexual Roles", Dialogue, (U.S.I.S.) vol. 3, no. 4, 1970, pp. 11-19.
83. "Twin Oaks & Little Folks", Communities, no. 9, July - August, 1974, pp. 10-12.

84. "Women in Community", Communities, no. 8, May - June, 1974, pp. 2-6.
85. Veysey, Lawrence, "Individualism Busts the Commune Boom", Psychology Today, vol. 8, no. 7, Dec., 1974, pp. 73-78.

APPENDIX A
COMMUNE INFORMATION

98

1. Community identifying number _____
2. Date started _____
3. Has community been in continuous existence since that date? Yes _____
No _____
4. How many original members were there? _____
5. What is the largest number of members this commune has had? _____
The smallest? _____
6. How many members have left since formation? _____
7. How many new members have joined? _____
8. How many current members have been in residence six months or longer? _____
9. Number of current members? _____
Men? _____
Women? _____
Children under 14? _____
Ages and sexes? _____
Older children of commune adults? _____
Ages and sexes? _____
10. How many members are married? _____
11. How many members are in ongoing couple relationships? _____
12. Is this commune - urban? _____
rural? _____
semi-rural? _____

13. Is this commune ? a separate entity _____
 part of a larger network of communes _____
 and / or _____
 receiving some direction from outside the
 commune itself (specify) _____

14. What are the criteria for belonging to this commune ? _____

15. (If ideology is a factor) does this ideology provide a source of
 specific expectations regarding members' behavior ?

Yes _____
 No _____

(If yes) what are these expectations ? _____

16. Is this commune interested in having new members ?

Yes _____
 No _____

Depends on _____

17. Does the commune have a formal procedure for deciding whether a
 prospective member should come into the commune ?

Yes _____
 No _____

(If yes) how is it done ? _____

(If no) how is the decision made ? _____

[illegible]

19. Where do single persons live ?

in separate houses or apartments _____

in a single house _____

do they have a room _____

to themselves ? _____

other (specify) _____

20. Are facilities for cooking _____
 a. separate by couple or family eating _____
 b. separate for individual bathing _____
 single persons laundry _____
 c. communal for single persons relaxing _____
 d. communal for all _____
 e. other (specify) _____

21. Where do children sleep ?

in a special children's house _____

in a room near parent(s) _____

in parent (s) room _____

other (specify) _____

(If they sleep in a special childrens' house) from what age ?

(If they sleep in a special childrens' house) who is responsible for them at night ?

22. Do children eat separately from their parents ?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) from what age ?

23. Who attended childbirth ?

woman goes to hospital _____

physician for home delivery _____

midwife for home delivery _____

father for home delivery _____

other adult member of commune _____

who ? _____

other (specify) _____

24. Does the commune own property ?

Yes _____
No _____

a. (If so) how was it obtained ?

as a gift _____
from members contributions _____
purchased by one member _____
purchased by one family _____
other (specify) _____

b. (If so) how is the property held ?

in trust _____
as a corporation _____
by individual (s) _____
(if so) who ? _____
other (specify) _____

c. (If so) is it completely paid for ?

Yes _____
No _____

(If not) how are payments made ? _____

d. If the commune were to disband how would property be disposed of ? _____

e. (If not) does the commune plan to own property if this is possible in the future ?

Yes _____
No _____

25. How is commune money held ? by one person _____

who ? _____

by persons who earn/receive it _____

by a group within the commune _____

other (specify) _____

26. What kinds of income producing work are done by members of the commune ? men-how many? women-how many ?

farming _____

gardening _____

crafts _____

paid jobs in outside _____

community _____

what kinds _____

other (specify) _____

none _____

27. How is such work assigned or obtained ? _____

28. How are specific financial needs of the commune met ?

	transportation _____
a. outside wages from members	food _____
b. gifts from members	clothing _____
c. gifts from outsiders	housing needs _____
d. public assistance	recreation/cultural _____
e. sale of commune produced items	education _____
f. other (specify)	medical _____
	misc. _____

29. Does the entire commune ever get together to perform a common task such as painting the house, canning, etc. ? Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) how often ? _____

(If yes) please specify tasks _____

30. Are required group meetings in which the entire commune gets together to discuss common concerns held ? never _____

daily _____

weekly _____

biweekly _____

monthly _____

other (specify) _____

31. What other types of group activities is this commune engaged in ?

About how often ? _____

Are any of these required for all ? Yes _____

No _____

(If so) which ones ? _____

32. Do children attend local public school ? Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) from what age ? _____

33. Does the commune have any kind of school ?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) who teaches ? _____

who attends ? _____

from what age ? _____

34. How does commune school differ from local public school ?

in philosophy _____

in content _____

in method _____

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

1. Community identification number _____
2. Respondent identification number _____
3. Personal information

sex	_____
age	_____
religion	_____
race	_____
marital status*	_____
children	Yes _____
	No _____
(If yes) sex	_____
ages	_____
4. Educational level attained

8th grade or less	_____
high school	_____
some college	_____
college completed	_____
some grad. study	_____
specialized training	_____
or school	_____
in what?	_____
completed grad. study	_____
in what field?	_____
5. What were your occupation(s) prior to joining the commune? _____

6. What is your present occupation? _____
7. Did you grow up primarily in an urban area, rural area or small town?

urban	_____
rural	_____
small town	_____
8. What is your understanding of the primary reason(s) for the formation of this commune? _____

*Note if spouse is resident or non-resident. If resident and participating, give respondent number.

9. What are the primary reasons that you personally joined this commune?

10. Have you lived in other communes prior to this one? Yes _____
 No _____

(If so) how many? _____
 how long? _____

11. What do you think some of the reasons are that people leave communes?

12. As you see your present situation, how long do you plan to remain in this commune? _____

(If planning to move soon) would you mind sharing what leads you to consider moving? _____

INTRODUCTION

13. Were sex roles discussed during formation of this commune?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) generally what did the discussions consist of? _____

13 (con't.).

(If there is an acknowledged ideology) did ideology play any part
in the discussion?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) in what ways? _____

(If yes) were the discussions -

extensive? _____

limited? _____

in between? _____

(If yes) did you come to any agreements?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) what were they? _____

(If yes) were there any major disagreements?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) what were they? _____

How frequently are similar issues discussed in ongoing meetings?

very often _____

fairly often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

(If so) what specific issues are raised? _____

14. Do you see communes as potentially having a unique influence in the development of the roles of men and women in our society?

Yes _____

No _____

Could you share your thinking on this? _____

15. Did you enter this commune expecting differences in sex roles from what is generally found in the traditional nuclear family?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) what kinds of differences? _____

16. Has this commune specifically discussed the socialization of its children regarding sex roles?

Yes _____

No _____

Have you come to any agreements?

Yes _____

No _____

(If so) what are they? _____

Have there been any major disagreements?

Yes _____

No _____

(If so) what? _____

17. If you could design the ideal arrangement of roles of men and women, what things would seem most important to you? _____

Could you order them in degree of importance?

18. At points where you are involved with the larger society (such as outside jobs, etc.) do you see any differences in the expectations of you as a man/woman?

Yes _____

No _____

(If so) what differences do you see? _____

How do you handle these differences? _____

19. At points where commune children are involved with the larger society, do they come up against standards and values different from those they have learned in the commune?

Yes _____

No _____

(If yes) what kinds of differences are involved? _____

Do you see any of these differences as related to sex role expectations?

Yes _____

No _____

19. (cont.)

How do children respond to these differences ? _____

In what ways do adults participate with children in resolving the differences ? _____

19a (If has a child) where does financial contribution for child (children) come from ?

If both parents are resident in the commune

from both parents _____

from one parent (which ?) _____

from entire commune _____

other (specify) _____

If one parent is resident in the commune (may have more than one answer)

from resident parent _____

from nonresident parent _____

from both parents _____

from parents' present partner _____

from entire commune _____

other (specify) _____

20. With whom does major responsibility rest for the care of children under two years ?

mother _____

father _____

both parents _____

other adults _____

who ? _____

21. With whom does major responsibility rest for the care of children from two - school age ?

mother _____

father _____

both parents _____

other adults _____

who ? _____

22. With whom does major responsibility rest for the care of children from school age - 12 years ?
- mother _____
father _____
both parents _____
other adults _____
who ? _____
23. What responsibilities do children over 12 have ? _____

24. What decisions do children make for themselves ?
	boys	girls
2 - school age	_____	_____
	_____	_____
school age - 12	_____	_____
	_____	_____
over 12	_____	_____
	_____	_____
25. If a child's behavior causes some difficulty for the group how is the situation dealt with ? _____

- Who is involved in the process ? _____

26. Have your ideals regarding sex role differentiation changed any as a result of communal living ?
- Yes _____
No _____

26. (cont.)

(If yes) would you be willing to identify what the changes are ?

(If yes) what do you think led to this change ?

27. To what extent do you feel this commune reaches the ideal arrangement you outlined earlier regarding roles of men and women ?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all very much

Could you share what leads you to feel this way ?

28. (If decisions were made) how satisfied are you, on the whole, with decisions that have been made by this community regarding roles of men and women ?

1 2 3 4 5
very very
dissatisfied satisfied

Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are ?

(If decisions were made)

29. How satisfied are you, on the whole, with decisions that have been made by this community concerning socialization of children regarding sex roles ?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are ?

30. (If decisions were made) to what extent do you feel group decisions regarding roles of men and women have actually become reality in this commune ?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all very much

Could you share how you feel this has come about ?

31. (If decisions were made) to what extent do you feel group decisions made concerning socialization of children regarding sex roles have actually become reality in this commune ?

1 2 3 4 5
not at all very much

Could you share how you feel this has come about ?

32. (If no decisions were made) how satisfied are you, on the whole, with the development of roles of men and women in this community ?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are ?

33. (If no decisions were made) how satisfied are you, on the whole, with the way in which socialization of children regarding sex roles has developed in this community ?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are ?

In this commune who ?

Activity	Who	Method of assignment	Any change over time? when? reasons?
washes clothes			
repairs and maintains the house			
does light cleaning			
reads to children			
plans meals			
cares for sick children			
speak for group to outsiders			
makes decisions on how money will be spent			
calls group meetings			
cares for livestock			
washes dishes			
cooks			
gardens			
prepares food for canning, freezing			
cans food			
keeps motor vehicles running			
puts children to bed			
changes diapers			
washes diapers			
pays bills			
does heavy cleaning			
disciplines children			
plays with children			
dresses children			
buys groceries			
farms			
hunts			
fishes			
deals with neighbors			
plans social activities			
decides on who may join			
decides on who may visit			

Could you summarize briefly either specific or general activities which you you never or rarely did before joining the commune but do now ? [use back]

WHO

- entirely up to men (a man)
- entirely up to women (a woman)
- mostly up to men (a man)
- mostly up to women (a woman)
- done by men and women equally
- done by others outside the commune
- no one
- not applicable

METHOD OF ASSIGNMENT

(more than one may be applicable)

- whoever is available
- by regular rotation among all members
- by regular rotation among some members who ?
- on permanent or long-term basis
- by individual interest and/or skill
- by lot
- by assignment from one person - who?
- by assignment from small group - who?
- other (specify)

APPENDIX B

COMMUNE INFORMATION

It may be helpful to read the entire questionnaire before beginning. If there are some questions that are not applicable to your situation, skip them.

1. Community identifying number _____
2. Date started _____
3. Has community been in continuous existence since that date? Yes _____
No _____
4. How many original members were there? _____
5. How many members (original members and/or later joiners) have left? _____
6. How many new members have joined since formation? _____
7. How many current members have been in residence six months or longer? _____
8. Number of current members? _____
 - a. Men? _____
 - b. Women? _____
 - c. Children under 14? _____
 - d. Ages and sexes? _____
 - e. Older children of commune adults? _____
 - f. Ages and sexes? _____
9. How many members are in ongoing couple relationships? _____
 - a. Of these, how many are legally married? _____
10. Is this commune - ?

urban	_____
rural	_____
semi-rural	_____

11. Is this commune - ?

a separate entity _____
 part of a larger network of communes _____
 and/or _____
 receiving some direction from outside
 the commune itself (specify) _____

12. What are the criteria for belonging to this commune? _____

13. Is this commune interested in having new members? Yes _____
 No _____

Depends on _____

14. Where do couples live?

in separate houses or apartments _____
 in a single house _____
 do they have a room to
 themselves? _____
 other (specify) _____

15. Where do single persons live?

in separate houses or apartments _____
 in a single house _____
 do they have a room to
 themselves? _____
 other (specify) _____

(May have more than one answer from list on left)

16. Are facilities for.cooking _____

a. separate by couple or family	eating	_____
b. separate for individual	bathing	_____
single persons	laundry	_____
c. communal for single persons	relaxing	_____
d. communal for all		_____
e. other (specify)		_____

17. Where do children sleep?

in a special childrens' house _____

in a room near parent(s) _____

in parent(s) room _____

other (specify) _____

a. If they sleep in a special childrens' house, from what age? _____

b. If children sleep in a special childrens' house, who is responsible for them at night?

(May check more than one answer)

both parents _____

mother _____

father _____

all adults by rotation _____

adults by proximity _____

older children _____

no one _____

other (specify) _____

18. Have any children been born to members since formation of this commune?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, how many? _____

b. If yes, who attended childbirth? _____

(May check more than one answer)

woman goes to hospital _____

physician for home delivery _____

midwife for home delivery _____

father for home delivery _____

other adult member of commune _____

who? _____

other (specify) _____

19. Does the commune own property?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, how was it obtained? _____

as a gift _____

from members contributions _____

purchased by one member _____

purchased by one family _____

other (specify) _____

19 (con't.)

b. If yes, how is the property held?

in trust _____

as a corporation _____

by individual(s) _____

who? _____

jointly by all adults _____

other (specify) _____

c. If the commune owns property, how would property be disposed of if the commune were to disband?

sold & proceeds distributed equally _____

haven't decided _____

donated to non-profit organization _____

shares sold to one or more members _____

other (specify) _____

d. If the commune does not own property, does it plan to own property if this is possible in the future?

Yes _____

No _____

20. Are financial contributions for support of the commune made - ?

equally by all members _____

by ability to pay _____

other (specify) _____

21. Are certain persons exempt from financial contributions?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, who and on what basis? _____

22. What kinds of income producing work are ordinarily done by members of the commune?

paid jobs in outside community

men - how many?

women - how many?

what kinds?

farming

gardening

crafts

other (specify)

23. Does the entire commune ever get together to perform a common task?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, how often? _____

b. If yes, please specify tasks? _____

24. Are group meetings in which the entire commune gets together to discuss common concerns held?

never _____

daily _____

weekly _____

biweekly _____

monthly _____

other (specify) _____

a. Is attendance generally expected?

Yes _____

No _____

b. If this pattern has changed since formation of the commune, how and why? _____

25. Do children attend local public school?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, from what age? _____

26. Does the commune have any kind of school?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, who teaches? _____

b. who attends? _____

c. from what age? _____

27. How does commune school differ from local public school?

a. in philosophy _____

27 (con't.)

b. in content

c. in method

RESPONDENT INFORMATION

It may be helpful to read the entire questionnaire before beginning.
There will undoubtedly be some questions that are not applicable to your
situation. Skip them.

1. Community identification number _____
2. Respondent identification number _____
3. Personal information
 - a. sex _____
 - b. age _____
 - c. Do you have children?
 - Yes _____
 - No _____
 - 1) If yes, males (ages?) _____ 2) females (ages?) _____
 - d. Are you in an ongoing couple relationship?
 - Yes _____
 - No _____
 - 1) If yes, is your partner resident in commune? Yes _____ No _____
 - 2) If yes, partner's respondent number _____
4. Educational level attained?
 - 8th grade or less _____
 - high school _____
 - some college _____
 - college completed _____
 - some grad. study _____
 - specialized train- _____
 - ing or school _____
 - in what? _____
 - completed grad. _____
 - study _____
 - in what field? _____
5. What were your occupation(s) prior to joining the commune? _____

6. What is your present occupation? _____
7. What is your understanding of the primary reason(s) for the formation
 of this commune? _____

8. What are the primary reasons that you personally joined this commune?

9. How long have you lived in this commune? _____

10. Have you lived in other communes prior to this one? Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, how many? _____

b. how long? _____

11. What do you think some of the reasons are that people leave communes?

12. As you see your present situation, how long do you plan to remain in this commune? _____

INTRODUCTION: The following questions focus on how roles of men and women and socialization of children related to sex roles have developed in this community.

When we refer to sex roles in the questions we mean those patterns of behavior or expectations for behavior, those specific rights and duties that are accorded an individual on the basis of what sex he or she is.

As you know, sex roles are being increasingly discussed and questioned in our society. We believe that there are many valid alternatives for individuals or groups in developing patterns of sex roles appropriate for themselves.

Communes are, of course, one form of intimate social organization in which sex roles, in some form, will be expressed. We are eager to gain some appreciation of how various communes are dealing with this area.

13. If you have been a member since formation, please answer these questions -

a. Were sex roles discussed during the formative period?

Yes _____

No _____

b. If yes, what specific issues were raised and what specific decisions were made? _____

c. How frequently are similar issues discussed in ongoing group meetings?

very often _____

fairly often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

d. What specific issues are raised and what new decisions have been made? _____

14. If you have joined the commune after formation, please answer these questions -

a. How frequently have sex roles been discussed in ongoing group meetings?

very often _____

fairly often _____

occasionally _____

rarely _____

never _____

- b. What specific issues are raised and what specific decisions have been made? _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

15. If decisions have been made (Questions 13 & 14) -

- a. How satisfied are you, on the whole, with the decisions that have been made by this community regarding roles of men and women?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

- b. Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are? _____
- _____
- _____

- c. To what extent do you feel group decisions regarding roles of women and men have actually become reality in this commune?

1	2	3	4	5
not at all				very much

- d. What factors have aided this process? _____
- _____
- _____

- e. What factors have hindered this process? _____
- _____
- _____

16. If no decisions have been made (Questions 13 & 14) -

a. How satisfied are you, on the whole, with the development of roles of men and women in this community?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

b. Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are? _____

17. Do you see communes as potentially having a unique influence in the development of the roles of women and men in the larger society?

Yes _____
No _____

a. If yes, how? _____

b. If no, why not? _____

18. Did you enter this commune expecting differences in sex roles from what is generally found in the traditional nuclear family?

Yes _____
No _____

a. If yes, what kinds of differences? _____

19. When sex role expectations of the larger society conflict with roles valued within the commune, how do you respond to these conflicts? _____

20. Have your ideals regarding sex roles changed any as a result of communal living?

Yes _____

No _____

- a. If yes, would you be willing to identify what the changes are?

- b. If yes, what do you think led to this change? _____

21. In this commune, who - ? (MORE THAN ONE ANSWER MAY BE APPLICABLE) CHOOSE ANSWERS FROM LISTS FOLLOWING CHART

<u>activity</u>	<u>who</u>	<u>method of assignment</u>
repairs the house		
cleans the house		
plans meals		
cares for sick children		
speaks for group to outsiders		
makes decisions on how communal money will be spent		
calls group meetings		
cares for livestock		
washes dishes		
decides on who may join		
cooks		
gardens		
prepares food for canning, freezing		
keeps motor vehicles running		
changes diapers		
pays bills		
buys groceries		
farms		
puts children to bed		
holds and distributes communal money		

WHO

- a. entirely done by men (a man)
- b. mostly done by men (a man)
- c. entirely done by women (a woman)
- d. mostly done by women (a woman)
- e. done by men and women equally
- f. done by both parents equally
- g. done mostly by mothers
- h. done mostly by fathers
- i. not applicable
- j. other (specify)
- k. no response
- l. uncodable response

21. (con't.) METHOD OF ASSIGNMENT

1. whoever is available (volunteer)
2. by individual interest and/or skill
3. by sign up sheet
4. by regular rotation among all members
5. by regular rotation among some members, who?
6. by assignment from one person, who?
7. by assignment from small group, who?
8. on permanent or long-term basis
9. by lot
10. other (specify)

22. Has the pattern of responsibility for any of the activities on the preceding page changed over time?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, how and why? _____

23. Could you summarize briefly either general or specific activities which you never or rarely did before joining the commune, but do now?

If this commune has children, please answer the rest of the questionnaire.

24. Has this commune specifically discussed the socialization of its children regarding sex roles?

Yes _____

No _____

25. How satisfied are you on the whole, with the way in which socialization of children regarding sex roles has developed in this commune?

1	2	3	4	5
very				very
dissatisfied				satisfied

a. Could you share what your major satisfactions and dissatisfactions are ? _____

26. At points where commune children are involved with the larger society, do they come up against standards and values regarding sex roles which are different from those they have learned in the commune ?

Yes _____

No _____

a. If yes, what kinds of differences are involved ? _____

b. If yes, how do children respond to these differences ? _____

27. If you are a parent and your child is resident, with whom does responsibility for care and for financial support rest ?

	responsibility for care		financial support	
	under 2	2 - school age	school age - 12	
both parents equally				
mother				
father				
entire commune				
non-resident parent				
resident parent's partner				
other (specify)				

28. Do you see the disciplining of children as a communal or
parental function ?

communal _____

parental _____

29. Who actually disciplines children ?

mother _____

father _____

both parents equally _____

person involved in _____

incident _____

adults in consultation _____

with parents _____

entire group _____

other (specify) _____

30. Do you think that disciplining of children is fairly consistent ?

Yes _____

No _____

APPENDIX C

INTRODUCTION OF RESEARCH TO GROUPS

[Notes for introduction of ourselves and the research material - for personal use or in letters requesting permission to visit and survey]

In taking on this project we realize we are asking a good deal of members of communes. We are strangers, and we are asking people to allow us into the privacy of their homes and lives. As you can imagine, we have a lot of scared feelings ourselves about doing this. We really would never have the nerve to consider asking commune members to so share themselves and to give the time involved if we did not genuinely feel that what we hope to experience and learn as persons and as social workers would make us better able to be helpful to other persons with whom we may work.

Both of us are personally and professionally committed to an effort to understand as many as possible of the options in life styles available to people in our current messed up society. We recognize there are all kinds of significant factors in communal life that could be considered. Our biggest problem has been to curb our enthusiasm and recognize the limitations of time and our student condition. We've focused on sex roles mainly because we know how urgent this concern is for many people right now and because we see this factor as having possible implications for other aspects of family and general social life. We recognize an element of bias in two women working on this subject.

There are a few specific areas which we'd like to clarify.

1. Commune members would be free not to answer specific questions which they might prefer not to. It would be up to them whether or not to offer reasons for such a preference.

2. Responses would be held both confidential and anonymous. It would not even be necessary for members to identify themselves by name if they prefer not to.

3. We would be very happy to share the results - whatever we end up with - to whatever degree participants would find it useful or interesting.

4. We are very open to questions or suggestions. We realize there may well be areas of relevant facts or feelings which we have missed in preparing these questions. This is another part of what we want to learn.

5. The questionnaire is long, and we're open as to how it can best be handled practically. We can meet with individuals at their convenience or can sit down with a group. We'd like each group to say how they would feel most comfortable. We would like to be present when answers are being given, in case of questions and also to provide some similarity in collecting of information from various groups.

We are very excited by the reading we have been doing about communal life and by the persons with whom we have already talked. We know we are amateurs in research and that we are very dependent on the patience

and good humor of those who are willing to help us in this task. We look forward to growth as persons and in our work through this experience, and most especially through the persons whom we hope to meet.

APPENDIX D

LIST OF VARIABLES

Information related to individual respondents

Age
 Sex
 Children
 Couple relationship
 Educational level
 Occupation
 Perceptions of reason for formation
 Personal reasons for joining
 Length of time in household
 Prior similar experience
 Perceptions of reasons for leaving
 Intent to remain
 Discussion of sex roles during formative period
 Frequency of ongoing discussion of sex roles
 Satisfaction with decisions
 Satisfaction with development of roles
 Perception of decisions becoming reality
 Perception of potential unique influence
 Expected differences in sex roles from nuclear family
 Response to conflicts with society over sex roles
 Change in sex role ideals
 Perception of actual task division and methods of assignment
 Change in task division
 New activities undertaken

Information related to cooperative households

Duration of household
 Continuity of household
 Original size
 Changes in membership
 Composition of membership
 Couple relationships
 Urban-rural designation
 Connectional status
 Membership criteria
 Openness to new members
 Living arrangements and facilities
 Ownership of property
 Financial support of household
 Income producing work
 Performance of common tasks
 Household meetings

APPENDIX E
CODING CATEGORIES

Original categories

Commune information

Question 12	financial personal interest in joining prior friendship mutual compatability certain needed skill similar values (shared ideology, like philosophy of life style) working together on common task other no response
Question 13	need of group presence of criteria for belonging other no response
Question 21	those who work around commune mother with small child(ren) persons with small or potential income handicapped (physical or mental) responsible for service functions outside the commune other no response
Question 23a	weekly or more about once a month vague - do meet often vague - not often by need other no response
Question 23b	maintenance of property food preparation outside job cooperative craft activity outside service project political activity child(ren) related project social and/or recreational activity other no response

Question 24 how: less frequently
 more frequently
 other
 no response
 why: things got organized
 group cohesiveness adequate without meetings
 lack of interest
 meetings were negative
 other
 no response

Question 26 parents
 mothers
 fathers
 other commune adults
 outside teachers
 older children
 other
 no response

Question 27 not coded - responses to be used for observations

Respondent information

Question 7 values
 personal growth
 growth in relationships
 emotional support from group
 ecology
 good for children
 good for parent rearing child(ren)
 economics
 escape
 as an experiment
 living close to land
 lessening household burdens
 other
 no response

Question 8 all of categories for no. 7 plus
 a personal relationship
 adventure

Question 11 personal conflicts
 difference in philosophy
 intensity of encounters

Question 11 (con't.)

need for more personal control
 unsuccessful couple relationship
 differences over child rearing
 changing goals
 external circumstances
 lack of commitment to group
 desire for more contact with outside world
 illness
 can't adapt to a new life style
 disappointment in expectations
 other
 no response

Question 13b & 13d

issues: household responsibilities
 parenting
 employment
 women learn to do traditional male skills and chores
 emotional roles
 observation of existing sex roles
 other
 no response
 (note: above may be given in various combinations)
 decisions: to avoid standardized stereotyped roles
 to learn to employ opposite sex role
 to start consciousness raising groups
 to reinforce standard roles
 to play it by ear
 other
 no response

Question 14b same as question 13b

Question 15b same as question 13b

Question 15d ideology
 commitment
 interpersonal support
 specific awareness training
 group expectations
 strong leadership
 other
 no response

Question 15e previous life experience
 social pressure

Question 15e (con't.)

social structure
 lack of communication
 internal differences of opinion
 internal practical difficulties
 other
 no response

Question 16b same as question 13b

Question 17a yes, how? as a model
 personal influence
 children who grow up in communal setting
 other
 no response

Question 17b no, why not ?too small
 change doesn't occur that fast
 lack of power
 lack of unity
 other
 no response

Question 18a same as question 13b

Question 19 aggressive - positive
 aggressive - negative
 passive - withdrawal (avoidance)
 passive - acceptance
 other
 no response

Question 20a more equalitarian
 ideal has become more realistic
 increased personal comfort with more equal roles
 less equalitarian
 other
 no response

Question 20b same as question 15 d

Question 22a how? more differentiated by male and female
 less differentiated by male and female
 other
 no response

Question 22a (con't.)

why?

changing needs of commune
changing philosophy of commune
practical considerations
other
no response

Question 23 same as question 22a, how section

Question 25a . presence of models
absence of models
differences among adults re standards
reversion to patterns of upbringing of adults
inability of communal experience to prepare children to maintain
standards outside
other
no response

Question 26a dress
 hygiene
 tasks
 occupational emphasis
 text books

Question 26b same as question 19

Revisions in categories

Commune information

Question 12	addition clarification	decision of group working together on common task is internal
-------------	---------------------------	--

Question 13

addition	availability of space
change	need of group to usefulness to group

Question 23b change maintenance of property to building and maintenance

Respondent information

Question 5 categories were delineated later as they were seen as fairly standardized categories as follows:

proprietors, owners, managers

Question 5 (con't.)

professional
semi-professional were collapsed
clerical and service
skilled (including artisans)
craftpersons considered as sub category
unskilled
(skilled and unskilled divided farm and nonfarm)
other
no response

Question 7	change	emotional support from group and growth in relationships collapsed and was redivided into two new categories, to live as a group and focus on support
	clarification	values are conscious and deliberate

Question 8 same as question 7

Question 11	change	personal conflicts to interpersonal conflicts
	addition	need for more privacy
	change	lack of commitment to lack of commitment to group
	clarification	changing goals are personal goals
	addition	dissatisfied with expectations

Question 13b issues:

- addition general roles
- addition issue not listed
- change collapse observations into other categories

decisions:

- change + - 0 $\oplus$ $\otimes$ $\boxtimes$ (the key for symbol definition is given with each table where used)
- addition decision not listed

Question 14b same as question 13b

Question 15b change satisfactions and dissatisfactions were merely differentiated rather than coded

Question 16b same as question 15b

Question 15d	addition	commonality of group members
	addition	personal growth and maturation
	change	group expectations to group expectations and agreement

Question 17a	addition addition	not specified as an alternative
Question 18a	same changes as 13 b addition addition addition addition	decision making sexual behavior cross-sex relationships (friendships) direction of changes
Question 19	change change addition clarification	aggressive - positive to assertive aggressive - negative to aggressive not a problem passive withdrawal includes ignoring
Question 20a	change	omit increased comfort with more equal roles
Question 21	Degree of structure was obtained by collapsing answers given under method of assignment. (See Appendix B) The resultant categories were based on the researchers' judgment. The categories were collapsed as follows: 1. more structured, responses 3 - 8 2. less structured, responses 1, 2 & 9	
	addition	added the category of "consensus" because of the large number of times which this was given as "other"
Question 22a	how: change addition addition clarification why: addition	to + 0 - (the key for symbol definition is given for each table where used) couldn't get cooperation individual preferences practical considerations includes skills group consciousness

TABLES

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF MONTHS COMMUNE HAD BEEN IN EXISTENCE
AS OF SEPTEMBER 1974

Number of Months	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 6	2	0	2
7 - 12	0	0	0
13 - 18	3	2	5
19 - 24	3	0	3
25 - 30	2	1	3
31 - 36	2	0	2
37 - 42	0	2	2
43 - 48	0	0	0
49 - 54	0	0	0
55 - 60	0	1	1
7 Years	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 2

WHETHER OR NOT COMMUNE HAS BEEN IN CONTINUOUS
EXISTENCE SINCE FOUNDED

Whether or Not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	13	6	19
No	0	0	0
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 3
NUMBER OF ORIGINAL MEMBERS

Number of Original Members	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 5	6	2	8
6 - 10	5	2	7
11 - 15	1	2	3
No Response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 4
NUMBER OF ORIGINAL MEMBERS AND/OR
LATER JOINERS WHO HAVE LEFT

Number Left	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 3	9	3	12
4 - 6	3	1	4
7 - 9	0	1	1
10 - 12	0	1	1
No Response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 5

NUMBER OF MEMBERS WHO HAVE JOINED SINCE FORMATION

Number of New Members	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 3	8	3	11
4 - 6	3	1	4
7 - 9	0	0	0
10 - 12	0	0	0
13 - 15	1	1	2
16 - 18	0	1	1
No response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 6

NUMBER OF CURRENT MEMBERS WHO
HAVE BEEN IN RESIDENCE 6 MONTHS OR LONGERNumber in residence
6 months or longer

	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 3	2	0	2
4 - 6	6	1	7
7 - 9	3	2	5
10 - 12	1	2	3
13 - 15	0	0	0
16 - 18	0	0	0
19 - 21	0	1	1
150	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19N

TABLE 7

NUMBER OF CURRENT MEMBERS

Number of current members	Urban	Rural	Total
0 - 3	0	0	0
4 - 6	7	1	8
7 - 9	4	2	6
10 - 12	1	2	3
13 - 15	0	0	0
16 - 18	0	0	0
19 - 21	0	1	1
150 ¹	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N
1. Estimate			

TABLE 8

NUMBER OF MEN CURRENTLY RESIDENT

Number of men	Urban	Rural	Total
0	0	1	1
1	2	0	2
2	0	1	1
3	6	0	6
4	2	1	3
5	2	2	4
6	0	0	0
7	0	1	1
No response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 9

NUMBER OF WOMEN CURRENTLY RESIDENT

Number of women	Urban	Rural	Total
0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0
2	5	2	7
3	5	0	5
4	1	2	3
5	1	1	2
6	0	0	0
7	0	0	0
8	0	1	1
No response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 10

NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 14 CURRENTLY RESIDENT

Number of children under 14	Urban	Rural	Total
0	8	1	9
1	2	2	4
2	0	1	1
3	1	0	1
4	1	2	3
25 ¹	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N
1. Estimate			

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF OLDER CHILDREN
(OF COMMUNE ADULTS) CURRENTLY RESIDENT

Number of older children	Urban	Rural	Total
0	12	5	17
1	0	0	0
2	0	1	1
No response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 12

NUMBER OF MEMBERS IN ONGOING COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS

Number	Urban	Rural	Total
0	1	1	2
1	0	0	0
2	3	0	3
3	2	0	2
4	4	2	6
5	1	0	1
6	1	0	1
7	0	0	0
8	0	2	2
No response	1	1	2
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 13

NUMBER OF MEMBERS WHO ARE LEGALLY MARRIED

Number	Urban	Rural	Total
0	5	3	8
1	0	0	0
2	5	1	6
3	0	0	0
4	1	2	3
5	0	0	0
6	1	0	1
No response	1	0	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 14

SETTING OF COMMUNE

Setting	Total	
Urban	13	13
Rural	6	6
Total	19	19 N

TABLE 15

CONNECTIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNES

Connections	Urban	Rural	Total
A separate entity	10	5	15
Part of a larger network of communes	3	0	3
Receiving some direction from outside commune itself	0	1	1
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 16

CRITERIA FOR BELONGING

Criteria	Urban	Rural	Total
Financial	2	1	3
Personal interest in joining	2	3	5
Prior friendship	3	0	3
Mutual compatibility	2	1	3
Certain needed skill	0	0	0
Similar values	8	1	9
Working together on common task	1	1	2
Decision of the group	4	2	6
Other	5	1	6
No response	0	0	0
Total	27	10	37 ¹
1. Multiple answers were given in many cases.			

TABLE 17

WHETHER OR NOT COMMUNE IS INTERESTED IN NEW MEMBERS

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	8	5	13
No	5	1	6
No response	1	0	1
Total	14	6	20 ¹
1. One group answered yes and no.			

TABLE 18

FACTORS AFFECTING INTEREST IN NEW MEMBERS

Factors	Urban	Rural	Total
Usefulness to the group	1	2	3
Presence of criteria for belonging ¹	1	0	1
Availability of space	7	1	8
Other	0	2	2
No response	4	2	6
Total	13	7	20 ²
1. This refers to criteria listed in Table 16.			
2. One group had two answers.			

TABLE 19
WHERE COUPLES LIVE

Where	Urban	Rural	Total
In separate houses or apartments	0	6	6
In a single house	11	0	11
Other	0	0	0
No response	2	0	2
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 20
WHERE SINGLE PERSONS LIVE

Where	Urban	Rural	Total
In separate houses or apartments	0	5	5
In a single house	12	0	12
Other	0	0	0
No response	1	1	2 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N
1. One of these groups has no single persons.			

TABLE 21
NATURE OF GROUPS' FACILITIES 1

Nature of	cooking	eating	bathing	laundry	relaxing	Total
Separate by couple or family	0/1	0/1	1/2	0/0	2/4	3/8 = 11
Separate for individual single persons	0/0	0/0	2/0	0/0	4/2	6/2 = 8
Communal for single persons	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0 = 0
Communal for all	13/6	13/6	11/6	12/6	12/5	61/29 = 90
Other	0/0	0/0	1/0	1/0	0/0	2/0 = 2
Total	13/7	13/7	15/8	13/6	18/11	72/39 = 111
Total	20	20	23	19	29	111 ²

1. Urban/Rural indicates manner in which divided.
 2. Multiple answers were given in some cases.

TABLE 22
WHERE CHILDREN SLEEP

Where	Urban	Rural	Total
In a special children's house	0	0	0
In a room near parent(s)	1	3	4
In parent (s)' room	1	1	2
Other	3	2	5
No response	8	0	8 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N

1. None of these groups have children resident.

TABLE 23

WHETHER OR NOT CHILDREN HAVE BEEN BORN TO
MEMBERS SINCE FORMATION OF THE COMMUNE

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	1	4	5
No	12	2	14
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 24

WHETHER OR NOT THE COMMUNE OWNS PROPERTY

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	5	6	11
No	8	0	8
Total	13	9	19 N

TABLE 25

HOW PROPERTY WAS OBTAINED

How	Urban	Rural	Total
As a gift	0	0	0
From members' contributions	1	3	4
Purchased by one member	0	1	1
Purchased by one family	0	0	0
Other	4	3	7
No response	8	0	8 ¹
Total	13	7	20 ²
1. Eight groups own no property. 2. One group answered in two categories.			

TABLE 26

HOW PROPERTY IS HELD

How	Urban	Rural	Total
In trust	0	0	0
As a corporation	0	2	2
By individual (s)	1	2	3
Jointly by all adults	2	2	4
Other	2	4	6
No response	8	0	8 ¹
Total	13	10	23 ²
1. Eight groups did not answer as they have no property.			
2. Several groups gave more than one answer.			

TABLE 27

HOW PROPERTY WOULD BE DISPOSED OF
IF COMMUNE WERE TO DISBAND

How	Urban	Rural	Total
Sold and proceeds distributed equally	0	0	0
Haven't decided	3	0	3
Donated to non-profit organization	0	1	1
Shares sold to one or more members	0	0	0
Other	2	6	8
No response	8	0	8 ¹
Total	13	7	20 ²
1. Eight groups did not answer as they have no property.			
2. One group gave more than one answer.			

TABLE 28

WHETHER OR NOT THOSE GROUPS HAVING NO
PROPERTY PLAN TO OWN PROPERTY IF THIS IS POSSIBLE IN THE FUTURE

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	5	0	5
No	1	0	1
Not sure	1	0	1
No response	6	6	12 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N
1. Eleven of these groups own property.			

TABLE 29

HOW FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR SUPPORT
OF THE COMMUNE ARE MADE

How	Urban	Rural	Total
Equally by all members	8	2	10
By ability to pay	2	2	4
Other	3	2	5
No response	1	0	1
Total	14	6	20 ¹
1. One group gave two answers.			

TABLE 30

WHETHER OR NOT CERTAIN PERSONS ARE
EXEMPT FROM FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	4	1	5
No	8	4	12
No response	2	1	3 ¹
Total	14	6	20 ²

1. Two of these were from the pre-test where this question was not included

2. One group answered yes and no.

TABLE 31

ON WHAT BASIS CERTAIN PERSONS ARE
EXEMPT FROM FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

On what basis	Urban	Rural	Total
Mothers with small children	0	0	0
Persons with smaller potential income	1	0	1
Handicapped	0	0	0
Responsible for service outside commune	3	0	3
Other	0	1	1
No response	9	5	14 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N

1. All of these groups either did not answer or answered no to the question of whether certain persons are exempt from financial contributions.

TABLE 32

KINDS OF INCOME PRODUCING WORK
DONE BY MEN AND WOMEN ¹

Kinds	Men	Women	Total
Paid jobs in outside community	24/16	20/12	44/28 = 72
Farming	0/0	0/5	0/5 = 5
Gardening	0/0	0/0	0/0 = 0
Crafts	0/5	0/4	0/9 = 9
Other	0/5	0/4	0/9 = 9
Total	24/26	20/25	44/51 = 95 ²
Total	50	45	95

1. Urban/Rural indicates manner in which divided.
2. Multiple answers occurred in many cases. No income producing work was indicated for many respondents.

TABLE 33

WHETHER OR NOT THE ENTIRE COMMUNE GETS
TOGETHER TO PERFORM A COMMON TASK

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	12	4	16
No	1	2	3
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 34

HOW OFTEN THE ENTIRE COMMUNE GETS
TOGETHER TO PERFORM A COMMON TASK

How often	Urban	Rural	Total
Weekly or more often	5	1	6
About monthly	2	0	2
Vague (but do meet-often)	1	1	2
Vague (but do meet - not often)	2	1	3
By need	0	1	1
Other	2	0	2
No response	1	2	3 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N
1. Three groups did not respond as they do not get together for this purpose .			

TABLE 35

TASKS WHICH THE ENTIRE GROUP GETS TOGETHER
TO PERFORM COMMONLY

Tasks	Urban	Rural	Total
Social and/or recreational activity	7	1	8
Building and property maintenance	9	2	11
Food preparation	1	0	1
Outside job	0	1	1
Cooperative craft activity	0	0	0
Outside service project	2	0	2
Political activity	1	0	1
Child-related project	0	0	0
Other	6	2	8
No response	1	2	3
Total	27	8	33 ¹
1. Several groups gave multiple answers.			

TABLE 36

HOW OFTEN GROUP MEETINGS ARE HELD
IN WHICH ENTIRE COMMUNE GETS TOGETHER
TO DISCUSS COMMON CONCERNS

How often	Urban	Rural	Total
Never	0	0	0
Daily	0	0	0
Weekly	5	1	6
Biweekly	1	1	2
Monthly	1	0	1
Other	6	4	10
Total	13	6	19

TABLE 37

WHETHER OR NOT ATTENDANCE IS GENERALLY
EXPECTED AT COMMUNE MEETINGS

Whether or not	Urban	Rural	Total
Yes	11	4	15
No	0	0	0
Happens when everyone is available	0	1	1
No response	2	1	3 ¹
Total	13	6	19 N
1. Question was not included in pre-test.			

TABLE 38

HOW THE PATTERN OF GROUP MEETINGS HAS CHANGED,
IF IT HAS CHANGED

How	Urban	Rural	Total
Less frequently	4	4	8
More frequently	1	0	1
Other	1	0	1
No response	7	2	9
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 39

WHY THE PATTERN OF GROUP MEETINGS HAS CHANGED,
IF IT HAS CHANGED (FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED LESS FREQUENTLY)

Why	Urban	Rural	Total
Things got organized	1	2	3
Group cohesiveness adequate without meetings	0	0	0
Lack of interest	1	0	1
Meetings were negative	0	2	2
Other	1	1	2
No response	10	1	11
Total	13	6	19 N

TABLE 40

WHY THE PATTERN OF GROUP MEETINGS HAS CHANGED, IF
IT HAS CHANGED (FOR THOSE WHO ANSWERED MORE FREQUENTLY)

Why	Urban	Rural	Total
Needed to	1	0	1
Wanted to	1	0	1
No response	12	6	18
Total	13	6	20 ¹
I. One group that answered more frequently gave two reasons.			

TABLE 41

SEX OF RESPONDENTS

Sex	Number of respondents
Women	46
Men	48
Total	94 N

TABLE 42

AGE OF RESPONDENTS

Age	Women	Men	Total
0 - 5	0	0	0
6 - 10	0	1	1
11 - 15	0	1	1
16 - 20	4	4	8
21 - 25	17	20	37
26 - 30	18	17	35
31 - 35	2	2	4
36 - 40	2	0	2
41 - 45	1	0	1
46 - 50	0	1	1
51 - 55	1	1	2
56 - 60	1	1	2
61 - 65	0	0	0
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 43

WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENTS HAVE CHILDREN

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	12	12	24
No	34	33	67
No response	0	3	3
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 44

SEX AND AGE OF CHILDREN

Age	Girls	Boys	Total
Under 2	1	1	2
2 - 5	5	2	7
6 - 12	4	7	11
12 - 21	2	2	4
Total	12	12	24 N

TABLE 45

WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENTS ARE IN COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	25	29	54
No	19	12	31
No response	2	7	9
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 46

WHETHER OR NOT PARTNERS ARE RESIDENT IN THE COMMUNE,
FOR THOSE WHO ARE IN COUPLE RELATIONSHIPS

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	21	25	46
No	3	5	8
No response	22	18	40
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 47.

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL ATTAINED

Educational level ¹	Women	Men	Total
High school or less	5	3	8
Some college	13	18	31
College completed	13	9	22
Some graduate study	10	10	20
Completed graduate study	4	7	11
No response	1	1	2
Total	46	48	94 N
1. Three men and one woman also listed specialized training in addition to one of the other categories.			

TABLE 48

OCCUPATION(S) OF RESPONDENTS PRIOR TO JOINING THE COMMUNE

Occupations	Women	Men	Total
Proprietors, managers, owners	4	4	8
Professional, semi-professional	25	20	45
Clerical service	18	8	26
Skilled - nonfarm	5	11	16
Skilled - farm	0	2	2
Skilled - crafts	1	1	2
Unskilled - nonfarm	1	3	4
Unskilled - farm	1	1	2
Students	16	11	27
Family ¹	3	1	4
Other	6	4	10
No response	0	1	1
Total	80	67	147 ²
<p>1. Some respondents listed family roles as occupations, for example: husband, wife, son, daughter.</p> <p>2. Many respondents listed more than one occupation.</p>			

TABLE 49

PRESENT OCCUPATION OF RESPONDENTS

Occupations	Women	Men	Total
Proprietors, managers, owners	3	2	5
Professional, semi-professional	15	9	24
Clerical service	1	7	8
Skilled - nonfarm	11	7	18
Skilled - farm	6	5	11
Skilled - crafts	1	2	3
Unskilled - nonfarm	2	1	3
Unskilled - farm	0	2	2
Students	6	6	12
Family ¹	4	1	5
Other	13	10	23
No response	0	1	1
Total	62	53	115 ²
1. Some respondents listed family roles as occupations, for example: husband, wife, son, daughter. 2. Many respondents listed more than one occupation.			

TABLE 50

PRIMARY REASON(S) FOR FORMATION OF COMMUNE

Reasons	Women	Men	Total
Value system	13	10	23
Personal growth	6	10	16
To live as a group with compatible people	12	12	24
Focus on support from group and/or strengthening of relationships	14	16	30
Ecology	5	1	6
Good for children	3	1	4
Good for parent rearing children	0	0	0
Economics	15	10	25
Serving others	2	7	9
Escape	3	0	3
As an experiment	5	5	10
Living close to the land	6	4	10
Lessening of household burdens	3	1	4
Other	6	14	20
No response	4	2	6
Total	97	93	190 ¹
1. Multiple answers were given in many cases.			

TABLE 51

PRIMARY REASONS FOR INDIVIDUAL JOINING COMMUNE

Reasons	Women	Men	Total
Value system	6	6	12
Personal growth	11	11	22
To live as a group with compatible people	24	14	38
Focus on support from group and/or strengthening of relationships	13	14	27
Ecology	2	0	2
Good for children	3	2	5
Good for parent rearing children	0	0	0
Economics	9	11	20
Serving others	2	2	4
Escape	1	3	4
An an experiment	4	3	7
Living close to the land	7	5	12
Lessening of household burden	5	1	6
A personal relationship	13	22	35
Adventure	1	3	4
Other	3	5	8
No response	0	0	0
Total	104	102	206 ¹
1. Multiple answers were given in many cases.			

TABLE 52

NUMBER OF MONTHS LIVED IN THIS COMMUNE

Number of months	Women	Men	Total
0 - 5	13	6	19
6 - 10	0	8	8
11 - 15	10	8	18
16 - 20	3	5	8
21 - 25	5	4	9
26 - 30	5	2	7
31 - 35	2	1	3
36 - 40	1	4	5
No response	7	10	17 ¹
Total	46	48	94 N
1. Fourteen of these were from pre-test where this question was not included.			

TABLE 53

WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENTS HAVE LIVED IN OTHER COMMUNES

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	21	18	39
No	24	30	54
No response	1	0	1
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 54

NUMBER OF OTHER COMMUNES RESPONDENTS HAVE LIVED IN

Number of other communes	Women	Men	Total
1	7	9	16
2	8	4	12
3	1	1	2
4	2	1	3
5	0	0	0
6	1	1	2
7	0	0	0
8	0	0	0
9	0	1	1
Unspecified	2	1	3
No response	25	30	55
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 55

NUMBER OF MONTHS RESPONDENTS
HAVE LIVED IN OTHER COMMUNES

Number of months	Women	Men	Total
0 - 6	6	3	9
7 - 12	3	5	8
13 - 18	1	0	1
19 - 24	5	4	9
25 - 30	2	0	2
31 - 36	0	1	1
37 - 42	0	0	0
43 - 48	1	1	2
60	1	1	2
Unspecified	2	3	5
No response	25	30	55
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 56

PERCEPTIONS OF REASONS PEOPLE LEAVE COMMUNES

Reasons	Women	Men	Total
Interpersonal conflicts	33	26	59
Differences in philosophy	4	3	7
Intensity of encounters	3	1	4
Need for more personal control	4	5	9
Unsuccessful couple relationship	1	3	4
Differences over child-rearing	1	2	3
Changing goals	9	7	16
External circumstances	8	4	12
Lack of commitment to group	5	9	14
Desire for more contact with outside world	2	4	6
Can't adapt to new life-style	6	9	15
Disappointed with expectations	7	5	12
Need for more privacy	8	5	13
Other	9	11	20
No response	1	3	4
Uncodable	2	0	2
Total	103	97	200 ¹
1. Multiple answers were given in many cases.			

TABLE 57

LENGTH OF TIME RESPONDENTS PLAN
TO REMAIN IN THE COMMUNE

Length of time	Women	Men	Total
3 months or less	2	6	8
4 - 6 months	0	0	0
7 - 9 months	3	2	5
10 - 12 months	8	5	13
13 - 24 months	0	1	1
25 - 36 months	0	0	0
37 - 48 months	1	0	1
Indefinitely	24	24	48
Other	8	5	13
No response	0	5	5
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 58

PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER OR NOT SEX ROLES
WERE DISCUSSED IN THE FORMATIVE PERIOD

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	25	19	44
No	8	7	15
No response	13	22	35 ¹
Total	46	48	94 N
<p>1. We assume most of these respondents were not present at formation of the commune. Twenty-nine of the thirty-five answered the alternate question.</p>			

TABLE 59.

SPECIFIC ISSUES RAISED AND SPECIFIC DECISIONS
MADE REGARDING SEX ROLES DURING THE FORMATIVE PERIOD¹

Decisions ²							
Issues	+	0	-	⊕	⊖	⊗	Total
General roles	3/3	1/2	0/0	0/0	0/1	0/1	4/7 11
Household responsibilities	13/9	0/0	0/0	2/1	0/1	1/0	16/11 27
Parenting	1/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/1 2
Employment	1/2	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	1/2 3
Women learning . . . ³	3/4	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	0/0	4/4 8
Emotional roles	0/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/1 1
Issues not listed	1/0	1/1	0/0	0/0	1/0	0/0	3/1 4
Other	0/1	0/2	0/0	5/1	0/0	4/0	9/4 13
Total	22/21	2/5	0/0	8/2	1/2	5/1	38/31 69
Total	43	7	0	10	3	6	69
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided. 2. <u>Key for decisions</u> + decision to break down traditional male/female roles 0 neutral decision - decision to reinforce traditional male/female roles ⊕ no decisions made ⊖ no decisions listed ⊗ other 3. Women learning to do traditional male tasks. 4. Many respondents were not present during formative period. 5. Some respondents gave multiple answers.					No response 18/24		42 ⁴
					Uncodable 2/2		4
					Total		115 ⁵

TABLE 60

FREQUENCY OF DISCUSSION OF SIMILAR ISSUES

How frequently	Women	Men	Total
Very often	3	2	5
Fairly often	5	5	10
Occasionally	9	11	20
Rarely	16	9	25
Never	3	0	3
No response	10	21	31
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 62

FREQUENCY OF DISCUSSION OF SEX ROLES
(RESPONDENTS WHO MOVED IN AFTER FORMATION OF COMMUNE)

How frequently	Women	Men	Total
Very often	2	2	4
Fairly often	1	1	2
Occasionally	4	6	10
Rarely	4	5	9
Never	2	2	4
No response	33	32	65 ¹
Total	46	48	94 N

1. Most of those who did not respond were present during formative period.

TABLE 64

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DECISIONS REGARDING SEX ROLES

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men	Total
Very dissatisfied (1)	1	0	1
(2)	4	1	5
(3)	2	5	7
(4)	11	13	24
Very satisfied (5)	16	14	30
No response	12	15	27
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 65

NUMBER OF SATISFACTIONS AND DISSATISFACTIONS
LISTED REGARDING DECISIONS

Number of satisfactions and dissatisfactions	Women	Men	Total
Satisfaction	38	31	69
Dissatisfaction	19	8	27
No response	14	16	30 ¹
Uncodable	0	4	4
Total	71	59	130 ²

1. Most of those who did not respond saw no decisions as having been made.
2. Several respondents listed more than one satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction. Eleven men and nine women listed both a satisfaction and a dissatisfaction.

TABLE 66

EXTENT TO WHICH RESPONDENTS FEEL GROUP DECISIONS
REGARDING SEX ROLES HAVE BECOME REALITY

Extent	Women	Men	Total
Not at all (1)	0	0	0
(2)	2	3	5
(3)	2	3	5
(4)	10	12	22
Very much (5)	12	8	20
No response	20	22	42 ¹
Total	46	48	94
1. Most of those who did not respond saw no decisions as having been made.			

TABLE 67

PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT FACTORS AIDED PROCESS
OF GROUP DECISIONS BECOMING REALITY

Factors	Women	Men	Total
Strong leadership	0	1	1
Ideology	0	1	1
Commitment	8	4	12
Interpersonal support	10	4	14
Specific awareness training	2	1	3
Group expectations or agreement	9	8	17
Commonality of group members	0	2	2
Personal growth and maturation	0	0	0
Other	8	10	18
No response	19	22	41 ¹
Uncodable	1	1	2
Total	57	54	111 ²
1. Most of those who did not respond saw no decisions as having been made. 2. Multiple answers were given in a few cases.			

TABLE 68

PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT FACTORS HINDERED THE PROCESS
OF GROUP DECISIONS BECOMING REALITY

Factors	Women	Men	Total
Previous life experience	8	8	16
Social pressure	0	0	0
Social structure	1	1	2
Lack of commitment	1	0	1
Internal differences of opinion	1	2	3
Internal practical difficulties	4	4	8
Other	7	7	14
No response	24	30	54 ¹
Uncodable	2	0	2
Total	48	52	100 ²
1. Most of those who did not respond saw no decisions as having been made. 2. Multiple answers were given in a few cases.			

TABLE 69

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DEVELOPMENT OF SEX ROLES,
(WHERE NO DECISIONS WERE MADE)

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men	Total
Very dissatisfied (1)	0	0	0
(2)	4	0	4
(3)	5	6	11
(4)	7	6	13
Very satisfied (5)	4	6	10
No response	26	30	56 ¹
Total	46	48	94
1. Most of those who did not respond to this question, responded to the alternative question where decisions had been made.			

TABLE 70

NUMBER OF SATISFACTIONS AND DISSATISFACTIONS LISTED
REGARDING DEVELOPMENT OF SEX ROLES
(WHERE NO DECISIONS WERE MADE)

Number of satisfactions and
dissatisfactions

	Women	Men	Total
Satisfaction	11	10	21
Dissatisfaction	9	4	13
No response	33	34	67 ¹
Uncodable	1	2	3
Total	54	50	104 ²

1. Most of those who did not respond saw decisions as having been made
2. A few respondents listed more than one satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction. Two men and four women listed both a satisfaction and a dissatisfaction.

TABLE 71

PERCEPTIONS OF WHETHER OR NOT COMMUNES
POTENTIALLY HAVE A UNIQUE INFLUENCE ON DEVELOPMENT
OF SEX ROLES IN THE LARGER SOCIETY

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	38	37	75
No	4	8	12
No response	7	3	10
Total	49 ¹	48	97 ¹
1. Three women answered both yes and no.			

TABLE 72

PERCEPTIONS OF HOW COMMUNES POTENTIALLY HAVE A UNIQUE
INFLUENCE ON THE DEVELOPMENT
OF SEX ROLES IN THE LARGER SOCIETY

Perceptions of how	Women	Men	Total
Not specified	8	7	15
As a model	7	7	14
Personal influence	3	2	5
Children who grow up there	3	0	3
As an alternative	19	17	36
Other	5	0	5
No response	3	14	17
Uncodable	4	1	5
Total	52	48	100 ¹
1. A few respondents listed multiple answers.			

TABLE 73

WHAT KINDS OF DIFFERENCES
(IN WHAT AREAS AND IN WHAT DIRECTION) RESPONDENTS EXPECTED
IN SEX ROLES FROM THE TRADITIONAL NUCLEAR FAMILY¹

Area	Direction ²			Total	
	+	0	-		
General roles	9/22	1/1	0/0	10/23	33
Household responsibilities	30/11	0/0	1/0	31/11	42
Parenting	9/4	0/0	0/0	9/4	13
Employment	7/2	0/0	0/0	7/2	9
Women learning . . . ³	9/2	0/0	0/0	9/2	11
Emotional roles	3/2	0/0	0/0	3/2	5
Decision - making	5/2	0/0	1/0	6/2	8
Sexual behavior	6/2	0/0	0/0	6/2	8
Cross - sexual friendships	2/1	0/0	0/0	2/1	3
Other	1/1	2/2	0/2	3/5	8
	81/49	3/3	2/2	86/54	140
Total	130	6	4	140	
				No response	13
					153 ⁴

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided .

2. Key for direction

+ differences in direction of less differentiation

0 unspecified or neutral

- differences in direction of more differentiation

3. Women learning to do traditional male tasks .

4. Many respondents gave multiple answers.

TABLE 74

TYPE OF RESPONSE RESPONDENTS REPORT THAT THEY GIVE
IN SITUATIONS WHERE CONFLICT
EXISTS BETWEEN THE LARGER SOCIETY
AND THEIR VALUES REGARDING SEX ROLES

Type of response	Women	Men	Total
Assertive	13	13	26
Aggressive	7	4	11
Passive - withdrawal	14	12	26
Passive - acceptance	1	5	6
Not a problem	7	4	11
Other	2	8	10
No response	8	11	19
Uncodable	3	1	4
Total	55	58	113 ¹
1. Several respondents listed more than one response depending on the type of conflict.			

TABLE 75

WHETHER OR NOT RESPONDENTS REPORT THEIR IDEALS REGARDING
SEX ROLES HAVE CHANGED AS A RESULT OF COMMUNAL LIVING

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	20	17	37
No	21	21	42
No response	5	10	15
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 76

NATURE OF CHANGES IN IDEALS REGARDING SEX ROLES

Nature of changes	Women	Men	Total
More equal	12	11	23
Less equal	0	0	0
Ideal more realistic	2	1	3
Other	1	3	4
No response	27	27	54 ¹
Uncodable	4	6	10
Total	46	48	94 N
I. Most of those who did not respond did not see their ideals as having changed.			

TABLE 77

PERCEPTIONS OF WHAT LED TO CHANGES IN
IDEALS REGARDING SEX ROLES

What led to changes	Women	Men	Total
Strong leadership	0	0	0
Ideology	0	1	1
Commitment	0	1	1
Interpersonal support	4	5	9
Specific awareness training	0	1	1
Group expectation and/or agreement	3	2	5
Commonality of group members	1	0	1
Personal growth and maturation	6	6	12
Other	6	4	10
No response	33	27	60 ¹
Uncodable	0	2	2
Total	53	49	102 ²
<p>1. Most of those who did not respond did not see their ideals as having changed.</p> <p>2. Multiple answers were given in a few cases.</p>			

TABLE 78

DEGREE OF STRUCTURE IN METHOD OF TASK ASSIGNMENT ¹

Commune ⁴	Degree of structure ²					Total
	More structure ³	Less structure	Consensus	Other	No response	
1	3/6	60/41	1/0	12/10	16/0	92/57
2	10/8	22/33	0/0	7/5	14/11	53/57
3	0/8	10/31	4/10	0/9	5/22	19/80
4	9/0	29/0	0/0	1/0	16/0	55/0
5	7/5	18/33	0/1	1/5	14/16	40/60
6	5/9	4/11	0/2	5/18	6/20	20/60
8	7/4	15/31	0/0	7/0	11/5	40/40
9	17/9	12/12	1/0	12/13	18/6	60/40
10	3/3	16/16	0/0	6/2	15/19	40/40
11	12/7	16/3	0/0	4/5	28/5	60/20
12	23/47	47/64	16/13	2/11	8/46	96/181
13	6/4	17/26	1/1	1/0	15/45	40/76
14	4/1	42/8	5/2	15/0	34/9	100/20
15	2/6	34/44	0/0	4/22	0/8	40/80
16	7/8	5/15	1/3	2/0	5/11	20/37
17	3/0	44/0	0/0	8/0	4/0	59/0
18	11/15	7/8	0/0	2/2	20/12	40/37
19	10/15	13/9	0/0	3/6	12/10	38/40

1. Women/Men indicates manner in which divided.

2. See Appendix E p.135.

3. This table is a composite and does not list tasks separately as Tables 87-104.

4. As previously stated commune # 7 did not fill out questionnaire.

TABLE 79

WHETHER OR NOT THE PATTERN OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ACTIVITIES
LISTED ON THE GRID (QUESTION 21) HAS CHANGED OVER TIME

Whether or not	Women	Men	Total
Yes	17	21	38
No	18	11	29
No response	11	16	27
Total	46	48	94 N

TABLE 80

HOW THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THOSE ACTIVITIES LISTED ON THE
GRID (QUESTION 21) HAS CHANGED OVER TIME (IF IT HAS CHANGED)

How 1	Women	Men	Total
+	6	11	17
-	2	3	5
0	7	8	15
±	0	1 ³	1
+	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
No response	22	16	38
Uncodable	9	11	20 ²
Total	46	49	96 ³

1. Key for how

- + activities cross traditional sex lines.
- activities follow traditional sex lines.
- 0 activities are neutral.
- ± respondents listed combinations.
- +
-
- 0

2. Fourteen of these were from pre-test where question was not close enough to that on final questionnaire.

3. One male respondent listed two answers. The way in which this table is constructed by listing combinations, inflates the total.

TABLE 81

WHY THE PATTERN OF ACTIVITIES LISTED ON THE GRID (QUESTION 21)
HAS CHANGED OVER TIME (IF IT HAS CHANGED)

Why	Women	Men	Total
Could not get cooperation	0	0	0
Individual preferences	5	2	7
Changing needs of commune	0	0	0
Changing philosophy of commune	0	0	0
Practical considerations	3	4	7
Consciousness of group	1	4	5
Other	1	2	3
Not specified ¹	8	8	16
No response ²	27	25	52
Uncodable	2	4	6
Total	47	49	96 ³
1. Listed a change but did not specify. 2. Listed no change at all. 3. Two respondents listed two reasons.			

TABLE 82

DIRECTION OF NEW ACTIVITIES DONE SINCE JOINING THE COMMUNE.

Direction ¹	Women	Men	Total
+	25	23	48
-	12	11	23
0	15	18	33
±	10	6	16
+ 0	2	3	5
0	1	2	3
No response	7	6	13
Uncodable	1	1	2
Total	73	70	143 ²

1. Key for direction

- + activities cross traditional sex lines.
- 0 activities are neutral.
- activities follow traditional sex lines.
- + Respondents listed combinations.
- + " " "
- + " " "
- 0 " " "

2. Several respondents listed more than one answer. In addition the way this table is constructed, by listing combinations, inflates the total.

TABLE 83

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DECISIONS REGARDING
SEX ROLES (WITH CATEGORIES COLLAPSED)

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men	Total
Very satisfied (4) - (5)	27	27	54
Very dissatisfied (1) - (3)	7	6	13
Total	34	33	67

TABLE 84

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DEVELOPMENT OF SEX ROLES
(WHERE NO DECISIONS WERE MADE) (WITH CATEGORIES COLLAPSED)

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men	Total
Very satisfied (4) - (5)	11	12	23
Very dissatisfied (1) - (3)	9	6	15
Total	20	18	38

TABLE 85

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DECISIONS REGARDING SEX
ROLES BY PERCENTAGES OF THOSE WHO RESPONDED

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men
Very dissatisfied (1)	3% (1)	0% (0)
(2)	12% (4)	3% (1)
(3)	6% (2)	15% (5)
(4)	32% (11)	40% (13)
Very satisfied (5)	47% (16)	42% (14)
Total	100% (34)	100% (33)

TABLE 86

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH DEVELOPMENT OF SEX ROLES
(WHERE NO DECISIONS WERE MADE) BY PERCENTAGES OF
THOSE WHO RESPONDED

Level of satisfaction	Women	Men
Very dissatisfied (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)
(2)	20% (4)	0% (0)
(3)	25% (5)	33% (6)
(4)	35% (7)	33% (6)
Very satisfied (5)	20% (4)	33% (6)
Total	100% (20)	99% (18) ¹
1. Each was actually 33.333...% .		

TABLE 87

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 1**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		2/0			3/3							
Cleans the house				3/2	2/1							
Plans meals				1/0	2/3					2/0		
Cares for sick children				1/1	1/1	1/1	1/0		1/0			
Speaks for group to outsiders					4/3				1/0			
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					4/3				1/0			
Calls group meetings					2/3				1/0	2/0		
Cares for livestock				1/2	1/1				1/0	2/0		
Washes dishes					3/3				1/0	1/0		
Decides on who may join					3/3				1/0		1/0	
Cooks				1/0	2/3				1/0	1/0		
Gardens				1/0	2/3				1/0	1/0		
Prepares food for canning, freezing					0/1				1/0			
Keeps motor vehicles running		4/3								1/0		
Change diapers				2/2		2/1			1/0			
Pays bills				1/0	2/2				1/0	1/1		
Buys groceries				1/1	2/2				1/0	1/0		
Farms					3/3				1/0	1/0		
Puts children to bed			1/0	1/2		1/1	1/0		1/0			
Holds and distributes communal money ³												
Total	0/0	6/3	2/0	16/12	35/38	4/3	2/0	0/0	15/0	13/1	1/0	0/0
Total	0	9	2	28	73	7	2	0	15	14	1	0
TOTAL											94/57	151

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

3. This question was not on the pretest.

TABLE 88

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 2**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		2/2			1/1							
Cleans the house					3/3							
Plans meals				2/2	1/1							
Cares for sick children					2/3	1/0						
Speaks for group to outsiders					3/3							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					3/3							
Calls group meetings				2/0	0/2					1/1		
Cares for livestock									2/1		1/2	
Washes dishes				2/0	1/3							
Decides on who may join					0/1				1/1	1/0	1/1	
Cooks					3/3							
Gardens					3/3							
Prepares food for canning, freezing				2/1	1/1						0/1	
Keeps motor vehicles running		1/3							1/0	1/0		
Change diapers			1/3	2/0	2/3						1/0	
Pays bills												
Buys groceries				2/3							1/0	
Farms					0/1				1/1	1/0	1/1	
Puts children to bed					2/3	1/0						
Holds and distributes communal money ³												
Total	0/0	3/5	1/3	12/6	25/34	2/0	0/0	0/0	5/3	4/1	5/5	0/0
Total	0	8	4	18	59	2	0	0	8	5	10	0
TOTAL												57/57
												114

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

3. This question was not on the pretest.

TABLE 89

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 3¹**

Who ²

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		1/4										
Cleans the house					1/4							
Plans meals					1/4							
Cares for sick children									0/2		0/1	1/1
Speaks for group to outsiders					1/4							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					1/4							
Calls group meetings					1/4							
Cares for livestock									0/3		1/1	
Washes dishes					1/4							
Decides on who may join					1/4							
Cooks					1/4							
Gardens				0/2	1/2							
Prepares food for canning, freezing				0/2	1/2							
Keeps motor vehicles running	1/2								0/2			
Change diapers									0/3		1/1	
Pays bills		1/2			0/2							
Buys groceries					1/4							
Farms									0/3		1/1	
Puts children to bed									0/3		1/1	
Holds and distributes communal money					1/3				0/1			
Total	1/2	2/6	0/0	0/4	12/45	0/0	0/0	0/0	0/16	0/1	4/5	1/1
Total	3	8	0	4	57	0	0	0	16	1	9	2
TOTAL											20/80	100

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 90

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 4¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		1/0			1/0					1/0		
Cleans the house			1/0	2/0								
Plans meals					3/0							
Cares for sick children								2/0			1/0	
Speaks for group to outsiders				1/0	2/0							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					3/0							
Calls group meetings					2/0			1/0				
Cares for livestock									2/0		1/0	
Washes dishes					3/0							
Decides on who may join					2/0						1/0	
Cooks					3/0							
Gardens		3/0										
Prepares food for canning, freezing		1/0									2/0	
Keeps motor vehicles running		1/0			2/0							
Change diapers									2/0		1/0	
Pays bills	1/0	1/0								1/0		
Buys groceries					3/0							
Farms									2/0		1/0	
Puts children to bed									2/0		1/0	
Holds and distributes communal money	1/0	1/0								1/0		
Total	2/0	8/0	1/0	3/0	24/0	0/0	0/0	0/0	11/0	3/0	8/0	0/0
Total	2	8	1	3	24	0	0	0	11	3	8	0
TOTAL											60/0	60

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 91

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 5**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		2/0			0/3							
Cleans the house				1/0	1/3							
Plans meals					1/1				1/0	0/2		
Cares for sick children					0/1				2/0		0/2	
Speaks for group to outsiders					2/2					0/1		
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent		0/2			2/0					0/1		
Calls group meetings		0/3			2/0							
Cares for livestock									2/1		0/2	
Washes dishes					2/3							
Decides on who may join	0/1	0/1			1/1					1/0		
Cooks					2/2					0/1		
Gardens				1/0	1/3							
Prepares food for canning, freezing			0/1	1/0					1/0		0/2	
Keeps motor vehicles running	0/3	2/0										
Change diapers					0/1				2/0		0/2	
Pays bills				1/0	1/2					0/1		
Buys groceries					2/2					0/1		
Farms									2/0		0/2	0/1
Puts children to bed					0/1				2/0		0/2	
Holds and distributes communal money	0/1	0/1			2/0					0/1		
Total	0/5	4/7	0/1	4/0	19/25	0/0	0/0	0/0	12/1	1/8	0/12	0/1
Total	5	11	1	4	44	0	0	0	13	9	12	1
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												40/60 TOTAL 100
2. Refer to key following Table 104.												

TABLE 92

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 6**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		1/1			0/2							
Cleans the house		1/1			0/2							
Plans meals					1/3							
Cares for sick children									1/0		0/3	
Speaks for group to outsiders		0/1			1/1						0/1	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					1/3							
Calls group meetings					1/2					0/1		
Cares for livestock									1/1		0/2	
Washes dishes		1/0			0/3							
Decides on who may join					1/3							
Cooks		1/0			0/3							
Gardens			0/3	1/0								
Prepares food for canning, freezing					0/2				1/0		0/1	
Keeps motor vehicles running					0/2					1/1		
Change diapers									1/1		0/2	
Pays bills		0/2			1/1							
Buys groceries	0/1	1/2										
Farms									1/1		0/2	
Puts children to bed									1/1		0/2	
Holds and distributes communal money		1/3										
Total	0/1	6/10	0/3	1/0	6/27	0/0	0/0	0/0	6/4	1/2	0/13	0/0
Total	1	16	3	1	33	0	0	0	10	3	13	0
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												20/60
2. Refer to key following Table 104.												80
TOTAL												

TABLE 93

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 8¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		2/2										
Cleans the house				1/1	1/1							
Plans meals				1/1	1/1							
Cares for sick children									1/2		1/0	
Speaks for group to outsiders		2/1			0/1							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent		2/1			0/1							
Calls group meetings		1/0			1/2							
Cares for livestock					1/1				0/1		1/0	
Washes dishes				2/0	0/2							
Decides on who may join					2/2							
Cooks				1/0	0/2						1/0	
Gardens		2/1			0/1							
Prepares food for canning, freezing			1/1	1/1								
Keeps motor vehicles running	1/1	1/1										
Change diapers			0/1						1/1		1/0	
Pays bills	1/0	1/2										
Buys groceries					2/2							
Farms		0/1							1/1		1/0	
Puts children to bed									1/1	0/1	1/0	
Holds and distributes communal money	1/0	1/2										
Total	3/1	12/11	1/2	6/3	8/16	0/0	0/0	0/0	4/6	0/1	6/0	0/0
Total	4	23	3	9	24	0	0	0	10	1	6	0
TOTAL											40/40	80

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 94

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 9**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house					3/1					0/1		
Cleans the house					3/2							
Plans meals					3/2							
Cares for sick children				0/1		1/1	1/0			1/0		
Speaks for group to outsiders					3/2							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					3/1							0/1
Calls group meetings					3/2							
Cares for livestock									1/0		2/2	
Washes dishes					3/2							
Decides on who may join					3/2							
Cooks					3/2							
Gardens				1/0					1/0		1/2	
Prepares food for canning, freezing					3/2							
Keeps motor vehicles running				1/0		1/1	1/0			0/1		
Change diapers					3/2							
Pays bills					3/2							
Buys groceries									1/0		2/2	
Farms												
Puts children to bed				1/0		0/2	2/0					
Holds and distributes communal money					3/2							
Total	0/0	0/0	0/0	3/1	42/26	2/4	4/0	0/0	3/0	1/2	5/6	0/1
Total	0	0	0	4	68	6	4	0	3	3	11	1
TOTAL											60/40	100

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 95

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 101**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	0/2	2/0										
Cleans the house					2/2							
Plans meals				2/1						0/1		
Cares for sick children									0/2		2 0	
Speaks for group to outsiders					2/2							
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent		0/1			2/0					0/1		
Calls group meetings					1/1				1/1			
Cares for livestock									1/2		1 0	
Washes dishes		0/1			2/1							
Decides on who may join					1/2						1 0	
Cooks				2/2								
Gardens					2/2							
Prepares food for canning, freezing									1/2		1/0	
Keeps motor vehicles running	0/1								1/0	1/0	0/1	
Change diapers									1/2		1/0	
Pays bills		1/1			1/0					0 1		
Buys groceries				1/1	1/1							
Farms									1/2		1/0	
Puts children to bed									1/2		1/0	
Holds and distributes communal money					1/0				1/1			0/1
Total	0/3	3/3	0/0	5/4	15/11	0/0	0/0	0/0	8/14	1 3	3/1	0/1
Total	3	6	0	9	26	0	0	0	22	-	9	1
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												40/40
2. Refer to key following Table 104.												80
Total												80

TABLE 96

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 11**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	1/0	2/1										
Cleans the house					2/1					1/0		
Plans meals					3/1							
Cares for sick children					2/1		1/0					
Speaks for group to outsiders					2/1						1/0	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					2/1						1/0	
Calls group meetings				1/0	1/0					1/1		
Cares for livestock									1/1		2/0	
Washes dishes					3/1							
Decides on who may join					3/1							
Cooks					3/1							
Gardens				1/0	1/0				0/1		1/0	
Prepares food for canning, freezing									0/1		3/0	
Keeps motor vehicles running					1/0				0/1		2/0	
Change diapers									0/1		3/0	
Pays bills					3/1							
Buys groceries			1/0	0/1	1/0						1/0	
Farms									0/1		3/0	
Puts children to bed			1/0	0/1	1/0	1/0						
Holds and distributes communal money			1/0		1/0						1/1	
Total	1/0	2/1	3/0	2/2	29/9	1/0	1/0	0/0	1/6	2/1	18/1	0/0
Total	1	3	3	4	38	1	1	0	7	3	19	0
TOTAL											60/20	80

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 97

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		0/2			4/6					1/0		
Cleans the house		0/1			5/7							
Plans meals					5/8							
Cares for sick children					3/2				1/4		1/2	
Speaks for group to outsiders					4/8				1/0			
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					4/8					1/0		
Calls group meetings					5/7						0/1	
Cares for livestock		4/7		1/0	0/1							
Washes dishes					5/8							
Decides on who may join					1/4					4/3	0/1	
Cooks					5/8							
Gardens				0/1	5/7							
Prepares food for canning, freezing				4/4	1/4							
Keeps motor vehicles running		3/5			1/3						1/0	
Change diapers				0/1	2/1				2/4		1/2	
Pays bills					4/6						1/2	
Buys groceries			1/1	2/3	2/4							
Farms					5/8							
Puts children to bed					0/1	2/0			2/4		1/3	
Holds and distributes communal money			0/1		2/5					3/2		
Total	0/0	7/15	1/2	7/9	63/106	2/0	0/0	0/0	6/12	9/5	5/11	0/0
Total	0	22	3	16	169	2	0	0	18	14	16	0
												100/160
												TOTAL 260

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 98

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 13¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	0/1	0/1			1/1					1/0	0/1	
Cleans the house				1/1	0/2					1/0	0/1	
Plans meals					2/3						0/1	
Cares for sick children						2/2			0/1		0/1	
Speaks for group to outsiders					2/2				0/1		0/1	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					2/2				0/1		0/1	
Calls group meetings					1/1				0/1		1/2	
Cares for livestock					2/3						0/1	
Washes dishes					2/3						0/1	
Decides on who may join					2/3						0/1	
Cooks					2/3						0/1	
Gardens					2/3						0/1	
Prepares food for canning, freezing					2/3						0/1	
Keeps motor vehicles running		2/2			0/1						0/1	
Change diapers					0/1	1/2	1/0				0/1	
Pays bills			2/0		0/2				0/1		0/1	
Buys groceries					2/2				0/1		0/1	
Farms					0/1				0/2		2/1	
Puts children to bed					0/1	2/2					0/1	
Holds and distributes communal money					2/2				0/1		0/1	
Total	0/1	2/3	2/0	1/1	24/39	5/6	1/0	0/0	0/9	2/0	3/21	0/0
Total	1	5	2	2	63	11	1	0	9	2	24	0
TOTAL											40/80	120

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 99

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	1/0	2/1			2/0							
Cleans the house			1/0	4/1								
Plans meals				3/0	1/0					1/1		
Cares for sick children									5/1			
Speaks for group to outsiders				2/0	2/0					1/1		
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					3/0				1/0	0/1	1/0	
Calls group meetings			1/0	1/0	1/0					2/1		
Cares for livestock									4/1		1/0	
Washes dishes				4/1	1/0							
Decides on who may join					5/1							
Cooks				3/0	1/0					1/1		
Gardens			3/0	1/1						1/0		
Prepares food for canning, freezing			1/0	2/0	1/0				0/1		1/0	
Keeps motor vehicles running					4/0					1/1		
Change diapers									4/1		1/0	
Pays bills			2/0		2/0					0/1	1/0	
Buys groceries				2/0	3/0					0/1		
Farms									4/1		1/0	
Puts children to bed									4/1		1/0	
Holds and distributes communal money			1/0		3/0					1/0	0/1	
Total	1/0	2/1	9/0	22/3	29/1	0/0	0/0	0/0	23/6	7/9	7/0	0/0
Total	1	3	9	25	30	0	0	0	29	16	7	0
100/20												120
TOTAL												

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 100

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN¹
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 15**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house		1/3			1/0					0/1		
Cleans the house				0/1	2/2					0/1		
Plans meals					2/3					0/1		
Cares for sick children					2/0	0/1		0/1		0/1	0/1	
Speaks for group to outsiders					2/3					0/1		
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					2/3					0/1		
Calls group meetings					2/3					0/1		
Cares for livestock		1/3			1/0					0/1		
Washes dishes			0/1		2/2					0/1		
Decides on who may join					2/3					0/1		
Cooks					2/3					0/1		
Gardens				0/1	2/2					0/1		
Prepares food for canning, freezing					2/3					0/1		
Keeps motor vehicles running				0/1	2/2					0/1		
Change diapers	1/1	1/2		1/3	1/0					0/1		
Pays bills										0/1		
Buys groceries					2/3					0/1		
Farms		1/2			1/1					0/1		
Puts children to bed		1/0			0/1			1/2		0/1		
Holds and distributes communal money					1/2			1/0		0/2		
Total	1/1	5/10	0/1	1/5	31/35	0/1	0/0	1/5	1/0	0/21	0/1	0/0
Total	2	15	1	6	66	1	0	6	1	21	1	0
TOTAL											40/80	120

1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.

2. Refer to key following Table 104.

TABLE 101

DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE¹

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	1/0				0/1						0/1	
Cleans the house				1/2								
Plans meals			1/1	0/1								
Cares for sick children							1/2					
Speaks for group to outsiders				0/1	1/0					0/1		
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					1/0					0/2		
Calls group meetings				0/1	1/0				0/1		0/1	
Cares for livestock											1/1	
Washes dishes		1/0			0/2							
Decides on who may join					1/0					0/2		
Cooks			1/1	0/1								
Gardens									0/1		1/1	
Prepares food for canning, freezing									0/1		1/1	
Keeps motor vehicles running		0/2			1/0							
Change diapers											1/2	
Pays bills					1/2							
Buys groceries				1/2								
Farms											1/2	
Puts children to bed					0/1	1/1						
Holds and distributes communal money					1/0					0/2		
Total	1/0	1/2	2/2	2/8	7/6	1/1	1/2	0/0	0/3	0/7	5/9	
Total	1	3	4	10	13	2	3	0	3	7	14	0
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided. 2. Refer to key following Table 104.												20/40 TOTAL 60

TABLE 102

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE 17**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house			3/0									
Cleans the house			3/0									
Plans meals			3/0									
Cares for sick children			2/0				1/0					
Speaks for group to outsiders			3/0									
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent			3/0									
Calls group meetings			3/0									
Cares for livestock			3/0									
Washes dishes			3/0									
Decides on who may join			3/0									
Cooks			3/0									
Gardens			3/0									
Prepares food for canning, freezing			3/0									
Keeps motor vehicles running			3/0									
Change diapers			1/0				2/0					
Pays bills			3/0									
Buys groceries			3/0									
Farms			3/0									
Puts children to bed			2/0				1/0					
Holds and distributes communal money			3/0									
Total			56/0				4/0					
Total			56				4					
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												60/0
2. Refer to key following Table 104.												TOTAL 60

TABLE 103

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house				1/1	1/1							
Cleans the house					2/2							
Plans meals					2/2							
Cares for sick children									2/1		0/1	
Speaks for group to outsiders		1/0			0/1				1/0		0/1	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					2/2							
Calls group meetings		0/1			2/1							
Cares for livestock									2/2			
Washes dishes					2/2							
Decides on who may join					0/1				2/1			
Cooks					2/2							
Gardens				1/0					1/2			
Prepares food for canning, freezing			1/0	1/2								
Keeps motor vehicles running		0/1			0/1				2/0			
Change diapers									2/1		0/1	
Pays bills					2/2							
Buys groceries					2/2							
Farms									2/1		0/1	
Puts children to bed									2/1		0/1	
Holds and distributes communal money					0/1				2/1			
Total	0/0	1/2	1/0	3/3	17/20	0/0	0/0	0/0	18/10	0/0	0/5	0/0
Total	0	3	1	6	37	0	0	0	28	0	5	0
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided. 2. Refer to key following Table 104.												TOTAL 40/40 80

TABLE 104

**DIFFERENT PERCEPTIONS OF MEN AND WOMEN
REGARDING DIVISION OF TASKS IN COMMUNE¹**

Who 2

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	0/1				2/1							
Cleans the house				1/0	1/2							
Plans meals				2/1	0/1							
Cares for sick children						1/2	1/0					
Speaks for group to outsiders		1/1							1/0		0/1	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent	0/1				2/1							
Calls group meetings			1/0	1/0	0/1						0/1	
Cares for livestock									2/1		0/1	
Washes dishes		1/1		1/0	0/1							
Decides on who may join					2/2							
Cooks												
Gardens		1/1			2/1	0/1						
					1/1							
Prepares food for canning, freezing					2/2							
Keeps motor vehicles running		0/1			1/0					1/0	0/1	
Change diapers						1/1			1/0		0/1	
Pays bills	1/2	1/0										
Buys groceries				0/1	2/1							
Farms									0/1		2/1	
Puts children to bed						2/2						
Holds and distributes communal money	0/2	2/0										
Total	1/6	6/4	1/0	7/3	13/14	4/5	1/0	0/0	4/2	1/0	2/6	0/0
Total	7	10	1	10	27	9	1	0	6	1	8	0
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												40/40
2. Refer to key following Table 104.												TOTAL 80

KEY TO TABLES 87 - 104WHO

- a. entirely done by men (a man)
- b. mostly done by men (a man)
- c. entirely done by women (a woman)
- d. mostly done by women (a woman)
- e. done by men and women equally
- f. done by both parents equally
- g. done mostly by mothers
- h. done mostly by fathers
- i. not applicable
- j. other (specify)
- k. no response
- l. uncodable response

TABLE 105

PERCEPTIONS BY WOMEN AND MEN OF WHETHER OR NOT
SEX ROLES WERE DISCUSSED IN THE FORMATIVE PERIOD
BY PERCENTAGES OF THOSE WHO RESPONDED

Whether or not	Women	Men
Yes	76% (25)	73% (19)
No	24% (8)	27% (7)
Total	100% (33)	100% (26)

TABLE 106

PERCEIVED TASK DIVISION BY MEN AND WOMEN IN URBAN COMMUNES¹Who²

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	2/3	15/11		1/1	10/9					1/1		
Cleans the house		1/1	2/0	9/2	16/22					1/0		
Plans meals				10/5	17/16				1/0	1/4		
Cares for sick children				0/1	4/5	3/3	3/0		13/8	1/0	4/7	1/1
Speaks for group to outsiders		4/3		3/0	18/17				2/0	1/2	1/3	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent	0/1	2/4			24/16				1/0	0/3	2/0	0/1
Calls group meetings		1/4	2/0	5/0	15/15				2/1	4/4	0/1	
Cares for livestock					1/1				18/14		10/10	
Washes dishes		2/2		9/1	18/22							
Decides on who may join	0/1	0/1			21/20				3/2	2/0	3/1	
Cooks		1/0		8/3	18/20					1/2	1/0	
Gardens		6/2	3/3	5/3	12/14				1/3	1/0	1/0	
Prepares food for canning, freezing		1/0	3/2	8/6	5/7				4/4		8/6	
Keeps motor vehicles running	2/7	5/6			11/5				4/3	5/2	2/2	
Change diapers			0/1	1/0	2/4	2/2	1/0		14/10	0/1	9/7	
Pays bills	3/2	5/7	3/3	3/0	13/10					1/3	1/0	
Buys groceries	0/1	1/2	1/0	5/6	20/14					0/2	2/0	
Farms		0/1			0/1				16/12	1/0	12/10	0/1
Puts children to bed			1/0	1/1	3/4	1/2	2/0		14/10	0/1	7/7	
Holds and distributes communal money ³	2/3	5/6	2/0		11/6				4/2	1/3	1/1	0/1
Total	9/18	49/50	17/9	68/29	239/228	6/7	6/0	0/0	97/68	21/28	64/55	1/4
Total	27	99	26	97	467	13	6	0	165	49	119	5
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.										TOTAL		
2. Refer to key following Table 104.										577/496		
3. This question was not on the pretest.										1,073		

TABLE 107

PERCEIVED TASK DIVISION BY MEN AND WOMEN IN RURAL COMMUNES. 1, 2

Who³

Tasks	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
Repairs the house	1/1	3/6			9/11					2/1	0/2	
Cleans the house		0/1		5/6	9/12					1/1	0/1	
Plans meals			1/1	1/1	11/17					2/1	0/1	
Cares for sick children				1/1	6/3	3/4	2/2	0/1	2/5	0/2	1/4	
Speaks for group to outsiders				0/1	13/16				2/1	0/2	0/1	
Makes decisions on how communal money will be spent					13/16				1/1	1/3	0/1	
Calls group meetings				0/1	11/14				1/1	2/1	1/4	
Cares for livestock		6/10		2/2	4/5				1/1	2/1	0/2	
Washes dishes		1/0	0/1		12/18				1/0	1/1	0/1	
Decides on who may join					9/13				1/0	4/6	1/2	
Cooks			1/1	1/1	11/16				1/1	1/1	0/1	
Gardens				1/2	11/15				1/1	1/1	1/2	
Prepares food for canning, freezing			1/0	8/9	4/8				1/1	0/1	1/2	
Keeps motor vehicles running	1/1	10/14			2/4					1/1	1/1	
Change diapers				2/3	4/3	3/3	1/0	0/2	3/4	0/1	2/5	
Pays bills			2/0	1/0	9/15				1/1	1/2	1/3	
Buys groceries			1/1	4/6	8/11				1/1	1/1	0/1	
Farms		1/2			9/13				1/2	1/1	3/3	
Puts children to bed		1/0	1/0	1/2	0/4	6/4	1/0	1/2	3/4	0/1	1/4	
Holds and distributes communal money 4			0/1	2/5	4/4				1/1	3/6	0/1	
Total	2/2	22/33	7/5	29/40	218	12/1	4/2	1/5	22/25	24/35	3/42	0/0
Total	4	55	12	69	377	23	6	6	47	59	55	0
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.												295/418 713
2. Commune 17 was omitted as it has only women residents.												
3. Refer to key following Table 104.												TOTAL 713
4. This question was not on the pretest.												

TABLE 108

PERCEIVED TASK DIVISION BY MEN AND WOMEN
IN URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNES BY PERCENTAGES¹

Who	Urban	Rural
Entirely done by men (a man)	2%(9)/ 4%(18)	1%(2)/0%(2)
Mostly done by men (a man)	8%(49)/10%(50)	7%(22)/8%(33)
Entirely done by women (a woman)	3%(17)/2%(9)	2%(7)/1%(5)
Mostly done by women (a woman)	12%(68)/6%(29)	10%(29)/10%(40)
Done by men and women equally	41%(239)/46%(228)	54%(159)/52%(218)
Done by both parents equally	1%(6)/1%(7)	4%(12)/3%(11)
Done mostly by mothers	1%(6)/0%(0)	1%(4)/0%(2)
Done by mostly by fathers	0%(0)/0%(0)	0%(1)/1%(5)
Not applicable	17%(97)/14%(68)	7%(22)/6%(25)
Other (specify)	4%(21)/6%(28)	8%(24)/8%(35)
No response	11%(64)/11%(55)	4%(13)/10%(42)
Uncodable response	0%(1)/1%(4)	0%(0)/0%(0)
Total	100% (577)/101% (496) ²	99% (295)/99%(418) ²
<p>1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.</p> <p>2. Percentages are rounded to nearest full number. Thus they do not always add up to exactly 100% .</p>		

TABLE 109

DIRECTION OF NEW ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN BY MEN AND WOMEN
IN URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNES

Direction ¹	Urban	Rural	Total
+	11/14	14/ 9	25/23 = 48
-	5/ 3	7/ 8	12/11 = 23
0	12/12	3/ 6	15/18 = 33
$\pm$	4/ 2	6/ 4	10/ 6 = 16
$\frac{+}{o}$	1/ 3	1/ 0	2/ 3 = 5
$\frac{-}{o}$	0/ 1	1/ 1	1/ 2 = 3
No response	6/ 1	2/ 4	8/ 5 = 13
Uncodable	0/ 1	1/ 0	1/ 1 = 2
Total	39/37 76	35/32 67	74/69 = 143 ² 143

1. Key for direction

- + activities cross traditional sex lines.
- 0 activities are neutral.
- activities follow traditional sex lines.
- $\pm$ respondents listed combinations.
- $\frac{+}{o}$ " " "
- $\frac{-}{o}$ " " "

2. Many respondents listed more than one answer.

TABLE 110

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION (WITH DECISIONS REGARDING SEX ROLES)
OF MEN AND WOMEN IN URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNES ¹

Level of satisfaction	Urban	Rural	Total
Very dissatisfied (1)	1/ 0	0/0	1/0 = 1
(2)	4/ 1	0/0	4/1 = 5
(3)	1/ 2	1/3	2/5 = 7
(4)	3/10	8/3	11/13 = 24
Very satisfied (5)	13/ 9	3/5	16/14 = 30
No response	7/5	5/10	12/15 = 27
Total	29/27 56	17/21 38	94 N
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.			

TABLE III

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION
 (WITH DEVELOPMENT OF SEX ROLES WHERE NO DECISIONS WERE MADE)
 OF MEN AND WOMEN IN URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNES ¹

Level of satisfaction	Urban	Rural	Total
Very dissatisfied (1)	0/0	0/0	0/0 = 0
(2)	4/0	0/0	4/0 = 4
(3)	3/3	2/3	5/6 = 11
(4)	4/3	3/3	7/6 = 13
Very satisfied (5)	3/3	1/3	4/6 = 10
No response	15/18	11/12	26/30 = 56
Total	29/27 56	17/21 38	94 N
1. Female/Male indicates manner in which divided.			

APPENDIX G

DESCRIPTION OF GROUPS IN SAMPLE

Group one

Group number one is a rural household located in an area in which farming predominates. The original group formed in a metropolitan area, living in houses together and preparing for a move to a farm. Most of the early members had been active in nonviolent opposition to the war in Southeast Asia and other similar causes. They felt frustration at the lack of results from these efforts and decided they might better find a life more satisfying to themselves, at the same time providing a model for others of like persuasion. They did not approach this latter goal in the manner of a crusade, rather leaving the impact to be made gradually as people came into contact with them and came to appreciate the value of their life style.

The community occupies a large piece of land which includes some open farming space and a lot of wooded portions, with a large stream flowing through. A good deal of effort has gone into clearing, planting, and building. The present buildings include a common house in the shape of a geodesic dome, a nearly completed barn, chicken and rabbit pens, and approximately sixteen small houses built by individuals or couples for personal use. These latter are scattered in such a way as to provide considerable privacy if this is desired. A small dome which was originally built to house children during the first phase, while adults slept in tents, is now used as a family dwelling. There is a plan by one of the women to build a scientifically designed structure

for the raising of rabbits (of which there are already a large number).

There is a large garden and pasture and it is planned that grains will eventually be grown.

The general condition of the buildings and property is about what might be expected where a large group is living much of its time out of doors. An initial impression of untidiness and dirt gives way to observation that open shelves, boxes, etc. have been designed to organize belongings in a way that is accessible and obvious to those who need them. There is a good deal of furniture, arranged around the circular room in a way which maximizes a sense of community and inclusion (whether intentional or not). The individual houses seem fairly tidy, and each that we saw was distinctive enough to reflect something of the individuality of the persons using it. Although simplicity of life is stressed, there is a very well-equipped workshop and some modern household equipment (eg. a freezer). It was mentioned that the members felt it wasteful of human energy to go overboard on a complete return to primitive work habits.

Since we had had a brief contact with the group at the time of an earlier open house, we did not feel complete strangers when we arrived with the questionnaires. Those whom we met seemed open and friendly to outsiders on both occasions. There are several neighbors who have become close friends and supporters of the group after an initial period of suspicion. The tone of local response was seen to change drastically as reflected in a scrapbook containing articles from the local paper, spread over the period of their first three years. In their relations with each other they appeared open and

affectionate. They were straightforward in remarking on differences that have developed since they have been together. One of the founders, who is no longer resident, had commented during our earlier visit on his disappointment in their gradual move away from complete sharing of all resources. Another person mentioned that restlessness had set in after the very hard task of getting shelter built was over. It was difficult for some to find additional meaningful activity and some left the group at that point. Considerable change has occurred in the outward signs of community as individuals have gotten into places where they feel comfortable. Meetings have decreased and people do not feel the need to cling closely to each other. For some this represents a diminution of community, for others a level of trust reached that no longer requires such outward support.

At time of formation the group was incorporated as a church based on nonviolence and humanistic and ecological principles. This was to allow nonprofit status for land purchase and also to permit the formation of a school. The school was not successful even though there were a number of community children and parents involved. It was seen as of too low a priority, especially for those without children. Children have been a source of tension in the group. Differences about rearing practices and responsibility have led some of the single or childless adults to declare their plan not to have children themselves. Only the child who has been in the group since infancy is seen to approach the ideal the founders had in mind in terms of development.

Group two

This urban group consists of three legally married couples and four children. They became friends while working on service projects and decided to expand this friendship through jointly buying a house and living together. Initially they planned to provide a community service by housing ex-convicts, or others in need, on a short-term basis. After brief experimentation with this, during which they were robbed of various possessions, this focus has been dropped in practice. Nevertheless, the idea still appeals to some members and dissatisfaction was expressed by one that they weren't doing this and had not really made a decision as to whether they would do so in the future.

This group sees itself as very middle class and lives in a large, neatly kept house that is tastefully but not elaborately furnished. Banners and posters reflect the religious orientation of the group which might be termed Catholic social activist.

These people were friendly and outgoing to us and seemed comfortable, open and affectionate with each other. Most hold professional or business jobs in the community and are involved in political and social activism. Two of the men were working intensively for political candidates at the time of our visit. They seemed very aware and concerned with quality of life issues and also with the quality of education their children were or were not receiving. Observations during our visit there indicate that the children are actively encouraged and allowed to learn to do things without adult hovering. They were put to bed by one of the men after gleefully singing to his guitar music.

Group three

The members of this group live in a large house in an urban area. Members are politically active and see their household as a tool to allow them to work more effectively in areas of social change than they could do if isolated from each other. They also see it as a model for community. Members work for various groups related to social and political concerns, at recycling and at various unskilled jobs to bring in money for their living and for other projects. Many of the members are related in some way or other to the local Society of Friends and reflect the philosophy and style of this group.

The house in which they live is owned by a land trust composed of more persons than those currently resident. It is seen as a permanent home even though individuals may come and go. The downstairs is simply furnished and fairly neat. The house is used for a lot of group and community meetings. There is a garden which gets attention on and off, but which at the time of our visit did not seem a high priority for any of the present members.

The group is friendly to outsiders but seems careful to avoid any appearance of recruiting. This latter is in spite of the fact that all are involved in worthwhile activities that are always short of help and resources. The members seem open and relaxed with each other, aware of what each is involved in and appreciative of it. Later contacts indicate occasional frustration experienced by members at not being as ideally accepting of each other as they want to be. They seem very aware of their need for growth in this area.

Group four

This urban group of four single persons and one married couple met while they were all students at a small midwest college. They are basically a friendship group who banded together to rent a large house on a lake in a midwestern city. Financial economy and friendship are dominant in their arrangements. No particular political or religious philosophy seems to be present as a focus for the group.

At the time of the visit only the women were at home as the men were working or attending evening classes. Follow-up efforts to get responses from the men have been unsuccessful.

The house has a screened porch facing the lake, is clean, neat and tastefully furnished with articles donated by residents and parents.

The response of the women was open, friendly and enthusiastic. Among themselves they seemed to express warm, close relationships. Particular mention was made of the fact that physical sexual relationships, except for the married couple, are only with persons outside the house. Generally, this group seemed middle class in approach, with economy and friendship expansion seen as the major advantages to group living.

Group five

This urban group is attempting to combine elements of gestalt therapy, primal therapy, selected drug use, sexual experimentation, and ecology to achieve an integration and power for personal and social use. The leader of the group sees himself, and is seen by the members, as a definite leader,

somewhat of the charismatic type. He is seen as the one through whom the above elements are channelled to produce a creative and constructive group life. They are into yoga, meditation and other similar emphases but are also concerned with political, educational and social issues. They operate a bookstore through which these ideas and efforts are channelled into the community.

At the time of the interview they were living on the third floor of an old house. The house had a minimum of furnishings, mainly mattresses and cushions. The considerable clutter was apparently well-organized, as the leader was able to reach into pile after pile of papers to draw out something to illustrate a point in discussion. From the interview and subsequent contacts it would appear that the distribution of literature is seen as a major part of their service.

The group members appear to welcome visitors and inquirers, although they wish their times of meditation to be respected. They made several open invitations to other students whom we might want to sent to meet them.

Among themselves they seem affectionate and respectful of differences and individual "space". The leader, however, is definitely shown deference and definitely acts as a "family head".

Group six

This urban group of single persons in their twenties have all participated in Transactional Analysis groups and are enthusiastic about the help they have received. They see themselves as somewhat of a half-way house but are self organized and administered. Longevity for the group does not

seem to be sought or desired; this arrangement is seen by them as a necessary, desirable phase between treatment and going on to something else.

Persons with both heterosexual and homosexual orientation are part of the group. However, sexual relationships are not allowed within the membership. They stressed that they feel avoidance of sexual liaisons among members contributes to their stable, good relationships.

They live in a single house where they feel individual members' rooms are too small. Common areas of the house are clean and tidy. Mention was made that this standard is expected, but that each individual has the freedom to maintain his/her room as personally desired. The house is located in what appears to be a middle class residential neighborhood.

They were very friendly to us after an initial reticence and told us of other groups we might want to visit. One male member became particularly involved in describing his personal background as a rejected, adopted child and his experience around sex role expectations in the shipyards where he works.

One of the cardinal principles in their relationships with each other is openness. This was mentioned repeatedly by various members.

Group seven

This large urban group sees themselves as a family and a church. They claim all have had visions which brought them together with the purpose of following the example of love in the New Testament and thus serving as a model for all that this love can be lived in the modern age. The founder is

a male who represents Christ. Through consent of all members (pursuant to joining) , he has the final word in all church matters . Church matters seem to be pervasive and cover all life activities . Elders are in authority in each living group . They are " appointed by the church " and are all men . There is some rotation of elders .

This group seems entirely communal in that upon joining , all is given to the church to be distributed by the elders as needed . The group lives in nine separate houses clustered in one neighborhood . They openly state they are attempting to buy up property in this neighborhood , to take it over and to live as an embodiment of love . Their creed is contained in a beautifully illustrated book which contains selected Bible verses and their church dogma relating to authority , their family , marriage , holy names , the bread of life and eternal life .

Members don't marry in the usual sense but are bonded together , apparently only for the purpose of procreation . This seems to be based on the idea that too close a couple relationship detracts from the solidarity of the group as a whole . Women are to relate to men as godly examples . The women seem to be gladly submissive , not seeing themselves as inferior by this but simple living out the creed that the man is the head of the woman as Christ is the head of the church . In spite of this there seems to be no strictly sex-related division of tasks .

Obedience of children is stressed in their book , with the idea that adults will only give good counsel to children and are raising them to be good , loving people . When asked , an elder stated that once a child reaches

a certain age, that child can decide for himself/herself whether or not to stay. The age was left vague.

Holy names embodying a Christian virtue are given to members by the leader when their virtue becomes apparent. Some of the names we heard included Frankness, Honesty, Respect, Imagination, Melody. All members share the same surname, which has a biblical origin.

This group was very friendly and hospitable to us, spending much time telling us of their philosophy. They were cool and skeptical toward the questionnaires so we did not push this. They commented on the impossibility of capturing what they are in words, and the need for a person to be among them to understand. Evasiveness about dates, numbers, and finances was noted as was the unclearness of their relationship with civil authorities. They said they were "in tight" with the police, but an outside observer related to us their hassles over utility bills. The group apparently feels there are some things they should not have to pay for.

We visited only the "guest house" which is next door to their storefront. This storefront seems to be a communications and public relations center as well as a distribution point for their own food and supplies. It does not appear to function as a commercial enterprise. The guest house is very simply and beautifully furnished. Neatness and color predominate. Colorful paint and flowers outside with a special bench made for the bus stop indicated their desire to be a pleasant site in the neighborhood.

The group seems very caring and loving of one another, joyfully embracing each other and singing together over dishes. Peacefulness and

gracefulness seem emphasized.

Group eight

This urban household serves as a clearinghouse for various types of alternative living groups and alternative social projects. A few members work in the community, supporting the rest who give their time to the above tasks. The plan of this group is to buy a large farm as well as maintaining their urban center. They expect this to make it possible for persons to move back and forth between the two kinds of life and to thereby keep their energy level at its best. The house, located in a middle class residential neighborhood, is large. It appeared fairly crowded, with a maximum number of residents plus office space for the preparation and organization of mailings. Books and papers were in stacks and the two in the office expressed some discouragement at the way paper work piled up. The overall impression was one of some clutter, but not of dirt or of unnecessary stuff lying around. There were plants and posters in profusion, also some cats and a large dog.

Members seemed friendly to outsiders but expressed resentment of the demands and impositions of people who feel they can just drop in without warning. All feel they are busy at important things and do not need that kind of thoughtlessness. As far as answering our questions, the person who appears to be something of a leader in the group commented that perhaps some school counselor would read the results of our work and realize the setting in which particular kids had grown up was not so bad after all. On this basis he felt it worth his time to talk to us and fill out the questionnaire. There was a

strong objection expressed to the use of the term "commune", in that the emotional overtones which this word has for some people might nullify the value of our findings for such a reader.

Group members seemed fairly open with each other. Where tensions were either seen or mentioned they expressed their awareness of the need for growth in this area. A house book of notes, poems, pictures, etc. reflected a continuing struggle for them to understand and accept each other and also to help each other see weaknesses and work on these. One lengthy discussion growing out of a question disclosed a very long standing misunderstanding between two members as to how one of them had felt at the time of formation.

Group nine

This urban household is made up of people who have served as volunteers in church related service projects. They live in a large house located in an old section of a large city. The neighborhood is an attractive one of old houses, with some evidence of racial mixture among residents. The members of the group share a common religious motivation for their individual and group life. Some work at community jobs, one gives full time to community organization work and all serve in church and community service projects.

The house is very neat and clean, comfortably furnished without being elaborate. A guest room and library is always available for a person who might wish to stay.

The group apparently feels no sense of separation from persons who might be termed "outsiders", recognizing themselves as basically middle class in orientation even though they have chosen this living arrangement. The nuclear family is revered and supported. At present there is one married couple with a child. Anyone who marries is required to live away from the house for at least a year, but may return after that if they desire.

Members seem relaxed and open with each other. Several were friends before joining the group. There was good natured joking and deference to each other in discussion. The only child is seen to present no problem at the present time. All consider themselves involved with him at various points, although he is headquartered with his parents.

Group ten

This urban household is a very loosely organized group of friends. One member remarked that the basis of the group was very shallow and that he felt he would not want to remain if it continues on this level. There seems to be no major unifying factor for the group other than the idea that sharing is a good thing in itself.

The group occupies a large house in an old, well-kept urban neighborhood. The house and yard are attractively maintained; considerable work in cleaning and painting having recently been done. One room is filled with well-tended plants. Four friendly dogs run loose but do not seem to be considered nuisances. Members are friendly with neighbors, but only one is

agressively so.

Among themselves the group members seem relaxed, although this group did not sit down with us to answer the questions so impressions are a bit more nebulous than is true for the others. They did make jokes about the vigorous discussion that grew out of the questionnaires.

Group eleven

This urban group began on a friendship basis with members varying in their reasons for joining. Economics is the only common reason but experiment in group living and emotional support were also mentioned. The group is jointly buying a very large house which provides a great deal of privacy for each resident. This was openly recognized as different from most urban groups and as a possible reason for their survival as a group. They perform a service function by offering their home to student trainees from a nearby grade school which their children attend. The children (ages 8, 11, and 13) seem quite independent and are encouraged to be so. The school they attend also encourages this.

They were friendly to us and somewhat interested in the topic of our study. Relationships between the members seem caring and fairly open.

Group twelve

This rural group is formed around the basic values of nonviolence, ecological use of the land and mutual support, all of which are central to their life and work. They do not consider themselves a drop-out community. They operate a bookstore in a nearby town and work at various occupations

and in service to the community. They feel the farm represents a model for an important style of life. The group has some fairly structured characteristics, particularly in their regular cycle of meetings and specific responsibilities resting with certain groups. The meetings are related to the following special emphases: business, worship, personal encounter and spiritual. In addition subgroups are responsible for farm matters and finance. Leadership for each of these meetings and subgroups is assigned by consensus, usually on the basis of volunteering, and is stable for one year. This is the first group visited with a wide age range. This appeared to be an accepted and comfortable arrangement for members.

The group seems friendly to outsiders, were very cordial and well prepared for us. There were several other guests present for the day. Reception of guests represents some sacrifice of group fellowship since they have only two Sundays a month when they are all home and free of meeting commitments.

Among themselves members seem very open and affectionate. Only one incident of stress was noted in the effort of one member to get away for an afternoon appointment. He did not receive much support in his mood of haste. Some family units are apparently intact in the sense of being permanent nuclear families within the community. However, multiple sexual alliances are reported by some members of the group.

Group thirteen

This rural group lives on a fairly large farm in a mountainous area where logging is a major industry. The land was originally purchased to be

developed into a retreat. The original owners who were involved in social service and action failed to use it and allowed this group to live on the property. They are now in the process of buying the land themselves.

No particular philosophy or reason for formation holds this group together. Some members seemed self-conscious about this and expressed dissatisfaction with lack of group solidarity.

Lack of jobs in this rural setting, especially jobs for women, is a source of some difficulty for this group. They would like to attract more women, as two women described as feminists recently left for lack of opportunity in the area.

A central house with kitchen, dining area and living room with a concentration of books, records and other shared items is the major meeting place. Small houses for couples and singles dot the landscape, each in an attractive, private setting. Design of these small houses is individual, varied and extremely attractive. There are also a well built chicken house and other small buildings for goats and other garden supplies.

Some of the group were very interested in the topic of our research and spent much time discussing their ideas about it and asking for our findings and experiences in other places. They took advantage of our visit to think through questions related to their group solidarity. Group members seemed fairly relaxed with each other but did not seem to demonstrate the closeness observed in some groups.

Group fourteen

This small urban group is made up of politically active single persons. They live in a large house in a middle class residential neighborhood. Most take jobs that will allow them a maximum amount of time to give to political and social action projects.

The scheduling of a time when most could be present for the questionnaire was difficult because of the varied responsibilities of different members. However, when the time was finally set, all current residents were present and gave a good part of an early evening to careful answering of the questions. They seemed responsive, friendly and generally interested in the topic of study. Among themselves they seemed open and affectionate.

At the time of the visit the group was planning to incorporate several other persons of like interest and then redivide into two or three houses.

Group fifteen

This rural group consisted mostly of people who went to the same college and knew each other at various levels during that time. One couple was buying a farm and others heard about it and came to visit. The group formed gradually and now all are contributing to the buying of the land. All are college graduates and some have graduate training. Their present situation is seen as an alternative to the nine-to-five rat race, although all but one of them hold some outside employment in the neighboring community.

The communal area at this point is an old trailer house which serves as kitchen, dining and general socializing center. Couples and singles each

have their own shelter for sleeping and privacy. These vary from a tee-pee , to two cottages which were on the original farm, to some ingenious structures built by the residents. A communal kitchen was in the process of building at the time of our visit. The original barn, remodeled by residents , is used for pigs, goats, a cow and a horse. Care seems to be taken with gardening and selective breeding of animals. Some feed grain has been grown for their own animals.

Members were very open with each other and although many differences emerged, they seemed to tolerate this well and use it creatively. According to one woman resident this group is considered to be permanent.

Their reaction to us was mixed, but not at all hostile. Some were genuinely interested, one man indirectly took issue with studying humans in such fashion, and some were cooperative but seemed minimally interested.

Group sixteen

This group of two married couples and four children is in transition from living in a small northwest town to a rural setting fairly close by. They met as dissatisfied suburban couples who were at first part of a larger group of five couples wishing to expand their relationships and horizons. This larger group discussed rural communal living for some time until differences emerged and the present group solidified. According to the present group, the other couples had different motivations such as group sex and "making a killing on the land".

They characterize themselves alternatively as middle-class and ex-middle-class. The men are presently commuting to a metropolitan area four days a week for ten hour days at steady, professional jobs. They hope to be able to cut back to less time in the future. Construction at their 22 acre farm is being done by the women when the men are working and by all the other three days of the week.

We visited them at their duplex apartments in a small town so did not see the farm where they hope to be by Christmas 1974. They are building three modern buildings at the farm, one double A-frame bunk house for each family and a communal A-frame structure consisting of kitchen, dining, living and laundry facilities. Electricity and plumbing will be in all three buildings in contrast to most communal groups we visited where bunk houses were usually without such.

This group pools their incomes for basic living expenses. What is left over is used by the individual families. The two families are of the same size and have similar incomes. They see this as reason for little difficulty with this arrangement. Expansion of the group seems to be desired if prospective joiners fit in with their values and life-style. This group also has a cooperative arrangement with their rural neighbors (other communes and nuclear families) for things such as shared gardening, shared tractor, etc.

They were extremely open to us and seem to have solid, loving relationships with each other. A lot of interest was shown in what other communal groups are doing and what we had learned in our visits.

Group seventeen

This group is the only single sex group in the sample. A small group of women live together on a farm in a basically agricultural area. The farm has been purchased to be maintained in perpetuity as a property specifically for the use of women. A small house and a trailer currently serve as housing for the group, but other dwellings are in the process of construction. The residents are attempting to do all maintenance and farming tasks without depending on the help of men and feel they are relatively successful at this point.

All present expressed appreciation for the support they gain from their ties with women's groups centered in a nearby metropolitan area.

Not all residents were present at the time of our visit but those who were seemed open and outgoing toward us. They were generous in sharing not only the information requested but also some of the problems they face both within the group and from external pressures.

Group eighteen

This urban household consists of five graduate students, three men and two women. They got together as friends and as people who wanted to live in a house with other people rather than in isolated apartments. This group has been together the shortest time of any in the sample, just a little over four months at the time of our visit. A group of sophisticated people, they are highly conscious of sex role considerations and appear to be confronting each other fairly regularly regarding stereotyping of men and women.

They rent a single house in a dense portion of a northwest metropolitan area. The house is fairly large and furnished with objects contributed by all members.

They were very open to our study and personally sharing of their views and feelings in a subsequent discussion. Relationships among the group seemed to be caring, warm and quite direct with a noticeable tendency to honestly face differences.

Group nineteen

A large old house in a northwest city is the home of this urban group. Two married couples, one with a child, and several single persons share their living here. All members are fairly young and in touch with social and political currents affecting sex roles. They were generally interested in sharing their ideas and feelings in this area, although all were not able to participate at the time of our visit. Although members share many common interests they also pursue individual concerns. What they give to each other is more in terms of individual support than of mutual help in any kind of external or internal common cause as may be identifiable in some groups.

The house in which they live was originally rented jointly by the two married couples and there has been some turnover in the other persons who have joined them. They do not see themselves as a long-term permanent group but have no plans for separation in the immediate future. Several are students and see their future residence as largely shaped by job opportunities.

The house has the attractiveness of being very old and is kept neat and clean. It is well stocked with the books, records and personal belongings of the various members. The group was open and friendly to us.

APPENDIX H

FINAL LETTER TO SAMPLE GROUPS

Greetings ,

Now that we have finally completed the task of putting together and examining the very helpful material provided by all of you who participated in our study, we wish to thank you again.

We realize now, even more than at the time of our visit, how much we have learned and hope that this will be reflected in increased sensitivity personally and professionally. We are aware that we promised feedback earlier, but we simply did not anticipate how long it would take to complete the project.

We are including specific sections of our final write-up which we thought might be of most interest to you. Sections included are interpretation of findings, conclusions and an epilogue suggesting areas for further study. For those of you who may wish to refer to them, the questionnaires used are included. For those who would prefer not to wade through all of it, perhaps the conclusions and epilogue would give a general picture of our results. If anyone is curious about the design of the study or specific data, we would be happy to provide other sections or answer specific questions. Also, we would appreciate any feedback you might wish to give us. In addition, if in glancing over the epilogue, any particular question raised seems of importance to you perhaps other students might be interested in following up on this.

We would like to comment on one specific issue since it was raised in several groups. This is the use of the word commune and the resultant

search for a more inclusive term. . Groups we visited called themselves by many different names such as communes, extended families, living collectives, intentional communities, collective households or just people living together. We hope that the term we decided to use, " cooperative household " although a compromise , will be seen as appropriate .

Again, we appreciate your receptiveness and willingness to help. We began with hesitancy to intrude and instead discovered interest and welcome from many of you. This was one of the best experiences in this study.

Sincerely,

Billie Huntwork

Emily Fultz