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This study investigates the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment in a sample of middle class couples. Romantic love is defined as a general disposition an individual has toward love, marriage, the family, and relationships involving male-female interaction in which the affective component is regarded as primary and all other considerations are excluded from conscious reflection. Marital adjustment is defined as the positive accommodation of husband and wife interacting within the framework of a legally established marital relationship. Middle socioeconomic class is operationally defined as a specific quantitative range on the Warner Index of Social Characteristics.

This study examines the nature of any quantifiable relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment, current or future. Three views of this relationship are investigated. The first view contends that romanticism is functional, contributing to positive marital adjustment. The second is characterized by the belief that romantic love has a negative impact upon marital adjustment and is dysfunctional.
A third view of the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment suggests that the critical element determining dysfunctionality is the disparity between partners, rather than the individual level of romanticism. No author has heretofore considered this alternative.

A sample of sixty-three married couples was surveyed anonymously. All participants were listed in the telephone directory of a particular community and were legally married, currently living with their mate, not previously married, in the age range of twenty-one to fifty-five years, and categorized as members of the middle socioeconomic class.

Participating subjects were grouped by length of marriage (zero to five years, six to ten years, eleven years or more), with twenty-one couples in each group. The Public Opinion Questionnaire (Appendix A), administered to all subjects anonymously, was comprised of the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test, the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Prediction Test, the Dean Romanticism Scale, and a brief demographic data questionnaire.

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between romanticism and individual marital adjustment, or between romanticism and prediction of future individual marital adjustment. Hypotheses Three and Four dealt with any relationship between couples discrepancy on the level of romanticism and their marital adjustment, and between
discrepancy on level of romanticism and the prediction of future marital adjustment. Hypotheses Five and Six stated that there would be no relationship between level of romanticism and sex of respondents, or between level of romanticism and length of respondents' marriage. Hypothesis Seven expressed the anticipation that there would be no significant interaction between sex and length of marriage in measured level of romanticism.

Statistical analyses were done, using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation for Hypotheses One through Four, and Hoyt's Analysis of Variance technique for Hypotheses Five through Seven. A .05 level of significance was required for rejection of the hypothesis of no difference.

Thirty-two correlations were computed. Two achieved the .05 level of significance. As this number could be expected to achieve significance by chance alone, and in neither case was there any rationale to support interpretation as other than random chance, the hypothesis of no relationship was accepted throughout. No significant F tests for main effects or interaction effect were obtained in an analysis of data for Hypotheses Five, Six, and Seven.

It is concluded that romantic love is not significantly related to current or future marital adjustment in middle socioeconomic class couples.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Acceptance of love as the only legitimate reason for marriage is indigenous to America (8). Although divorce statistics are on the increase, so too is the percentage of eligible people who ultimately marry. Young people marry, often unadvisedly, because they are "in love." Dysfunctional marriages are prolonged beyond reasonable limits in the name of "love." University counselors, psychologists, sociologists, marriage counselors, and behavioral scientists of all persuasions routinely meet with both couples and individuals having conflicted marriages and deal with the impact of these marriages upon all areas of the client's life.

Romantic love has been a topic of concern for over forty years in both academic and non-academic contexts. It is dealt with routinely in the mass media, the pulpit, private discussions, university classrooms, and in the professional publications. In spite of this interest and discussion, there is not a consensus of what is meant by this concept or of how it might affect marriage and family living. This study is an analysis of the relationship between individual and dyadic romanticism and marital adjustment.
Little empirical research on romanticism is found in the literature. Marital adjustment has been studied extensively in a variety of settings, but never as related to individual and/or dyadic romantic conceptualizations. Professionals of all disciplines involved in helping relationships frequently find themselves attempting to untangle a conflicting collection of opinion on romanticism and marital adjustment while their client painfully waits.

These opinions may be divided into two distinct schools of thought. The first is characterized by the belief that romanticism is functional, and the second is characterized by the belief that romanticism is dysfunctional. No author gives consideration to a third view that, rather than the level of romanticism, the amount of congruence or incongruence between partners is positively correlated with the reported level of marital adjustment-maladjustment.

Statement of the Problem

The problem with which this study is concerned is to determine the nature of any extant relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment.

Purpose

It is the purpose of this study to investigate the validity of three views regarding the relationship between marital adjustment and romantic love. The first position holds that romanticism is functional, and contributes to
positive marital adjustment. The second is characterized by the belief that romantic love has a negative impact upon marriage and is thus dysfunctional. A third view of the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment suggests that the critical element determining dysfunctionality is the disparity between partners, rather than the individual level of romanticism.

Definition of Terms

For purposes of this study the listed terms are defined as follows:

Marital adjustment.--"... accommodation of a husband and wife to each other at a given time" (36, p. 251). Marital adjustment is a hypothetical construct measured by the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (36) and represented by a quantitative score.

Marital prediction.--"... forecasting the likelihood of marital adjustment at a future time" (36, p. 251). Marital prediction is a hypothetical construct measured by the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (36) and represented by a quantitative score.

Middle social class.--For purposes of this study middle social class is operationally defined as those persons scoring from twenty-three to thirty-seven points on the Warner Index of Social Characteristics (54).
**Romantic love.**—A general disposition an individual has toward love, marriage, the family, and relationships involving male-female interaction in which the affective component is regarded as primary and all other considerations are excluded from conscious reflection (55, 11).

**Romanticism.**—See "Romantic love."

**Romantic complex.**—See "Romantic love."

**Social class.**—"... a grouping or division of a society, made up of persons having certain common social characteristics which are taken to qualify them for participation on roughly equal terms with others of the group ..." (12, p. 89).

**Background and Significance**

Factors contributing to, or subtracting from, marital adjustment, stability, and success have been a topic of general concern since the institution of legal marriage. Romantic conceptualizations, long felt to be a factor of significance, have received their share of both deification and vilification in recent years. In spite of this circumstance, no research has determined the presence or absence of any relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment.

No other culture places as high a value on romantic love; although the idea has spread to other countries since World War II. Many people dogmatically insist that marriage is the formal sanction to an experience so intimate and personal that any attempt to scrutinize or question it must be regarded
as impertinence. This attitude has inhibited inquiry, not only into the nature of the marriage relationship, but into familial disorganization.

It was not until the Middle Ages that the word "love" was used in any way similar to that in which it is used today (32). Communities developed under the protection of the noblemen. The lady of a castle assumed a prestigious position requiring little more of her than physical attractiveness, pursuit of the arts and education, and light administrative duties (46, p. 522).

The crusades began, in the eleventh century, taking many of the noblemen away from their castles and already bored wives. During this period of prolonged absence, there arose the phenomenon of the troubadour, usually a noble himself, who traveled from castle to castle to entertain. The troubadours sang songs and ballads about "romance" to entertain the lady of the castle.

The literature suggests that sex outside of marriage became the fashion with these ladies (46, 32). In their leisure, they gathered themselves into groups called "Courts of Love." The example which follows is a code of love agreed upon by a court of women under the leadership of the Countess of Champaign, in May, 1174.

**Code of Love of the Twelfth Century**

1. Marriage is no good excuse against loving.
2. Whoever cannot conceal a thing, cannot love.
3. No one can bind himself to two loves at once.
4. Love must always grow greater or grow less.
5. There is no savour in what a lover takes by force.
6. The male does not love until he has attained a complete manhood.
7. A widowhood of two years is proscribed to one lover for the other's death.
8. No one, without abundant reason, ought to be deprived of his own love.
9. No one can love unless urged thereto by the hope of being loved.
10. Love is always exiled from its dwelling by avarice.
11. It is not decent to love one whom one would be ashamed to marry.
12. The true lover does not desire embraces from any but the co-lover.
13. Love that is known publicly rarely lasts.
14. An easy conquest renders love despised, a difficult one makes it desired.
15. Every lover turns pale in the sight of the co-lover.
16. The lover's heart trembles, at the expected sight of the co-lover.
17. A new love makes one quit the old.
18. Probity alone makes a man worthy of love.
19. If love lessens, it dies speedily and rarely regains health.
20. The man prone to love is always prone to fear.
21. Real jealousy always increases the worth of love.
22. Suspicion and the jealousy it kindles increase love's worth.
23. Whom thought of love plagues, eats less and sleeps less.
24. Whatever a lover does ends with thinking of the co-lover.
25. The true lover thinks naught good but what he believes pleases the co-lover.
26. Love can deny love nothing.
27. The lover cannot be satiated by the delights of the co-lover.
28. The least presumption compels the lover to suspect evil of the co-lover.
29. He is not wont to love, whom too much abundance of pleasure annoys.
30. The true lover is haunted by the co-lover's image unceasingly.
31. Nothing prevents one woman from being loved by two men, or one man by two women.
We pronounce and decree by the tenour of these presents, that love cannot extend its powers over two married persons; for lovers must grant everything, mutually and gratuitously the one to the other without being constrained thereunto by any motive of necessity; while husband and wife are bound by duty to agree the one with the other and deny each other nothing. Let this judgment, which we have passed with extreme caution and with the advice of a great number of other ladies, be held by the truth, unquestionable and unalterable.

In the year 1174, the third day from the Calends of May (9, pp. 266-267).

This is one documentation of the origin of "romantic" love. Like most human beliefs, attitudes, and ways of behaving, it grew out of the social conditions and requirements of an era, and represented an adjustment to those conditions. The phenomenon of "romance" grew even stronger when there were powerful female monarchs on the throne, such as Queen Elizabeth and Queen Victoria (46).

America, from its inception, shared the European spirit of self-determination in marital choice as well as in the more widely publicized areas of politics and religion. A review of early marriage manuals in the United States reveals, nevertheless, that "love" was not conceptualized in the same manner as it generally is today. As a British observer noted, "Love, among the American people, appears to be regarded rather as an affair of the judgment, than of the heart; its expression seems to spring from a sense of duty, rather than from a sentiment of feeling" (4, p. 479). An individual loved as a function of his role as spouse, rather than because
of the quality of interaction between him and his beloved; hence, love was more properly seen as unfolding after marriage rather than before it.

In their review of nineteenth century marriage manuals, Gordon and Bernstein (16) further observe that the chief criteria of mate-choice were religious, constitutional and physical, and moral and character considerations. An ideal husband, for example, was religious, sound of mind and limb, and the recipient of no black marks for "... idleness, intemperate use of intoxicating drinks, smoking, chewing, sniffing tobacco ... taking ... opium, licentiousness ... gambling, swearing and keeping late hours at night" (13, p. 131). Love was characterized, therefore, by an appreciation of the other's sterling qualities. Nowhere in early nineteenth century treatises was there much emphasis on love resulting from the quality of interaction of the man and woman.

Within the twentieth century, a major revolution has occurred in the relationship between men and women. No longer is homogamous selection a necessity. Humanism, with its emphasis upon individualism, has strongly influenced the attitudes and beliefs of the people (41). The belief that romantic love is the only acceptable basis for marriage is as entrenched in the American value system as the belief in free enterprise (14).

When professionals in the field of marriage and family point to the one factor responsible for marital difficulties,
romantic love is likely to be singled out as the culprit. Belief in romantic love leads one to expect a great deal from marriage. This concept places a set of idealized images before the individual by which he will judge the object of his love, as well as the quality of the relationship. Unfortunately, the expectations generated by idealized images usually bear little relationship to the real world. Often one projects his images onto another person, exaggerating those characteristics of the person that match his internalized images, and masking those characteristics that do not. The other person is then transformed into an unreal person that fits the lover's idiosyncratic idealized concept of the romantic marital partner. In essence, some individuals are in love with their own romantic images rather than with a real human being (55).

Interest was first focused on the subject of romanticism by Burgess (5) in his paper on "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization," in which he emphasized the dysfunctionality of romanticism for the family. Referring to exponents of the romantic complex as "radical idealists" (5, p. 293), he states without equivocation that "The romantic impulse by itself and unsupported by other sentiments and interests is not, it seems, sufficient to maintain the permanence of even a free union" (5, p. 293). Writing pessimistically of social change, the emancipation of youth, disillusionment, and cynicism, Burgess concludes:
The romantic impulse is an inveterate human trait which seeks expression in every field of man's activity, particularly in the love life. Its expression in courtship and marriage will continue. But there is even now every indication that the doctrine of romantic love as the supreme if not the sole raison d'être of marriage and the family is being replaced by the conception that romance, comradeship, and mutuality of interests, in due and perhaps changing proportions, are all necessary for satisfying relationships in courtship and marriage (5, p. 294).

Contemporary authors, on the whole, support this pioneering stance. Lederer and Jackson (32), in their treatment of what is styled as the seven major myths of marriage, repeatedly emphasize their belief that not only is "Romance . . . not necessary for a good marriage" (32, p. 54), but that it is more often than not detrimental. Bach and Wyden, in their best seller, The Intimate Enemy (1), discuss the difficult necessity of the members of the dyad ridding themselves of unrealistic romantic illusions before they can get to the business of learning to "depend on each other for real [Bach's italics]" (1, p. 218). Rapoport and Rapoport (45), Kubie (30), Nagy and Framo (42), Lippman (34), Landis (31), and Greenfield (17), all share these opinions of romantic conceptualizations, assigning to them responsibility for disillusionment, personal maladjustment, and the spiraling divorce.

Kubie (30) defines "being in love" as "an obsessional state driven in part by anger" (30, p. 62). Nagy and Framo (42), following orthodox psychoanalytic theory, describe the dynamic process of falling in love as "almost magical" (42,
p. 185). They view it as an extremely complex and subtle blending of conscious and unconscious conditions designed to recreate both the idealized family, with its inherent promise of unconditional love, and the negative "inner object" (42, p. 185). "Part of the function of the romantic ritual . . . is to deny recognition of the bad object in the partner which will provide confirmation for the inner role model" (42, p. 186). Even Popenoe (44), denigrates the "Romantic Platform" as immature self-love. Greer (18), in a chapter on love, states "It is easy to imagine that love survives . . . But it isn't true and it never was, and now for sure it never will be" (18, p. 215).

According to Winch's formulation,

... in romantic love the love-object is thought to be predestined and to be discovered by love-at-first-sight, is idealized and is inaccessible, and emotion and suffering are emphasized. From this analysis it would seem to follow that the degree to which one is a romantic lover would depend on the degree of one's feelings of inferiority and insecurity. As Reik (1944) observes, the suddenness with which someone falls in love is the emergency of his need to be loved. In romantic love the theme of idealization emphasized love, whereas the theme of inaccessibility discourages intimacy and thereby fosters the dissociation of love and sex (55, p. 635).

An argument for the functionality of romanticism in marital adjustment may also be advanced. Virtually all elements of our society work together toward an expectation of marriage based on romantic love. It is reasonable to expect young people entering marriage to have at least some romantic notions about marriage. Once living together, the romanticism that exists
may serve to help the couple adjust to each other in their day-to-day interaction. Because they have romantic notions about love and marriage, they may strive to fulfill the expectations to which they were socialized. Romanticism in this instance would help marital adjustment.

Kolb (28) points out that persons who attack romantic love also are attacking fundamental values inherent in the family system and in the larger society. These include the fundamental obligation of the family and other social systems to encourage personal freedom and growth, and the integrity of democratic value and freedom in human relationships. Furthermore, Kolb argues that the attack on romanticism is based on a false dichotomy between freedom and order, the society and the individual, and self-love and the love of others. If carried to its logical conclusion, denunciation of romantic love would result in rigid conformity to the endogamous norms, mate selection would become totally congruent with the views of one's parents, and by reflecting extreme conventionality and conforming behavior, probably would stifle further personality growth or creativity in human relationships.

"There is much emphasis on a romantically oriented youth culture" (23, p. 343). This culture facilitates adjustment by providing the adolescent with appropriate forms of tension release and by encouraging emancipation from dependency on the parental home, thus easing the transition to adulthood (43).
Waller (53) sees romanticism and idealization as a natural response to a blocking of the sex drive. He conceives of unrealistic romantic love as "the anesthetic which renders the amputation of our cherished habits (of 'blessed singleness') painless" (53, p. 207) in marriage. Romantic love serves to lure the members of the irresponsible younger generation away from their hedonistic pleasure chasing and sets them to doing "the work of the world" (53, p. 113).

Parsons (43) sees adolescent romantic love as part of a more general tendency in the youth subculture to behave in unconventional, irresponsible, and unrealistic ways in response to the tensions of the adolescent status in our society. He suggests that romanticism serves important functions in adjusting adolescents to tensions.

Beigel (2) develops a thesis similar to the ideas of Waller, that courtly love arose in the twelfth century as an expression of a social-psychological process which was aimed at the reconciliation of basic human needs with frustrating social conditions. Similarly, he believes adolescent romanticism is occasioned by contemporary cultural frustration of the sex drive which is at a maximum during adolescence. In this function, romantic love is not a harmful relationship within the couple bond, but helps to raise the status of the female and to soften the impact of factors which might endanger the marital union. In this way, romantic
love not only serves as a final powerful catalytic agent in mate selection, but it also helps persons to adjust to frustrating situations.

In viewing the hitherto unexplored concept of romantic complementarity, a look at familial role theory provides one model. Research indicates that male-female role definitions within the marital dyad are subjectively defined. Related conflict evolves only as expectation-performance incongruity develops. In different families, male-female role definitions may be totally reversed with no resultant diminution in marital adjustment so long as shared role definitions are complementary (37, 38, 39, 49, 29, 50, 27, 25, 26, 40, 21).

Similarly, romantic conceptualizations, no matter how "high" or "low," may have little or no effect upon the marital adjustment if they are mutually complementary. The more fully needs are met, the less is the likelihood of dissatisfaction or maladjustment in that area. As they become increasingly incongruent, however, the nonmutual complementarity may result in neither a strenuous effort to save the relationship, nor in any great interest in the exploration of meanings each person may have to offer the other. Feelings of alienation, aloneness, and disillusionment cannot be long avoided by either member.

Little empirical research is to be found in the literature on the subject of romanticism. Gross (19) collected data on over 200 subjects while attempting to validate his
romanticism scale. This study demonstrated that a hypothetical construct labeled "romanticism" operates within the general population and that it can be quantified.

Hobart (24) studied the incidence of romanticism during courtship, using a shortened scale consisting of twelve items from the Gross scale. The Hobart sample consisted of 831 college students of both sexes. He hypothesized that the romantic responses of adolescents would change at different stages of courtship. The evidence supported the hypothesis that the "strains of separation" (24, p. 366) result in an increase in romanticism for separated men. However, the trend of the data suggested that women in regular contact with their steady date, whether "going steady," engaged, or married, tend to be more romantic than separated women. Hobart predicted without explicit theoretical justification, that married men would display a significant decline in romanticism. This expectation was contradicted. The level of romanticism for married males was not significantly different from those engaged, going steady, and/or favorite date subjects. In all groupings, male subjects scored higher on the applied measure of romanticism than female subjects.

Dean (11) studied the relationship between romanticism and emotional maturity, sampling 194 undergraduate university women. A thirty-two item scale was developed for the purpose of assessing romanticism in heterosexual relationships. Dean conceptualized romantic and companionship love as polar types.
Romantic love was considered essentially the same as the conception portrayed widely in the mass entertainment media and summarized in the above definition. Companionship love was described as a relationship of gradual development, more mature, other person centered, altruistic, and responsible. Dean found no significant correlation between romanticism and emotional maturity for his sample, suggesting that "It may well be that the Romantic Complex is so all pervasive in the American youth culture that there is little discernible difference between the emotionally immature in regard to romanticism" (10, p. 8).

In a post hoc examination of his data, Dean (10) found that the correlation between romanticism and emotional immaturity exceeded the .01 level of significance for women from a higher socio-economic status. This correlation resulted not from differences in emotional maturity between high and low status subjects, but from apparent differences in romanticism. Dean suggests that "Perhaps romanticism is a cultural 'compensatory mechanism' for low status . . . " (10, p. 7).

No clear definition of marital adjustment is found in the literature. Attempts at brevity fall prey to simplistic overemphasis, while attempts to involve the full spectrum of such a complex concept quickly become so unwieldy as to be of no value.
Research focus on marital adjustment, happiness, and/or stability has abounded in the last decade. Hicks and Platt (22) reviewed 120 research articles published in the United States in the 1960's. It was their conclusion that "the time has come for a major shift in research emphasis" (22, p. 74) from atheoretical, demographic surveys to a set lending itself to the discovery or formulation of a theoretical framework tailored to marriage itself.

In the absence of any foundational theory giving rise to a uniform set of concepts, the definitional problems in research on marital adjustment are almost overwhelming. "Happiness," "success," "adjustment," and "satisfaction" are the terms most frequently used to delineate the subjective state of the marital relationship. These words have many nuances of meaning, and behavioral scientists who have explored these phenomena have been unable to formulate precise definitions for any of them. As an alternative most investigators have essentially let the subjects provide their own definitions.

According to Lively (35), marital success has too often been viewed as a state of achievement rather than as a continuous variable. In fact, it is probably not even an unitary or continuous variable since the success of one person is not necessarily equal to that of another. Of the easily identifiable criteria used in most measures of marital success (e.g. remaining married, sharing residence, having
children, acquisition of material goods, agreement of husband-wife role sets, etc.), none have differentiating possibilities beyond a false, simple dichotomization into successful-unsuccessful categories.

Burgess, Lock, and Thomas claim that satisfaction with marriage is not by itself an adequate measure of success, for either husband or wife may be dissatisfied in marriage where there is no conflict or incompatibility, or they may be highly satisfied in a union which has unsolved problems of adjustment (7, p. 292).

Referring to marital interaction, Rossi says:

Happiness is too personal and subjective a phenomenon to be studied by the crude measuring devices presently available to the social scientist (3, Preface, p. v).

Schvaneveldt (47) suggests that marriage must be considered within an interactional framework referring to group processes, while happiness is an individual referent. He questions whether there can be any meaningful association between them.

Goode (15) states that "happiness is not, and cannot be, built into any family system as either a statistical average, or as a moral norm. As members of the society, we cannot be morally required to be happy or unhappy" (15, p. 7). He argues that instability, conflict, and unhappiness are inevitable in the family system because it involves different people who interact differently. There are institutional modes of expressing such inevitabilities. Consequently, there are no moral choices between happiness and unhappiness.
Interaction is based on choices within a normative framework so individuals and couples tend to choose between types of pleasure or between undesired results. According to Goode (15), a choice between happiness and unhappiness is not available, and attempts to measure either or both cannot be predictive of marital activity.

Lively (35) states that it "seems more tenable to argue that individual happiness and group relationships are independent variables, and no causal interdependence exists or can be assumed to exist" (35, p. 110). Factors which contribute to one's mental and emotional states are highly personal. Those that produce "happiness" for one may not for another. This applies to individuals and does not incorporate interaction in marriage.

"Adjustment," the fourth term most frequently applied in studies of the marital relationship, also has its negative elements. It too is frequently applied in such a way as to suggest the attainment of some ultimate, static position, rather than a fluctuating process idiosyncratically defined at a given point and involving individual, couple, and larger societal referents. However, it has a greater potential to be used to describe the continuing development of the relationship between husband and wife. "It is a valuable concept for emphasizing the dynamic nature of marriage" (35, p. 111).

The first attempt to measure success by a numerical score was made by Hamilton in 1929 (20). Burgess and Cottrell (6)
must be credited with the earliest comprehensive study of marital adjustment by developing and distributing a scale to permit the prediction of marital success. Burgess and Cottrell saw marital adjustment as being good when there was husband-wife agreement on major issues of importance, common interests and activities, sharing of affection and confidences, few complaints, and absence of loneliness. These factors were, in turn, associated with the similarity of couples' backgrounds, happiness in the parental family, and a fairly conventional adjustment in other areas of life. Terman (51), in another early study, looked at personality factors associated with marital adjustment.

Since these pioneering efforts, researchers have developed numerous scales to measure the concept of marital adjustment. Straus (48) reviews 327 published family measurement techniques, of which the titles of forty-seven specifically indicate a focus upon the primary husband-wife interaction and adjustment.

After reviewing summaries of the many studies done concerning marital adjustment (22, 31, 33, 52), it is clear that a concise definition of the concept does not exist. However, marital adjustment is a term which generally describes those marriages which are relatively free of conflict, in which the husband and wife are in relative agreement on major issues, in which both enjoy the same leisure interests and participate in them together, in which spouses show affection for one
another. Well-adjusted spouses are described as mature, stable, conventional, conforming people, who themselves come from untroubled backgrounds. The term marital maladjustment will refer to the opposite characteristics, or the inability of a couple to achieve a relationship in which the well-adjusted characteristics are present.

It is clear from a review of the literature that there is no consensus of opinion on the functionality-dysfunctionality of romanticism. Biased, unsubstantiated opinions must not be randomly perpetuated, no matter how respected their authors may be. The existence or nonexistence of a relationship between romantic conceptualizations and marital adjustment must be established through careful research.

Summary

Love, and its effect on marital adjustment, has been a topic of debate for over forty years in both professional and non-professional contexts. A review of the literature suggests that the most widely held opinion among professional family theorists and counselors is that the romantic complex gives rise to dysfunctional marital adjustment. There is, however, very little published research on the topic.

The lack of sound research in this area has resulted in opposing doctrinal positions, without the ability to particularize any underlying principles. This study examines the nature of any quantifiable relationship between romantic
love and marital adjustment, current or future. Three views of this relationship are considered. The first is that romanticism is functional, contributing to positive marital adjustment. The second is characterized by the belief that romantic love has a negative impact upon marriage and is thus dysfunctional. A third view of the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment suggests that the critical element determining dysfunctionality is the disparity between partners, rather than the individual level of romanticism. No author has heretofore considered this alternative.

In the present study research attention is given to the length of the marriage, the sex of the respondent, and the disparity between mates on level of romanticism, all as related to romanticism and marital adjustment. This study also investigates the level of romanticism as related to sex and/or length of marriage without regard to marital adjustment.

A detailed description of the experimental design, procedures, and testable hypotheses is contained in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Subjects

All subjects were drawn from the population of a suburban community of 29,000 residents, most of whom find their employment in the neighboring Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. The principal wage earners are predominantly members of a profession, executives in local industry, and/or businessmen. The members of the community are active in civic and social affairs, taking great pride in their recreational resources and general quality of life. This community has twelve public schools, twenty-one churches serving twelve denominations, twelve public parks covering eighty-seven acres, twenty-five tennis courts, seven swimming pools open to the public, three eighteen-hole golf courses, and two major country clubs. Lions Club, Rotary Club of Dallas County, Northwest, Kiwanis Club, Junior Chamber of Commerce, and two local women's civic organizations are active in the community.

There is a similarity between the demographically descriptive data of this particular middle-class community and Green's (4) description of the civic and social conscience of the middle class:
Members of this class are hyperactive in civic affairs. They hold over three-fourths of all positions of leadership in civic organizations. The men are concentrated in the local power organizations, such as Rotary, the Chamber of Commerce, the country club; the women are active in the prestigious social organizations, such as D.A.R., W.C.T.U., and the Home Garden Club (4, p. 187).

Every tenth residence listed in the local telephone directory was contacted by telephone in the evenings. Each adult respondent received a standard explanation of the purpose of the call and intent of the research. Those who expressed willingness to cooperate were questioned to insure they met the following requirements for participation, and the Warner Index of Social Characteristics (13; See Appendix B) was then administered via telephone.

The following characteristics were accepted as criteria for participation:

1. Both husband and wife were willing to participate in an anonymous study of how attitudes and opinions may affect marriage.

2. The participating couples were in a legal heterosexual marital relationship.

3. All participants were in the age range twenty-one to fifty-five years.

4. No participant was accepted who was separated from their mate, whether legally or otherwise, or who had been previously married.

5. All participants were members of the middle socioeconomic class, as measured by Warner's Index of Social Characteristics (13) and as defined above.

All couples agreeing to participate were grouped by length of marriage (zero to five years; six to ten years;
eleven years or more). Three hundred and forty-nine contacts were made, from which eighty-two qualified couples (23.49 percent) verbally agreed to participate. Of these eighty-two, twenty-seven were married zero to 5 years, twenty-six were married six to ten years, and twenty-nine were married eleven years or more.

The average age of those subjects participating in the research (see below) was 26.09 years in the group married zero to five years, 32.42 years in the group married six to ten years, and 37.36 years in the group married eleven years or more. Those subjects married zero to five years had been married an average of 2.24 years and reported an average of .71 children. Those in the six to ten year group had been married 8.40 years, with 1.93 children. The average family participating in the eleven years or more sample had been married 15.48 years and reported 2.95 children per family. There was little variation in the groups as to the average level of formal education completed at the time of marriage. Those married zero to five years reported 14.19 years, those in the six to ten year group reported 14.04 years, and the eleven years or more sample had completed 14.55 years of education.

Average scores on the Warner Index of Social Characteristics (13) were 33.82 for those married zero to five years, 31.01 for the six to ten year group, and for those married eleven years or more the average was 24.98.
Procedure

All subjects were asked to complete the selected instruments individually and in one setting. The instruments were presented in small group meetings held in the evenings at a location in the community. The meetings were held on Monday, May 21, 1973; Wednesday, May 23, 1973; Saturday, May 26, 1973; Tuesday, May 29, 1973; and Wednesday, May 30, 1973. Each participating couple was allowed to select the group meeting of their choice, but was required to attend conjointly. The questionnaires were completed anonymously with couple answer sheets matched through the use of a numerical code.

Of those originally agreeing to participate, twenty couples married zero to five years actually attended their group meeting, nineteen couples married six to ten years attended, and twenty-one couples married eleven or more years participated. Twelve couples, not attending, contacted the experimenter to explain their absence. Of these, one couple married zero to five years and two couples married six to ten years were visited in their homes by the experimenter on Thursday, May 31, 1973, and allowed to complete the questionnaire at that time. A total of sixty three couples participated, evenly divided into three groups according to reported length of marriage.
The questionnaire (Appendix A) was presented at each meeting with the following instructions:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research on the way in which opinions and attitudes may affect marriage. I will be handing each of you an eighty-nine item questionnaire which will help us know more about these questions. There are no right or wrong answers. Please complete the questionnaire without discussing it with anyone, especially your mate. We want only your opinions on each of these questions. It is important that you answer every question. If you are uncertain of the answer, mark your first impression. Do not spend too much time on any question. Your answers will be kept strictly confidential. Do not sign your name. If you have any questions please raise your hand and I will answer it for you. Do not discuss it with your husband or wife until both of you are completed. When finished you may leave your questionnaire on the table by the door and leave. Again, our thanks for your assistance.

Instruments

The Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test, the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Prediction Test, the Dean Romanticism Scale, and a demographic data questionnaire were combined into one "Public Opinion Questionnaire" (Appendix A), and anonymously administered to all subjects.

The Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (8) contains fifteen items. It was developed after Locke discovered several fairly independent factors in an analysis of his marital adjustment data (7), but no general factor which could be called "adjustment" (9). These items were selected from a pool of approximately 540 items on the basis of those which (1) had the highest level of discrimination, (2) did
not duplicate other included items, and (3) would cover the important areas of marital adjustment as judged by the authors. Applied to a sample representing 236 middle-class marriages, the reliability coefficient was .90, as computed by the split-half technique and corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula.

Dividing the sample into matched groups known to be maladjusted in marriage (N=48) and those judged to be "exceptionally well-adjusted" by close friends, a critical ratio of 17.5 was obtained between group means. Thus, there is evidence for the validity of this instrument.

The range of total possible scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test is 2 to 158 points. All items are forced choice.

The Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (8) contains thirty-five items. These items were selected from a pool of approximately 950 items on the same criteria as the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test. Applied to a sample representing 236 marriages, the reliability coefficient was .84, as computed by the split-half technique and corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula. Validity, beyond the content area discussed above, was based upon the correlation of the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test with the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test. For the total sample, the correlation between the prediction and adjustment scores
was .47. Item format is basically the same as that for the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test. The total range of scores for men is 0 to 532, and from 0 to 502 for women.

Considerable difficulty was experienced in locating a satisfactory scale of romanticism. Dean (3), in a study of romanticism and emotional maturity, developed a thirty-two item questionnaire to assess romantic love. All items are responded to on a five point scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree," with a Likert-type weighting of response scores from zero to four. The mean discriminatory power for all items, following item analysis, was reported to be .97 (3). When applied to a sample of 194 female university students, a split-half reliability corrected for attenuation was reported as .90 (3).

All data obtained through administration of the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test, the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test, and the Dean Romanticism Scale was treated as interval level. The Dean Romanticism Scale, scored by a Likert-type weighting, lends itself well to the assumptions of interval data and has been treated in this way by Dean in his reported computations of means, Pearson correlations, critical ratios, and reliability coefficients corrected for attenuation.

The two Locke-Wallace instruments have been treated as rendering data of interval level by other researchers (10, 11).
In addition to the reported studies of Locke in which obtained data were treated through application of Pearson correlation, critical ratios between means, and reliability coefficients corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula, Locke and Williamson (9) report a factor analytic study of essentially the same items.

The Locke-Wallace instruments are both scored with weighted response values according to the degree of differences between the percentages of the happily married and divorced who had responses in a given category to each item (7, p. 46). The numerical weight to each category of a question was assigned by the method of graphical determination of weights (6, p. 446). Because men and women tended to respond to certain items differently, some of the response weights vary slightly depending on the sex of the subject.

The reported score distributions on the Dean scale and both Locke-Wallace instruments approximate a normal distribution (7, p. 54, 3, p. 8). Instruments of this nature, using direct and obvious questions regarding the subject's personal feelings about his marriage, are open to criticism concerning the integrity of the subject's responses and resultant bias. Burgess, Locke, and Thomas (1) advance the argument that the most authentic evaluation of a marriage is the criterion that each couple selects as its standard of success.

The results of research show that in marriages which are unhappy, individuals seize on many things or anything as
concrete evidence of marital dissatisfaction, whereas in marriages that are happy complaints are minimized (12, 2). Thus, the falsification bias (6, p. 452) has been corrected through both the response sets of respondents, and the application of empirical weights.

Limitations

The results of this study are limited in their generalizability to the extent that the participating sample is representative of typical middle class values and attitudes, and by the validity of each of the three selected instruments.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were tested, using appropriate statistical techniques as discussed below:

1. There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for:
   (a) the total sample
   (b) male subjects
   (c) female subjects
   (d) subjects married zero to five years
   (e) subjects married six to ten years
   (f) subjects married eleven years or more
   (g) male subjects married zero to five years
   (h) male subjects married six to ten years
   (i) male subjects married eleven years or more
(j) female subjects married zero to five years
(k) female subjects married six to ten years
(l) female subjects married eleven years or more

2. There will be no significant relationship between scores on the **Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test** and the **Dean Romanticism Scale** for:
   (a) the total sample
   (b) male subjects
   (c) female subjects
   (d) subjects married zero to five years
   (e) subjects married six to ten years
   (f) subjects married eleven years or more
   (g) male subjects married zero to five years
   (h) male subjects married six to ten years
   (i) male subjects married eleven years or more
   (j) female subjects married zero to five years
   (k) female subjects married six to ten years
   (l) female subjects married eleven years or more

3. There will be no significant relationship between married couples discrepancy scores on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** and family scores on the **Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test**, expressed as a proportion of the combined observed to the combined possible, for:
   (a) the total sample
   (b) subjects married zero to five years
(c) subjects married six to ten years
(d) subjects married eleven years or more

4. There will be no significant relationship between married couples discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test, expressed as a proportion of the combined observed to the combined possible, for:
   (a) the total sample
   (b) subjects married zero to five years
   (c) subjects married six to ten years
   (d) subjects married eleven years or more

5. There will be no significant differences in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale between the sexes.

6. There will be no significant differences in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale among length of marriage grouping.

7. There will be no significant interaction effect between sex and length of marriage in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale.

Treatment of Data

The data obtained from the test administration was compiled for statistical analysis. The .05 level of significance was required for rejection of the null hypothesis. Statistical analyses were done using the North Texas State University Statistical Library (University Computer Center).
The following statistical analyses were accomplished:

1. Pearson Product-moment coefficient of correlation (5) utilizing the raw score formula was computed utilizing appropriate test scores for all relevant comparisons in Hypotheses One through Four.

2. Level of significance for each obtained correlation coefficient was assessed through referral to Guilford's table of "Coefficients of Correlation and t Ratios Significant at the .05 Level" (5, Table D, p. 538).

3. A two-by-three Analysis of Variance (5) was used to evaluate the differences between male and female scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale for the total sample, for sub-samples as divided by length of marriage, and for interaction effects of sex by length of marriage (Hypotheses Five through Seven).

4. Tukey's honestly significant difference procedure (14, pp. 87-88) was used to test the significance of differences among means for all significant F tests.

Summary

Sixty-three married couples (126 individuals) were selected from the population of Farmers Branch, Texas, and surveyed anonymously through application of a "Public Opinion Questionnaire" (Appendix A). Farmers Branch is a satellite city of Dallas, Texas and is operationally defined as a representative middle socioeconomic class community. All
participants were listed in the Farmers Branch telephone directory and were legally married, currently living with their mate, not previously married, in the age range of twenty-one to fifty-five years, and categorized as members of the middle socioeconomic class on the basis of their scores on the Warner Index of Social Characteristics (13).

Participating subjects were grouped by length of marriage (zero to five years; six to ten years; eleven years or more), with twenty-one couples in each group. The questionnaire, administered to all subjects anonymously, was comprised of the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test, the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Prediction Test, the Dean Romanticism Scale, and a brief demographic questionnaire.

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between romanticism and individual marital adjustment, or between romanticism and prediction of future individual marital adjustment. For each of these first two hypotheses, eleven sub-samples were considered besides the total sample. They were as follows: male subjects, female subjects, subjects married zero to five years, subjects married six to ten years, subjects married eleven years or more, male subjects married zero to five years, male subjects married six to ten years, male subjects married eleven years or more, female subjects married zero to five years, female subjects married six to ten years, and female subjects married eleven years or more.
Hypotheses Three and Four dealt with any relationship between the couples' discrepancy on the level of romanticism and their marital adjustment, and between their discrepancy on the level of romanticism and the prediction of future marital adjustment. For each of these hypotheses, three sub-samples were considered besides the total sample. They were as follows: subjects married zero to five years, subjects married six to ten years, and subjects married eleven years or more.

Hypotheses Five through Seven stated that there would be no relationship between the level of romanticism and the sex of respondents, the level of romanticism and the length of respondents' marriage, nor would there be any interaction between sex and length of marriage in the measured level of romanticism.

The data were compared using Pearson's Product-moment Correlation and Hoyt's Analysis of Variance technique. The results are reported in the next chapter.
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CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Overview

The results of the data collected for this study are presented in this chapter, and the hypotheses are restated. Statistical analyses were done using Pearson's Product-moment Correlation and Hoyt's Analysis of Variance technique through programs furnished from the North Texas State University Statistical Library. The programs used were "ST006: Simple Correlation (revised June, 1971)," and "ST040: Analysis of Variance (two or three way design) revised December, 1971." All hypotheses were stated in the null form and tested at the .05 level of significance.

Results

All of the hypotheses are restated below in their original null form, along with the results of the statistical treatment as it applies to each hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1a.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for the total sample. There were 126 observations, rendering a mean score of 47.38 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation
14.96) and 111.00 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 25.70). The obtained correlation of .070 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1b.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean score of 48.97 for the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 16.93) and 108.05 for the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 28.01). The obtained correlation of .087 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1c.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean score of 45.79 for the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 12.62) and 113.95 for the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 23.00). The obtained correlation of .077 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1d.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment
Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married zero to five years. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 47.21 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 15.59) and 113.50 for the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 24.85). The obtained correlation of -.297 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis le.—There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married six to ten years. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 44.14 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 13.88) and 106.07 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 28.85). The obtained correlation of .230 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1f.—There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married eleven years or more. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 50.79 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 14.95) and 113.43 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation
22.94). The obtained correlation of .234 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis 1g.**—There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 49.86 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 17.52) and 111.57 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 29.09). The obtained correlation of -.293 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis 1h.**—There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 41.95 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 16.17) and 104.24 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 30.96). The obtained correlation of .330 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 1i.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 55.09 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 15.10) and 108.33 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 24.47). The obtained correlation of .210 was not significant at the .05 level, and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1j.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 44.57 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 13.29) and 115.43 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 20.29). The obtained correlation of -.280 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 1k.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 46.33 on the Dean
Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 11.12) and 107.90 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 27.21). The obtained correlation of .049 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis II.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 46.48 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 13.82) and 118.52 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation 20.64). The obtained correlation of .464 was significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 2a.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for the total sample. There were 126 observations, rendering a mean score of 47.38 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 14.96) and 308.74 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 60.25). The obtained correlation of .077 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 2b.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean score of 48.97 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 16.93) and 320.40 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test. The obtained correlation of .100 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2c.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean score of 45.79 for the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 12.62) and 297.08 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 60.63). The obtained correlation of .005 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2d.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married zero to five years. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 47.21 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 15.59) and 297.81 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 66.21). The obtained
correlation of -.206 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2e.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married six to ten years. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 44.14 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 13.88) and 304.43 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 59.33). The obtained correlation of .258 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2f.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for subjects married eleven years or more. There were forty-two observations, rendering a mean score of 50.79 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 14.95) and 323.98 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 52.77). The obtained correlation of .180 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2g.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations,
rendering a mean score of 49.86 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 17.52) and 311.43 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 58.42). The obtained correlation of -.320 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2h.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 41.95 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 16.17) and 315.38 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 58.82). The obtained correlation of .328 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2i.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for male subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 55.09 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 15.10) and 334.38 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 56.98). The obtained correlation of .236 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 2i.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 44.57 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 13.29) and 284.19 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 71.99). The obtained correlation of -.193 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2k.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 46.33 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 11.12) and 293.48 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 59.21). The obtained correlation of .264 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2l.--There will be no significant relationship between scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test and the Dean Romanticism Scale for female subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean score of 46.48 on the Dean Romanticism Scale.
Scale (standard deviation 13.82) and 313.57 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation 47.27). The obtained correlation of -.007 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 3a.--There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test for the total sample. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 12.38 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 10.06) and a mean family score of .693 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation .139). The obtained correlation of -.370 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 3b.--There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test for subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 10.33 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 10.91) and a mean family score of .718 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard
deviation .15). The obtained correlation of -.149 was not significant at the .05 level and thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

**Hypothesis 3c.**—There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test for subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 11.81 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 7.61) and a mean family score of .641 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation .17). The obtained correlation of -.551 was significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 3d.**—There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test for subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 15.00 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 11.65) and a mean family score of .719 on the Locke-Wallace Short Marital Adjustment Test (standard deviation .10). The obtained correlation of .377 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.
Hypothesis 4a.---There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** and family scores on the **Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test** for the total sample. There were sixty-three observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 12.38 on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** (standard deviation 10.06) and a mean family score of .5952 on the **Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test** (standard deviation .09). The obtained correlation of -.217 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 4b.---There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** and the family scores on the **Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test** for subjects married zero to five years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 10.33 on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** (standard deviation 10.91) and a mean family score of .576 on the **Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test** (standard deviation .10). The obtained correlation of -.274 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 4c.---There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the **Dean Romanticism Scale** and family scores on the **Locke-Wallace**
Marital Prediction Test for subjects married six to ten years. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 11.81 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 7.61) and a mean family score of .587 on the Locke-Wallace Prediction Test (standard deviation .10). The obtained correlation of -.151 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 4d.—There will be no significant relationship between married couples' discrepancy scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale and family scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test for subjects married eleven years or more. There were twenty-one observations, rendering a mean discrepancy score of 15.00 on the Dean Romanticism Scale (standard deviation 11.65) and a mean family score of .627 on the Locke-Wallace Marital Prediction Test (standard deviation .07). The obtained correlation of -.219 was not significant at the .05 level and, thus, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 5.—There will be no significant differences in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale between the sexes. Hypothesis Five could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The obtained F of 1.479 evidenced a probability of occurrence of .226, below the established level for rejection. The hypothesis of no difference was accepted.
Hypothesis 6.--There will be no significant differences in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale between length of marriage groupings. Hypothesis Six could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The obtained F of 2.163 evidenced a probability of occurrence of .119, below the established level for rejection. The hypothesis of no difference was accepted.

Hypothesis 7.--There will be no significant interaction effect between sex and length of marriage in scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale. Hypothesis Seven could not be rejected at the .05 level of significance. The obtained F of 2.230 evidenced a probability of occurrence of .112, below the established level for rejection. The hypothesis of no difference was accepted.

Summary

In this chapter, the results of the data collected for this study were presented. Each hypothesis was restated in the null form and the statistical results were presented. A .05 level of significance was required for rejection of the hypothesis of no difference.

A total of thirty-two correlations were computed. The null form of the hypothesis was accepted in thirty instances. At the 5 per cent level of confidence, 1.6 (rounded to two) correlations would be expected to achieve significance, if chance alone were operating. In neither hypothesis achieving
the .05 level of significance was there any rationale to support interpretation as other than random chance. Accordingly, the hypothesis of no relationship was accepted for all thirty-two correlations. An analysis of variance yielded no significant main effects nor interaction. In a post hoc examination of the data, it was determined that no relation exists between length of marriage and marital adjustment for the total sample nor for either sex group.

Discussion of these results and conclusions are contained in the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Summary

This study investigated the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment in a sample of middle-class couples. Romantic love was defined as a general disposition an individual has toward love, marriage, the family, and relationships involving male-female interaction in which the affective component is regarded as primary, and all other considerations are excluded from conscious reflection (42, 13). Marital adjustment was defined as the positive accommodation of husband and wife interacting within the framework of a legally established marital relationship.

Romanticism has been dogmatically asserted to be a significant factor in marital dysfunctionality by authors such as Burgess (6), Lederer and Jackson (26), Bach and Wyden (2), Rapoport and Rapoport (37), Kubie (24), Nagy and Framo (32), Lippman (27), Landis (25), and Greenfield (15). Without benefit of empirical research, they have concluded that the concept of romantic love will result in the lovers relating to idealized images rather than to real people, ultimately causing disillusionment, dissatisfaction, and dysfunctionality.
Kolb (23), Hobart (21, 22), Parsons (35), Waller (40), and Beigel (3), all develop the thesis that romantic love is not only functional, but necessary for positive marital adjustment. It is their belief that romanticism assists in adolescent adjustment, that it eases the passage from single life to marital status, and that it has helped to raise the status of the female. They state that the concept of romantic love epitomizes the heart of humanism and free choice, in that it contributes to personality growth and creativity in human relationships.

The lack of sound research into this matter has resulted in opposing doctrinal positions, without the ability to particularize any underlying principles. This study examined the nature of any quantifiable relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment, current or future. Three distinct views of this relationship were investigated. The first view contends that romanticism is functional, contributing to positive marital adjustment. The second is characterized by the belief that romantic love has a negative impact upon marriage and is thus dysfunctional. A third view of the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment suggests that the critical element determining dysfunctionality is the disparity between partners, rather than the individual level of romanticism. No author has heretofore considered this alternative.
Little empirical data is to be found in the literature on any aspect of romanticism. Gross (16), Hobart (21, 22), and Dean (13) each provided evidence that romanticism is an identifiable construct which may be objectively measured, yielding quantifiable scores. Concepts of marital adjustment have received much research attention since the pioneering work of Hamilton in 1929 (18). A review of the literature, however, reveals no prior empirical attempt to study the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment. The present study is, to an extent, exploratory in nature.

Due to the nature of the topic, experimental manipulation of the independent variable (romanticism) was impossible. Accordingly, a sample of sixty-three married couples (126 individuals) were surveyed anonymously through application of a "Public Opinion Questionnaire" (Appendix A). Farmers Branch is a "satellite city" of Dallas, Texas, and was operationally defined as a representative middle socioeconomic class community. All participants were listed in the Farmers Branch telephone directory and were legally married, currently living with their mate, not previously married, in the age range of twenty-one to fifty-five years, and categorized as members of the middle socioeconomic class on the basis of their scores on the Warner Index of Social Characteristics (41).

It was hypothesized that there would be no relationship between romanticism and individual marital adjustment, or
between romanticism and prediction of future individual marital adjustment. For each of these first two hypotheses, eleven subsamples were considered besides the total sample. They were as follows: male subjects, female subjects, subjects married zero to five years, subjects married six to ten years, subjects married eleven years or more, male subjects married zero to five years, male subjects married six to ten years, male subjects married eleven years or more, female subjects married zero to five years, female subjects married six to ten years, and female subjects married eleven years or more.

Hypotheses Three and Four dealt with any relationship between couples' discrepancy on level of romanticism and their marital adjustment, and between their discrepancy on level of romanticism and the prediction of future marital adjustment. For each of these hypotheses, three subsamples were considered besides the total sample. They were as follows: subjects married zero to five years, subjects married six to ten years, and subjects married eleven years or more.

Hypotheses Five through Seven stated that there would be no relationship between level of romanticism and sex of respondents, level of romanticism and length of respondents' marriage, or interaction between sex and length of marriage in measured level of romanticism.
Statistical analyses were done, using Pearson's Product-Moment Correlation for Hypotheses One through Four, and Hoyt's Analysis of Variance technique for Hypotheses Five through Seven. A .05 level of significance was required for rejection of the hypothesis of no difference.

A total of thirty-two correlations were computed. Prior to meaningful interpretation of data for specific hypotheses, it was necessary to first determine if the number of significant correlations were so numerous that chance alone could not account for them. At the 5 per cent level of confidence, 1.6 (rounded to two) correlations would be expected to achieve significance if chance alone were operating.

In thirty instances, the null form of the hypothesis was accepted due to the failure to achieve the .05 level of significance. The hypothesis of no relationship was rejected on two occasions. The first of these dealt with the relationship between level of romanticism and current individual marital adjustment for females married eleven years or more. The second concerned the relation between couples' discrepancy on level of romanticism and their current marital adjustment for subjects married six to ten years. In neither case was there any rationale to support interpretation as other than random chance. Accordingly, the hypothesis of no relationship was accepted for Hypothesis One through Four, inclusive.

No significant F tests for main effects or interaction effects were obtained for data on Hypotheses Five through
Seven, inclusive. Therefore, the hypotheses of no relationship are accepted throughout.

Discussion

The literature concerning the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment has been dogmatic and inconclusive. Romantic love has frequently been assigned a negative valence in discussions of the etiology of marital dysfunctionality (6, 26, 2, 37, 24, 32, 25, 15, 42).

Kolb (23), Hobart (21, 22), Parsons (35), Waller (40), and Beigel (3) develop the converse position that romanticism is not only functional, but a necessary contributor to positive marital adjustment. In no case has the question been approached empirically. Neither has any author considered mate discrepancy in the level of romanticism as an alternative explanation to any potential relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment.

This study was conducted to determine if any relationship exists at an experimentally demonstrable level. The results were not statistically significant, a finding which must call into question the conclusions of the above cited authors.

Before discussing the implications of these findings, it is appropriate to consider potential criticisms. Although the questionnaire method of data gathering can be faulted by some for failure to control for insincere, self-protective,
and/or humorous responses, the results of this study cannot be seriously challenged on that basis. All questionnaires were completed under the close observation of the experimenter and scored individually by him. In no case was there any indication of an insincere, protective, or light-hearted response set. To the contrary, comments made verbally and/or recorded on the questionnaire margins implied a high level of interest and candidness on the part of the participants.

The validity and reliability of the three scales used were considered in their selection (28, 12, 13, 29, 39, 7). Furthermore, the actual scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale (from 10 to 94) covered most of the range of possible scores (0 to 128), and closely approximate a normal curve, suggesting that the sample surveyed was representative of the normative population.

The failure to obtain statistical significance in the relationship between romantic love and marital adjustment in middle class couples challenges the easy assumptions of many authors. Romanticism, a philosophical conceptualization of the ideal male-female relationship in which the affective component is primary (e.g. "Love conquers all"), is vague and of questionable importance in the society of the 1970's. Values and attitudes within the current American culture are in a process of change. Without the ability to evaluate the glib assertions concerning romanticism made in the 1950's and
1960's, it seems reasonable that romantic love has neither positive nor negative valence in relation to marital adjustment in today's world.

Obtained scores on the Dean Romanticism Scale approximated a normal distribution. There was not a significant correlation between romanticism and current or predicted marital adjustment. These results suggest that the romantic complex is so all-pervasive in the middle socioeconomic class of the American culture that there is little discernible difference between those couples who have achieved functional marriages and those couples who have not.

Family theorists have postulated for several years that at least two basic marital types co-exist in the United States: the institutional, and the companionship (20). The assumption has been that the institutional is the older, more firmly established type, but that there is a shift toward the companionship marriage.

In the institutional marriage, adherence to traditional role specifications, custom, and mores would be the factors which would be most significant to the success of the marriage. This is a tradition-oriented marriage in which modal roles exist, and are sex differentiated. The husband role is held to be the more instrumental, while the wife role is regarded as being the more expressive-integrative. In this marital type, since the wife is more accommodating
and the husband more rigid in role needs, marital happiness is more a function of the husband's possession of the expected instrumental needs and capacities. Thus, the instrumental aspects of marriage predominate. Variables such as higher occupational statuses, income, and educational levels for husbands, and husband-wife similarities in socio-economic status, age and religion, and religiosity are expected to be significant for happiness in this marital type. It has been frequently suggested that this is the modal type, and that those marriages which follow this model have the greater likelihood of achieving marital happiness.

A second, emerging type, usually referred to as the companionship or "open" marriage (33), places greater emphasis on the affective aspects of the relationship. Emphasis is placed on personality interaction. Role specifications are taken for granted and may even be supplemented. Much more is expected, or even demanded, than in the institutional marriage. Companionship, expressions of love, etc., characterize this pattern. Marital happiness is a function of the expressive aspects of the relationship. Variables such as affection, sexual enjoyment, companionship, and communication are expected to be significant to happiness in this type of marital relationship.

There is no reported research that has systematically studied the evolution or frequency of occurrence of the
latter marital style. Anecdotal reports show that, within the last decade, an increasing number of couples are relating in this manner. Inherent in this type of relationship, romantic conceptualizations are modified to a less potentially pathological format, and their broad acceptance obviates them as critical factors in marital adjustment.

Thus, on the basis of obtained data, it is concluded that romantic love has no significant relationship with current or predicted marital adjustment.

In the review of the literature following this study, it was observed that several authors present data indicating that marital happiness varies over time, with a trend toward a decrease in happiness. This research has been both cross-sectional and retrospective in nature (31, 30, 4, 38, 1, 5, 17, 8) and longitudinal (14, 36, 34, 10).

This research leads to the conclusion that there are significant differences in marital satisfaction at various times, and that husband's and wife's satisfaction do not necessarily co-vary. The findings relative to trend and direction are confusing. Most of the studies reveal a gradual decrease in satisfaction, but other data indicate some abrupt changes, as well as some increases over time.

In view of these conflicting reports, a post hoc examination was made of the marital adjustment data obtained in the present study. Hoyt's Analysis of Variance was applied, using a two-by-three matrix. A sample of 126
subjects, grouped by sex and length of marriage, resulted in equal cell number of twenty-one subjects. No significant F was obtained for the main effects, or the interaction effect. Thus, the post hoc hypotheses of no relationship could not be rejected.

Implications

The results of this study must be understood and interpreted in terms of the particular treatment, population, and measures used. The range of external validity is determined by the above, and caution is advised in making implications from the results for other populations and conditions. Nevertheless, the obtained results imply that the concept of romanticism, as operationally defined, has neither positive nor negative impact upon current or predicted marital adjustment for this sample of middle class couples. It is also implied that the concept of romanticism is not a viable concept for any other population or sample like that in this particular study.

Implications for Research

Although virtually no research on the topic of romanticism has been published since the efforts of Dean (12, 13), interest in the topic remains high. Casler's article (9) provided the impetus for symposia on "Love" in both 1970 and 1971 at the American Psychological Association's annual meetings. Curtin (11) published a book based upon the second of these symposia,
and the Herrigans (19) have attracted popular attention with their attempt to deal with one facet of the romantic complex. Although the results of this research appear unequivocal, further research is needed to clearly delineate the parameters of the variables concerned, and to carefully ascertain that no significant interactions are operative.

Gross developed his romanticism scale in 1944. Dean developed his scale in 1960. For over a decade, no author has revised either of the instruments or published a new scale. There has been no attempt to compensate for changing cultural attitudes and values in this sensitive area. It is suggested that the development of a new romanticism scale is needed before further research is undertaken. The Likert-style scoring used by Dean might lend itself admirably to a new scale. An adequate procedural model for such an effort is found in the early work of Gross (16).

As measured by the instruments used in this study, the romantic complex has been shown to have no significant relationship to present marital adjustment or to prediction of future marital adjustment in middle socioeconomic class couples. A homogeneous sample, operationally defined as representative of the American middle socioeconomic class, was selected for participation in this study. No consideration was given to "institutional" or "companionship" (20) alternatives within the dyadic relationship. Sampling
procedures specifically excluded participants in non-traditional family forms (e.g. communal living, cohabitation, homosexual relationships), ethnic minorities, and socioeconomic class groupings other than the middle class.

Future cross-sectional research concerning levels of romanticism and/or any relation between romanticism and marital adjustment should draw its research sample so as to evaluate not only sex and length of marriage, but also extant family form, ethnicity, and all socioeconomic class groupings. In view of the changing conceptualization of the marital relationship, specific attention should be paid to the distinction between institutional and companionship marriages to ascertain any variance in romantic conceptualizations and their effect.

A longitudinal study, beginning at pre-engagement, on the above suggested variables might assist in the delineation of both current and long-range effects of varying levels of romanticism in marital adjustment and outcome.

Implications for Clinical Practice

The American society largely considers loving and being loved as important and necessary to the well-adjusted, mature, and full life. Consequently, the unloved and unloving are frequently made to feel as if they are incomplete persons. Weigert (11) has suggested that self-respect is perhaps a
better criterion than love for the "mature" person. Her definition of self-respect includes these aspects: (1) the person's sense of his/her own value, and (2) confidence in one's ability to fulfill one's intentions.

The failure of this research data to reject the hypotheses of no relationship between romanticism and marital adjustment suggests that past concern and debate over the romantic complex may have been an exercise in pedagogy. Until the time that contradictory results are obtained, the marriage and family theorist, as well as those involved in direct clinical practice, are advised to use restraint in their assumptions. In the interim, consideration of Weigert's concept of self-respect might be profitable.
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APPENDIX A

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRE

We are interested in knowing more about how opinions and attitudes may affect marriage. By answering all of the following questions, you can help. THERE ARE NO "RIGHT" OR "WRONG" ANSWERS. Please complete the questionnaire without discussing it with anyone, especially your mate. We want only what you think. It is important that you answer every question. If you are uncertain of the answer mark your first impression or best guess.

Answers will be kept strictly confidential. DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME. Thank you for your cooperation.

* * * * * * *

1. Your sex? M_____ F_____ 
2. How many years have you been married? _____
3. Have you been married before? _____ If "yes," how many times? ______. Previous marriage(s) terminated by: Death _____ Divorce _____
4. How many children do you have? ______. Please list sex and age of each child. ____________________________
5. Are you now in marriage counseling? ________. Have you been in marriage counseling in the past? ________
6. How old are you? ______

78
7. Please check your race (optional).
   Mexican-American ________
   Black-American ________
   Anglo-American ________
   Other (Specify) ________

8. Circle the number which represents the highest grade of schooling which you had completed at the time of marriage:

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4 1 2 3 4
   Grade School High School College Post-
   (0) School (10) graduate (5) (20)

9. Check the number which represents your age at the time of your marriage: 19 and under (0); 20-24 (H, 2; W, 5); 25-30 (10); 31 and over (8).

10. How long did you "keep company" with your mate before marriage? (check) 1 to 3 months (0); 3 to 6 months (2); 6 months to 1 year (4); 1 to 2 years (7); 2 to 3 years (10); 3 years or longer (15).

11. How long had you known your mate at the time of your marriage? (check) 1 to 3 months (0); 3 to 6 months (2); 6 months to 1 year (4); 1 to 2 years (7); 2 to 3 years (10); 3 to 5 years (15); 5 years or longer (20); since childhood (25).

12. My father and mother (check) both approved my marriage (15); both disapproved my marriage (0); father disapproved (H, 0; W, 5); mother disapproved (5).

13. My childhood and adolescence, for the most part, were spent in: (check) open country (20); a town of 2,500 population or under (15); a city of 2,500 to 10,000 (10); 10,000 to 50,000 (3); 50,000 and over (0).

14. Did you ever attend Sunday School or other religious school for children and young people? (check) Yes; no (H, 5; W, 0). If answer is yes, at what age did you stop attending such a school? Before 10 years old (H, 10; W, 5); 11 to 18 years (H, 15; W, 10); 19 and over (H, 25; W, 20) still attending (H, 25, W, 20).

15. Religious activity at time of marriage: (check) never attended church (0); attended less than once per month (3); once per month (H, 8; W, 5); twice (H, 12; W, 7); three times (H, 15; W, 10); four times (H, 15; W, 10); more than four times (H, 15; W, 10).
16. Indicate the number of your friends of the same sex before marriage: (check) almost none (0); a few (H, 5; W, 10); several (H, 10; W, 15); many (H, 15; W, 20).

17. Before your marriage how much conflict was there between you and your father? (check) None (H, 25; W, 20); very little (H, 20; W, 15); moderate (H, 15; W, 10); a good deal (H, 5; W, 3); almost continuous (0).

18. Before your marriage how much attachment was there between you and your father? (check) None (0); very little (5); moderate (7); a good deal (H, 15; W, 10); very close (H, 25; W, 15).

19. Before your marriage how much conflict was there between you and your mother? (check) None (H, 25; W, 20); very little (H, 20; W, 15); moderate (H, 15; W, 10); a good deal (H, 5; W, 3); almost continuous (0).

20. Before your marriage how much attachment was there between you and your mother? (check) None (0); very little (5); moderate (7); a good deal (H, 15; W, 10); very close (H, 25; W, 15).

21. Give your appraisal of the happiness of your parents' marriage: (check) very happy (45); happy (30); about averagely happy (15); unhappy (3); very unhappy (0).

22. My childhood on the whole was: (check) very happy (35); happy (20); about averagely happy (10); unhappy (3); very unhappy (0).

23. In my childhood I was (check) punished severely for every little thing (0); was punished frequently (2); was occasionally punished (10); rarely (15); never (15).

24. In my childhood the type of training in my home was: (check) exceedingly strict (5); firm but not harsh (20); usually allowed to have my own way (5); had my own way about everything (3); irregular (sometimes strict, sometimes lax) (0).

25. What was your parents' attitude toward your early curiosities about birth and sex? (check) Frank and encouraging (15); answered briefly (10); evaded or lied to me (3); rebuffed or punished me (0); I did not disclose my curiosity to them (5).
26. My general mental ability, compared to my mate's is:
(check) very superior to his (hers) (0); somewhat
greater (H, 5; W, 0); about equal (h, 15; W, 20);
somewhat less (H, 5; W, 10); considerably less (0).

27. Before marriage what was your general attitude toward
sex? (check) One of disgust and aversion (0); indiffer-
ence (H, 0; W, 5); interest and pleasant anticipation
(15); eager and passionate longing (H, 5; W, 0).

28. Do you often feel lonesome, even when you are with other
people? (check) Yes (0); No (5); ? (2).

29. Are you usually even-tempered and happy in your out-
look on life? Yes (20); No (0); ? (9).

30. Do you often feel just miserable? (check) Yes (0);
No (7); ? (3).

31. Does some particular useless thought keep coming into
your mind to bother you? (check) Yes (0); No (5);
? (2).

32. Do you often experience periods of loneliness? (check)
Yes (0); No (10); ? (4).

33. Are you in general self-confident about your abilities?
(check) Yes (5); No (0); ? (2).

34. Are you touchy on various subjects? (check) Yes (0);
No (6); ? (2).

35. Do you frequently feel grouchy? (check) Yes (0); No
(8); ? (3).

36. Do you usually avoid asking advice? (check) Yes (0);
No (5); ? (2).

37. Do you prefer to be alone at times of emotional stress?
(check) Yes (0); No (5); ? (2).

38. Do your feelings alternate between happiness and sadness
without apparent reason? (check) Yes (0); No (6);
? (2).

39. Are you often in a state of excitement? (check) Yes
(0); No (5); ? (2).

40. Are you considered critical of other people? (check)
Yes (0); No (8); ? (3).
41. Does discipline make you discontented? (check) Yes (0); No (?) ; ? (3).

42. Do you always try carefully to avoid saying anything that may hurt anyone's feelings (check) Yes (10); No (0); ? (4).

43. Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage. The middle point, "happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or felicity in marriage.

Very Unhappy 0 2 7 15 20 25 35
Happy Perfectly Happy

State the approximate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please check each column.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44. Handling family finances</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  4  3  2  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>45. Matters of Recreation</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  4  3  2  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>46. Demonstrations of Affection</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8  6  4  2  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>47. Friends</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5  4  3  2  1  0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>48. Sex relations</th>
<th>Always Agree</th>
<th>Almost Agree</th>
<th>Occasionally Disagree</th>
<th>Frequently Disagree</th>
<th>Almost Disagree</th>
<th>Always Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
49. Conventionality (right, good, or proper conduct)  5 4 3 2 1 0

50. Philosophy of life  5 4 3 2 1 0

51. Ways of dealing with in-laws  5 4 3 2 1 0

52. When disagreements arise, they usually result in: husband giving in (0), wife giving in (2), agreement by mutual give and take (10).

53. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests together? All of them (10), some of them (8), very few of them (3), none of them (0).

54. In leisure time do you generally prefer: to be "on the go" __________, to stay at home __________? Does your mate generally prefer: to be "on the go" __________, to stay at home __________? (Stay at home for both, 10 points; "on the go" for both, 3 points; disagreement, 2 points.)

55. Do you ever wish you had not married? Frequently (0), occasionally (3), rarely (8), never (15).

56. If you had your life to live over, do you think you would: marry the same person (15); marry a different person (0), not marry at all (1)?

57. Do you confide in your mate: almost never (0), rarely (2), in most things (10), in everything (10)?

Please mark each of the following statements with the response which most nearly fits your beliefs. Remember:

* SA--indicates "Strongly Agree"
  A--indicates "Agree"
  U--indicates "Uncertain"
  D--indicates "Disagree"
  SD--indicates "Strongly Disagree"

*Unless otherwise indicated, "Strongly Agree" receives a value of 4 and "Strongly Disagree" a value of 0 on items 58 through 89.
58. Love is the strange bewilderment which overtakes one person on account of another person.
59. One can't help falling in love if she meets the right person.
60. "Everytime we are near each other we get a funny feeling inside" is a good sign of being in love.
61. One doesn't "fall in love;" it has to be achieved.
62. The wish to be with someone constantly is a good test of love.
63. Perfect love means one is always satisfied with her partner.
64. "Marriage for convience" can be successful.
65. One can truly love only once.
66. True love is not based at all on physical attraction.
67. Problems always work out when two people are really in love.
68. People in love are often oblivious to their surroundings.
69. Love usually makes the heart beat faster.
70. The strength of your feelings towards each other demonstrates the fact that you were made for each other.
71. Love can develop after marriage.
SA (0) A (1) U (2) D (3) SD (4)

72. People do not need to have a long engagement if they are meant for each other.
SA A U D SD

73. True love lasts forever.
SA A U D SD

74. Love sometimes gives one a sickly feeling.
SA A U D SD

75. When in love, it is hard to see the other's faults.
SA A U D SD

76. A loss of appetite often accompanies true love.
SA A U D SD

77. Love is an "all-or-nothing" feeling; there is no in-between.
SA A U D SD

78. One in love should just love and not reason why.
SA A U D SD

79. One in love will never be bored.
SA A U D SD

80. One shouldn't strive to maintain love; it maintains itself.
SA A U D SD

81. Marriage requires hard work in order to succeed.
SA (0) A (1) U (2) D (3) SD (4)

82. Love will find a way.
SA A U D SD

83. If it's true love, one won't need to actively seek the other.
SA A U D SD

84. Happiness is inevitable in true love.
SA A U D SD

85. Love doesn't happen, it's learned.
SA (0) A (1) U (2) D (3) SD (4)
86. People in love are always considerate of each other.
87. It's love if it makes you feel good.
88. Opposites attract each other.
89. You really fall in love just once in a lifetime.
APPENDIX B

WARNER'S INDEX OF SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals and proprietors of large</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>businesses (such as doctors and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factory owners)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiprofessionals and smaller officials</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of large business (such as lab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technicians or managers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerks and similar workers (secretaries</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>, bookkeepers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled workers (bakers, carpenters,</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietors of small businesses (owners</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of small groceries, restaurants, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiskilled workers (bus drivers,</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cannery workers, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled workers (such as warehousemen</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or ditch diggers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source of Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inherited wealth</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Wealth</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profits and fees</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private relief</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relief and &quot;nonrespectable&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomes (e.g. gambling)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>House Type</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large houses in good condition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large houses in medium condition;</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium sized houses in good condition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large houses in bad condition</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium sized houses in medium condition; apartments in regular apartment</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buildings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small houses in good condition; small houses in medium condition; dwellings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over stores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium sized houses in bad condition; small houses in bad condition</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All houses in very bad condition; dwellings in structures not originally</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intended for homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area Lived In**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Lived In</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very exclusive; Gold Coast, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The better suburbs and apartment house areas, houses with spacious yards, etc.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above average; areas all residential, larger than average space around house; apartment areas in good condition, etc.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average; residential neighborhoods, no deterioration in the area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below average; area not quite holding its own, beginning to deteriorate, business entering, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low; considerably deteriorated, run-down, and semi-slum</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low; slum</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Class</th>
<th>Total Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Class</td>
<td>12-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper class probably, with some possibility of upper-middle class</td>
<td>18-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate; either upper or upper-middle class</td>
<td>23-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper-middle class</td>
<td>25-33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate; either upper-middle or lower-middle class</td>
<td>34-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lower-middle class 38-50
Indeterminate; either lower-middle or upper lower class 51-53
Upper-lower class 54-62
Indeterminate; either upper-lower or lower-lower class 63-66
Lower-lower class probably, with some possibility of upper-lower class 67-69
Lower-lower class 70-84
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