

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERPERSONAL
COMFORTABLENESS AND THE PREDICTION
OF MARRIAGE ADJUSTMENT

By

DAVID LEE HAUN

Bachelor of Arts
Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma
1959

Bachelor of Divinity
Phillips University
Enid, Oklahoma
1963

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1974

NOV 25 1974

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERPERSONAL
COMFORTABLENESS AND THE PREDICTION
OF MARRIAGE ADJUSTMENT

Thesis Approved:

Rich Stinnett
Thesis Adviser

James G. Gault

Althea Wright

N. D. Duran
Dean of the Graduate College

896486

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to all who have contributed to the completion of this study.

Special thanks is expressed to Dr. Nick Stinnett, whose guidance, encouragement, and friendship has made the excitement and joy of research come alive.

Appreciation is also extended to Dr. James Walters, whose guidance started the writer in the study of Family Relations, and to Dr. Althea Wright, for her critical reading and helpful suggestions in the preparation of this study.

Special thanks is extended to the generous respondents, who helped in the preparation of the study through their replies to the lengthy questionnaire.

Greatest appreciation and love is extended to the writer's wife, Twylah, whose willingness to support the family during this period of study made it possible, and who helped in so many ways to bring it about, and to the writer's children, Debbie and Nicki, for their loving patience during the completion of the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.	1
Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale	5
Purposes of the Study	6
II. SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
Factors Related to Marriage Success	9
Length of Acquaintance or Engagement.	9
Age at Marriage	9
Happiness of Parent's Marriage.	10
Personal Childhood Happiness.	11
Reason for Marriage	11
Determination	11
Flexibility	12
Love.	13
Emotional Maturity.	14
Role Expectations	14
Compatibility	15
Relationship Factors.	16
Marital Attitudes	16
Relationships with Inlaws	16
Common Interests.	17
Cultural Backgrounds.	17
Children.	17
Communication	18
Income.	18
Occupation.	19
Religious Involvement	19
Comfortableness	20
Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale	20
Empathy	20
Spontaneity	21
Trust	23
Interest-Care	24
Respect	25
Criticalness - Hostility.	26

III. PROCEDURE.	28
Selection of Subjects	28
Instrument.	30
Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale	31
Analysis of the Data.	32
IV. RESULTS.	34
Description of Subjects	34
Item Analysis	36
Mean Subscores of the CCOS Scale.	41
CCOS Item Responses	43
Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results . .	47
V. SUMMARY	57
Discussion.	60
Areas of Possible Future Study.	61
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.	63
APPENDIX	69
Newspapers Used in the Sample	70
The CCOS Instrument	72
Letter of Request Sent with Questionnaire	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	35
II. Item Analysis Based on Comparisons of Upper and Lower Quartiles in Section One of CCOS Scores Reflecting the Individual Behavior in Making His or Her Fiance(e) Comfortable	37
III. Item Analysis Based on Comparisons of Upper and Lower Quartiles in Section Two of CCOS Scores Reflecting the Fiance(e)'s Behavior in Making the Individual Comfortable	39
IV. CCOS Sub-Score Means.	42
V. Self - rating Responses to the CCOS Items	44
VI. Responses to CCOS Items Concerning Rating of Fiance(e). . .	45
VII. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Within Each Couple Between the Male's Self-rating of his CCOS and the CCOS Rating Given Him by His Fiancee . .	48
VIII. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Within Each Couple Between the Female's Self-rating of Her CCOS and the CCOS Rating Given Her by Her Fiance .	49
IX. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the Individual's Self-rating and the Rating for the Fiance(e)	50
X. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the Respondents' Combined CCOS Rating and the Marriage Prediction Score	51
XI. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between Self-CCOS Ratings and the Marriage Prediction Score	52
XII. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the Individual's Evaluation of the Fiance(e)'s CCOS Rating and the Marriage Prediction Score	53

Table	Page
XIII. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the CCOS Rating of the Male by the Female and the Marriage Prediction Score of the Male	53
XIV. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the CCOS Rating of the Female by the Male and the Marriage Prediction Score of the Female	54
XV. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the Female's CCOS Rating by the Male and His Marriage Prediction Score	
XVI. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Reflecting Association Between the Male's CCOS Rating by the Female and Her Marriage Prediction Score	55
XIX. Pearson Correlation Coefficient Association Between the Couple's Combined CCOS Scores and the Couple's Combined Marriage Prediction Score	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Blood (1969) has stated that the three events which most effect one's life are birth, death, and marriage. Of the three, he adds, marriage alone is under any degree of man's influence or free choice, since birth and death are largely beyond his control.

Perhaps this desire for some sense of lasting influence over life could help explain why the practice of marriage remains so popular in modern society. The 1973 Population Reports (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973) indicates that 72% of all men and 78% of all women were at that time, or previously had been married. In her book The Future of Marriage (1972, p. 269), Bernard concludes that

...men and women will continue to want intimacy, they will continue to want the thousand and one ways in which men and women share and reassure one another. They will continue to want to celebrate their mutuality, to experience the mystic unity that once led the church to consider marriage a sacrament. They will therefore, as far into the future as we can project, continue to commit themselves to each other. There is hardly any probability that such commitments will disappear and that all relationships between them will become merely casual or transient.

Another indication of society's desire for the practice of marriage might be its refusal to accept to any degree, alternate methods of co-habitation. Mead (1966) proposed a period of trial relationships, which she called "Individual Marriage", and which she suggested easily

might be broken if the couple later desired. The large amount of public response to this suggestion led Mead two years later, to write:

It now seems clear to me that neither elders nor young people want to make a change to two forms of marriage. They want to reserve the word marriage for a commitment that they can feel is permanent and final, no matter how often the actual marriages fail. (Mead, 1968, p. 50).

Failure in the marriage relationship can create lasting problems, even though the couple is able to avoid an actual divorce. As LaHaye (1968, p. 8) states:

One of the most common causes of emotionally disturbed people today is the average American home. Instead of experiencing security-building love between their parents, children all too often see and feel the traumas of hostility, hatred, and animosity between the two people they love most: their mother and father.

Spock (1971) concurs with this by suggesting that parents who are loving with each other and their children will make those children more likely to feel good about themselves, about respecting others, being trustworthy, and expressing spontaneous thoughtfulness and helpfulness. Since it appears that marriage will remain as a social institution, the question becomes, how can a couple improve their chance of making the marriage a success? As Linton (1951) indicates, the problem we face is providing young adults with knowledge and insight adequate to make intelligent selections in marriage partners.

Satir (1967) has stated that one way of improving the chances of marital success is by helping the couple through counseling, to a better understanding of themselves and each other. In speaking of the possibility of this type of counseling, she states, "Human beings are limited only by the extent of their knowledge, their ways of understanding themselves, and their ability to 'check out' with others" (1967, p. 97).

While, as Morris (1960) indicates, there is a tendency among some couples considering marriage to believe that physical attraction and the recitation of vows fill all requirements of a happy marriage, others, such as Albert (1967, p. 38) report that among college youth in particular, "...there appears to be a growing regard for the importance of the personality traits and character in their choice of a mate."

Many who request counseling help, face counselors who themselves experience a lack in knowledge of many problems brought to them (Locke, 1951). One tool that might prove helpful with a counseling relationship would be an instrument capable of assessing the couple's understanding of marriage, and the maturity and capability required in its adjustments (Burgess, Locke, and Thomas, 1963). Such a tool could be helpful both as a means of locating problem areas for discussion and improvement, and as a means of predicting later marriage success (Stephens, 1968).

Several years ago, Ellis (1948) questioned the value of marriage prediction tests, because, along with other shortcomings, he insisted they could not predict the adjustment of the individual marriage. However, as Robb, Bernardoni, and Johnson (1972) point out, prediction tests are applied to numerous life situations, such as success or failure in school, emotional stability, individual development, personal aptitude, individual performance, or intelligence and mental ability. While in none of these could the test results be accepted as infallible for each individual, all of them are recognized as helpful in planning and decision-making (Brown and Thornton, 1971). This is also true in the area of prediction in marriage. As Stephens indicates in his book *Reflections of Marriage* (1968, p. 120):

Using the actuarial model, one can also say something about the life expectancy of marriages. One cannot predict with certainty about a particular marriage. Neither can we quote precise odds. However, we do have evidence that certain types of people are more apt to make successful marriages, are less prone to divorce, than are other types. The marital adjustment studies point to numerous signs. If, for a certain prospective marriage, the signs are generally good, that marriage stands an excellent chance for success. If the signs are generally negative, the future of that marriage looks bleak.

In the second place, marriage prediction tests need not be predictably reliable for the individual couple in order to be helpful for their guidance and understanding. Stephens (1968) points out that prediction of marriage is much like prediction procedures used by life insurance companies. By examining such factors as a person's age, occupation, and length of parent's life, the company can determine the length of time he is expected to live. The individual person may or may not match the prediction, but the prediction still can help in guiding insurance planning.

A number of marital prediction scales have been developed by researchers such as Burgess, Locke, and Thomas (1963), Locke (1952), Burgess and Wallin (1951), and Katz (1963). However, as Blood (1969, p. 59) points out, most of the items used on the tests are concerned with:

...the skill component of success in marriage. For example, items deal with happiness of family background, personal intelligence, education, income, religiosity, and sociability. These contribute to an individual's marital success, to be sure, but they affect his chances of success in marrying anyone. They fail to measure the compatibility of one particular couple.

In addition, the prediction tests tend to overlook what might be one very important aspect of marital success: the degree of comfortableness felt by the individuals. As Hindman (1972, p. 3) states,

"It is unfortunate that many individuals date and eventually marry persons with whom they do not feel comfortable." It is, therefore, the intention of this investigation, to develop a means whereby the degree of comfortableness in individual couples may be evaluated.

Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale

For purposes of this study, Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale (hereafter known as the CCOS), is defined as "the degree to which the individual is inclined to help his fiance(e) feel secure, unthreatened, and respected" (Hindman, 1972). Through a review of literature, several qualities were established by Hindman (1972) as affecting one's degree of comfortableness. Though perhaps not exhaustive, the six aspects discovered as having a significant effect on how comfortable an individual will feel with his or her fiance(e) are: (a) empathy -- the ability to place oneself mentally in the position of another and see things from that person's viewpoint; (b) spontaneity -- the open expression of natural feelings, and freedom from extreme guardedness; (c) trust -- the willingness to entrust one's self to the other person's care, and to be trustworthy in his own actions; (d) interest care -- having a genuine interest and acceptance for the other person's concerns and welfare; (e) respect -- consideration and regard for the uniqueness of the other individual; (f) criticalness-hostility -- the tendency to criticize others and express hostility when another's actions are different or undesirable.

Purpose of the Study

The purposes for this study are:

- A. To develop an instrument based on the one devised by Hindman (1972), which is designed to measure interpersonal comfortableness of engaged couples.
- B. Determine those areas in which:
 1. The total group of engaged persons express the highest and lowest degree of interpersonal comfortableness.
 2. The engaged males express the highest and the lowest degree of interpersonal comfortableness.
 3. The engaged females express the highest and lowest degree of interpersonal comfortableness.
- C. To examine the following specific hypotheses:
 1. There is no significant relationship between the male's self-rating of his CCOS and the CCOS rating given him by his fiancée.
 2. There is no significant relationship between the female's self-rating of her CCOS and the CCOS rating given her by her fiancé.
 3. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating of CCOS and the individual's CCOS rating for his or her fiancé(e).
 4. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's combined CCOS rating score of self and fiancé(e) and the score obtained on the scale developed by Burgess (1963).
 5. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's self CCOS ratings and the marriage prediction score.

6. There is no significant relationship between the individual's marriage prediction score and his or her evaluation of the fiancée's CCOS rating.
7. There is no significant relation between the CCOS scores of the males as rated by his fiancée and the marriage prediction score of the male.
8. There is no significant relationship between the CCOS scores of the female as rated by her fiancé and the marriage prediction score of the female.
9. There is no significant relationship between the male's CCOS rating for his fiancée and his marriage prediction score.
10. There is no significant relationship between the female's CCOS rating for her fiancé and her marriage prediction score.
11. There is no significant relationship between the combined CCOS scores for the couple (the male's rating of his fiancée's CCOS behavior, and the female's rating of her fiancé's CCOS behavior) and the combined marriage prediction score for the couple.

CHAPTER II

SELECTED REVIEW OF LITERATURE

According to Lederer and Jackson (1968), man, since his existence in ancient primitive society, has been interested in improving his success in the relationships of the family unit. However, it has been in the last 40 years that most of the studies which document various correlates of marital success have been undertaken (Stephens, 1968).

In tracing the history of marital studies, Sproakowski (1968) indicates that early research was largely limited to the measure of adjustment in married couples. Then, with Bernard (1934), the efforts were expanded to include not only the assessment of marital adjustment, but predictive functions as well.

Traditionally, marital adjustment investigation has determined adjustment in one of three ways (Stephens, 1968): (a) ratings, in which the researcher or acquaintances rate the marriage adjustment and success; (b) the use of divorce as a determinate of marriage success, assuming that couples still living together will have a greater degree of adjustment than couples who have separated; (c) questionnaires, which adopt a standard key to scale the degree of success in the relationship. From these efforts, a series of factors have been discovered that tend, in various degrees, to affect marriage success. Stinnett and Walters (1974) indicate several factors which they find

to be related to a successful marriage, and which have served as a basis for the review in this research.

Factors Related To Marriage Success

Length of Acquaintance or Engagement

Landis and Landis (1973) have suggested that perhaps the best way to insure marriage success is to lengthen the period of the engagement, since this gives the couple a better opportunity to learn inner needs and roles. Kirkpatrick (1963) agrees with this comment, as does Saxton (1968), who stresses that a longer acquaintance before marriage gives the couple a greater opportunity to establish effective communication methods, learn each other's marriage expectations, and grow in self-awareness of their own needs and values. Albert (1967, p. 40) states that:

Courtship is a trying-out period. Difficulties that arise during this time are often glossed over because 'we love each other.' But rarely do they disappear after the wedding kiss; they are more likely to grow in importance. The longer the courtship, the greater the probability that the uniting process will be well-advanced prior to marriage and will continue after the ceremony.

Landis (1970) estimates that one fourth of college engagements are broken, indicating that as couples grow in this understanding, many tend to separate, and without this period of engagement-learning, the rate of separation after marriage no doubt would be considerably higher.

Age At Marriage

As Stephens asserts (1968), p. 119), the couple might improve their possibilities simply by waiting a few years before getting

married, since "As people grow older, their chances of making a successful marriage increases." Albert (1967) explains the importance of age. He states:

The capacity to withstand frustrations develops with maturity. When one's marriage partner fails to live up to expectations (which are often unrealistic in the beginning), that extra edge of maturity may be needed to provide toleration of the other's shortcomings without excessive impatience and disillusionment.

This factor of age appears to be consistently significant in a number of studies (Kirkpatrick, 1963; Burchinal, 1965; Roundtree, 1964; and Monahan, 1953). Landis and Landis (1968, p. 121) indicate that "All the studies show that the chances for happiness in marriage are less when men marry before the age of 20 and when women marry before the age of 18."

Happiness of Parent's Marriage

As is stated by Stinnett and Walters in their proposed book Together In Marriage And The Family (1974), the one factor which seems most strongly related to success in marriage is the happiness in the marriage of the parents. If the parents of an individual were happily married, he or she is statistically more likely to have a happy marriage, and less likely to become divorced. If, on the other hand, one's parents were unhappy or divorced, the likelihood of his experiencing an unhappy marriage, or becoming divorced, have a greater statistical possibility. While Stephens (1968) does not indicate that parental happiness is this important, he does agree that it plays an important part in the marriage success.

Personal Childhood Happiness

In his book The Individual, Marriage, and the Family, Saxton (1968, p. 210) states that "Major studies since 1937 have agreed that a person's background is the single most important factor determining marital success." The person most likely to have a successful marriage has the following background characteristics: (a) parents who are happy in their marriage; (b) a happy childhood; (c) lack of conflict with the mother; (d) home discipline that was firm, but not harsh; (e) a strong attachment to the mother; (f) parental frankness about sex; (g) infrequency and mildness of childhood punishment; (h) lack of conflict with the father; and, (i) attitudes toward sex that are anticipatory and free from disgust or aversion (Saxton, 1968).

Reason For Marriage

Landis (1970) points out the danger of marrying for the wrong reasons. The desire to escape an unhappy home situation, to fill a personal need for affection, to overcome loneliness, to hurt someone, or because of pregnancy, all are related to poorer marital success. On the other hand, Kirkpatrick (1963) reports that entering marriage because of love or common interests are positively related to later marriage success and happiness.

Determination

According to Blood (1969), determination has two aspects: committing oneself to this person even if a more intriguing one turns up later, and applying skill and effort to the marital success. The importance of skill development is seconded by Folkman and Glatworthy

(1970), who stress that a major determinant of marital success is the couple deciding that the marriage merits the effort required to learn how to live together. As is pointed out by Brown and Thornton (1971) in their discussion of predictive testing, one weakness of such instruments is their inability to assess the degree or quality of the individual's motivation. This influence of motivation would also play an important part in the role of marriage. Religious concepts often play an important part in the degree of this determination, both to succeed and to strive for correction of differences and problems (Thompson, in Mead, 1968). However, the decision as to the permanence of the relationship must be faced by every couple (Blood, 1969).

Flexibility

Folkman and Glatworthy (1970) describes this as the couple accommodating themselves to the kind of life they both want to live. Several studies comparing happily and unhappily married persons indicate that this ability to give or to change, plays an important part in the marriage success (Landis and Landis, 1973). Satir (1972) indicates that one goal for a family is to develop an "open system" which can flexibly adapt to forces (both from within and outside the family) that result in the need for new and different relationships. All of the individual needs and wishes of each marriage partner cannot be met in marriage, and the success of the relationship requires a recognition that life always offers both compensation and disappointment, and a practice of compromise and flexibility (Landis and Landis, 1968).

Love

As implied by LaHaye (1968), the concept of love has been over-used and under-defined in much of modern society. There has been a tendency to equate love with "ringing bells" or a "tingle", and to assume that a lack of these manifestations means an absence of love. In The Exorcist (Blatty, 1971, p. 370), the old priest, Father Merrin states to his younger acquaintance, Father Karras, "How many husbands and wives must believe they have fallen out of love because their hearts no longer race at the sight of their beloved!"

Several have attempted to correct this misconception by defining love as it effects relationships in life and in marriage. Folkman and Clatworthy (1970, p. 38) state that love is "...the overwhelming concern of one person for the other." Landis and Landis (1968, p. 132) expand the concept and indicate:

You love a person if his well-being, his growth toward his greatest potential in all facets of his personality, matters to you as much as your own, probably not more, but as much.

Love also involves the aspects of sexualness and the desire to give and receive physical pleasure. As Udry (1966, p. 199) states, love contains "...a strong emotional attachment, with at least the components of sex desire and tenderness."

Perhaps the best-known description of love is that found in the Bible:

Love is very patient and kind, never jealous or envious, never boastful or proud, never haughty or selfish or rude. Love does not demand its own way. It is not irritable or touchy. It does not hold grudges and will hardly even notice when others do it wrong. It is never glad about injustice, but rejoices whenever truth wins out.

If you love someone you will be loyal to him no matter what the cost. You will always believe in him, always expect the best of him, and always stand your ground in defending him....Love goes on forever." (I Corinthians 13:4-8, The Living New Testament, 1967)

Emotional Maturity

According to Saxton (1968) emotional maturity involves an awareness of one's own needs and values, and an awareness of the needs and values of other people and society at large. Landis and Landis (1968, p. 114) state:

Emotional maturity can be defined as the level of development of one's ability to see oneself and others objectively, to be able to discriminate between facts and feelings, and to act on facts rather than feelings.

Stein (1972, p. 280), in his presentation of qualities that contribute to marriage success has stated:

There is evidence that the following qualities contribute to marriage success: (a) being empathic; (b) having inner resources to enjoy oneself; (c) having the capacity to confront and resolve differences; or else to allow the other to be different; (d) having the courage to share all of oneself; (e) being appropriately other-centered; (f) having the security to tolerate suggestions and at times criticisms; (g) having the inclination to help the other actualize himself; and (h) being able to engage in meaningful nondefensive communication.

Role Expectations

Stinnett and Walters (1974) discovered that a great deal of marital conflict, and personal dissatisfaction with marriage, is caused by one mate having very different intentions and expectations for himself and the marital relationship than that held by his partner.

There is some question how much effect roles have on marriage success, since some findings indicate little consistency on role-desire

over a passage of time, and it appears that role practices change with maturity (Udry, 1966). However, evidence exists that marriage success is negatively affected by extreme incompatibility in what roles the couple expect themselves and each other to play (Burr, 1971).

Three sources of an individual's expectations for his or her roles in family life have been identified (Udry, 1966). They are: (a) concepts developed while a child, by watching adults that the child feels are significant; (b) mass media; (c) interactions and practices that develop during the marriage itself.

Compatibility

Blood (1969, p. 37) defines compatibility as the extent to which a couple's intrinsic characteristics fit together. In the area of compatibility, two positions exist in research: (a) the theory of "heterogamy", which asserts that people tend to marry individuals who are different or opposite to themselves, and the theory of "homogamy", in which persons select mates who have characteristics similar to their own (Holtz, 1968).

The Ktsanes sum up this position in their article "Do Opposites Attract, Or Does Like Marry Like?" (Cavin, 1969), by stating that people love and tend to marry those who fulfill their needs. Therefore, the marriage success would be affected by the degree to which the intrinsic needs of each individual (whether those needs are homogamous or heterogamous) fit with the characteristics of the marriage partner (Blood, 1966).

Relationship Factors

Evidence exists that marriage happiness results from a fulfilling relationship between the husband and wife (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Couples who are involved in the marriage experiences and with each other, judge their marriage to be happier than those who have little involvement in the relationship (Gurin, Beroff, and Feld, 1960). On the other hand, a study by Matthews and Milhanovich (1963), found that unhappily married individuals felt they: (a) were neglected by their mates, and (b) received little appreciation, affection, companionship or understanding from their mates.

Marital Attitudes

Stinnett and Walters (1974) examined the attitude that results in marital dissatisfaction. Listing such characteristics in these unhappy marriages as: (a) extreme jealousy; (b) one partner more dominant than the other; (c) one mate feeling superior to the other; or (d) one partner believing he is more intelligent than the other, they conclude that the most successful marriages have partners that display equalitarian and democratic attitudes toward each other.

Relationships With Inlaws

Williamson (1972) states that the relationship between the couples and their inlaws often affect the success they feel in their marriage. Studies generally indicate that if the relationship with the inlaws are good, then the marriage is more likely to be identified as successful (Flomenhaft and Kaplan, 1968; Karma, 1973), while problems with inlaws may shift to problems within the marital couple (Stinnett and Walters,

1974; Landis and Landis, 1963).

Common Interests

Kirkpatrick (1963) found that couples with common interests tend to rate a higher satisfaction to their marriage. Saxton (1968) reports studies on the effects of mutual interests in marriage success. He states that mutual interests in the home, children, romantic love, sex, and religion, along with a lack of interest in good times, commercial entertainment, and companionship to avoid loneliness, highly correlate with success in marriage. The study points out that possessing a shared interest in leisure activities has no correlation with marital happiness.

Cultural Backgrounds

Research tends to agree that similar cultural backgrounds such as education, socioeconomic level, race and nationality, are positively related to marriage success (Stinnett and Walters, 1974). On the other hand, great differences between the couple in these areas are often associated with marriage failure (Hicks and Platt, 1970).

Children

Having a desire for children relates to marital satisfaction (Kirkpatrick, 1963), but according to Udry (1966), research has discovered no reliable relationship between the presence or absence of children and marital adjustment. As Stinnett and Walters (1974) indicate, research in general indicates that for some couples the responsibility of rearing children is associated with decreased marriage

satisfaction, while for other couples, rearing of children relates to, and is associated with increased marriage satisfaction.

Communication

Communication will not eliminate all marital conflict. As is pointed out by Walters, Parker, and Stinnett (1972), a certain amount of conflict is present in any close relationship. However, Nevran (1967), indicates that couples who judge themselves to be happily married, do tend to be more effective in their communication processes than unhappily married couples, and as is stated in The Christian and the Changing Family (Disciples of Christ, 1973), a lack of communication within the family often results in its experiencing a lack of vitality and in many cases breaking apart. Satir (1972) ranks the development of adequate communication patterns as one of the more important abilities that a family must learn for adequate success in their relationships.

Income

Cutright (1971), has observed that income has a greater effect on marriage than either education or occupation. Hicks and Platt (1970) and Saxton (1968) stress that economic stability is the key, whatever the actual earning level might be.

Financial management is a major source of conflict and adjustment with persons at every income level. Stinnett and Walters (1974) indicate that the possibility for disagreement often arises over how the money is to be spent. A failure on the part of the couple to coordinate their life interests, goals, and purposes, adds to the problem,

increasing the level of disagreement, and resulting in greater feelings of dissatisfaction.

Occupation

As Saxton (1968) points out, the important thing for marital stability is that there be an adequate degree of vocational preparedness, in whatever area one chooses, and a lack of vocational ability can create numerous problems in the marriage. Studies have shown various other factors to be involved, such as (a) the level of income (Bernard, 1966); (b) job satisfaction (Ridley, 1973); (c) the degree of involvement in the work (Ridley, 1973); and (d) employment of the wife outside of the home (Axelson, 1963; Orden and Bradburn, 1969).

Religious Involvement

Stinnett and Walters (1974) stress that a positive association between religious involvement and marriage success has been indicated in numerous studies during the last 40 years. They state that couples who have strong religious belief and participation, tend to have less divorce and experience a higher rated marriage success and happiness, than those with little religious orientation.

Some investigators indicate that this factor might not be due as much to the religious aspect as to the fact that religious people tend to be conventional. And generally, conventional people "...are less willing to seek divorce, and less able to face the truth about their marriages when they take marital adjustment tests" (Stephens, 1968, p. 129). However, much research does indicate that religious beliefs

and the strengths that develop through those beliefs, have a positive association with marriage success (Stinnett and Walters, 1974).

Comfortableness

The degree of personal comfortableness within the couple may play an important part in the marriage relationship. Research by Hindman (1972) indicates that this aspect of comfortableness has an effect on many of man's personal involvements, and "...appears to be an extremely important factor involved in mate selection and marriage success" (Hindman, 1972, p. 3). For example, the marriage partner may fail to meet completely the needs of his mate (Landis and Landis, 1968). The concept of comfortableness would indicate that the failure of having needs met would be of secondary importance, as long as the individual was comfortable in the situation. With this possibility in mind, let us consider some of the elements that the literature suggests compose Interpersonal Comfortableness.

Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale

Empathy

Empathy may be defined as the ability to recognize and appreciate what makes another individual act as he or she does. It is more than sympathy. It is in a sense "taking the role" of the other and interpreting actions from their position (Landis and Landis, 1973). Smith (1966) indicates that empathy involves an ability to recognize that another person's feelings, thoughts and behavior are similar to our own, and is essential to understanding the individuals around us. This concept of empathy being the recognition of the other person's inner

position, and in a sense taking his role, is widely accepted in research (Rogers, 1962; Blood, 1969; Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Katz, 1963).

Competent interactions, both within the family and with society in general, appear to depend heavily on the development of the sense of empathy (Hindman, 1972). Expression of empathy tends to improve relations (Rogers, 1952; Gibb, 1965), both through increasing one's supportiveness, and reducing defensiveness (Hindman, 1972). It also tends to increase feelings of reassurance within the individual (Gibb, 1965). Truax and Carkhuff (1967) indicate a growing realization in parent-child relationship research, that empathy, warmth, and genuineness, positively relate to healthy human development.

Spontaneity

Spontaneity is defined as the ability to be open in expressing one's feelings, free from past programming or extreme concern of what "others might think" (Bern, 1964; Maltz, 1960). It is an important aspect of all of life. As Satir (1972, p. 93) states, "The biggest job an individual has [is] to know himself and to know it is safe to express honest feelings." Powell, in the book Why Am I Afraid To Tell You Who I Am? (1969) agrees with this attitude, and asserts that an individual, realizing that "he is what he is at that moment in time", hesitates to reveal his true self or feelings, and assumes a disguise, for fear that if he does honestly indicate who he is, he might be rejected by his associates.

This ability to be open involves all areas of life, from feelings of anger and aggression to affection or love (Satir, 1972). A suppression of personal spontaneity is dysfunctional, both to the success of interpersonal relations, and the inner growth of the individual himself. As

Maltz (1960) points out, an over-concern with what "others will think" before allowing expression of ourselves leads to inhibition in our lives. He and Rogers (1970) agree that a lack of personal spontaneous reaction robs us of the opportunity to learn that it is natural to be warm and genuine. Satir (1972, p. 93) has found in her experience that people who "...can't or don't show their feelings are very lonely, even though their behavior doesn't indicate it." Even more harmful than possible unhappiness, is the fact that continuous stifling of spontaneity eventually can result in our becoming blind to who we are and what we feel. Jourard (1964, p. 5) says, "No man can come to know himself except as an outcome of disclosing himself to others."

Perhaps most depressing of all, is the fact that this struggle to "control" spontaneous reactions can shorten life itself. As Satir (1972, p. 244) observes:

I've noticed that men live shorter lives than women, which I think to a large extent is attributable to the fact that he strangles his soft feelings. He's not supposed to ever cry or be hurt. He has to become insensitive, and if he has rules against being violent, then he can't vent his aggressive feelings. Having to bottle up the feelings, then, they go underground and play havoc with his body, and he ultimately gets high blood pressure and heart attacks.

Spontaneity is important then, to the individual person's well being, his general dealings with those around him, and as O'Neill and O'Neill (1972) indicate, the general success of his marriage. Satir (1964) warns that anyone who tries so hard to please the other person, that he finds himself living in the manner he thinks the other wants him to live, denies both himself and the relationship the full meaning that spontaneity can bring.

Trust

Erikson (1954) has stated that trust implies a sense of trustworthiness in dealing with oneself, and a sense of reasonable truthfulness in dealing with others. It is developed over a period of time as a result of experience, according to Lederer and Jackson (1968), who write: "Spouses who trust have learned to depend on each other's behavior because experience has taught them that their relationship is predictable" (Lederer and Jackson, 1968, p. 108).

Trust is an essential component of any workable marriage (Lederer and Jackson, 1968). Albert (1967, p. 40) points out that if "...either of the partners cannot confide fully in the other, cannot express affection for the other, or feels strongly disturbed by any of the other's beliefs or attitudes," the marriage is in danger of difficulty. The O'Neills (1972) in their book Open Marriage, list trust as one of the eight essential components for an open marital relationship. Powell (1969) has indicated that we often dislike or mistrust another person in those very characteristics which we fear are present in our own lives. Satir (1972) traces the origin of trust to the nurture and comfortableness that the individual receives as a child from the adults around him.

Whatever its source, a feeling of trust toward those with whom we deal can deepen and enrich the feelings of closeness that we experience (Schutz, 1967), as well as aid us in breaking out of our own limitations and feelings of incompetency. Lewis and Streitfield (1970) state that developing a sense of trust in those with whom we deal and a feeling of trust toward our own abilities, will help us to grow and more completely enjoy our own lives, as well as enable us to help

those around us in their growth.

In The Christian and the Changing Family (Disciples of Christ, 1973, p. 49), the statement is made that without a sense of trust in ourselves and in others we are essentially immobilized. The writers continue:

We do not move genuinely toward others because we are afraid that (1) we do not have "what it takes," in other words, we distrust our ability to meet the needs of another, and (2) when we come with our 'guard down' and literally offer ourselves, we will be rebuffed.

Trust helps us to accept differences, regarding them, according to Lederer and Jackson (1968, p. 131), as "...indications of varying tastes or values, not as symbols of a hostile relationship."

Satir (1972) indicates that the family role of nurturing people depends to a great degree on the sense of acceptance and trust in the essential worth and humanness of the family members. English and Pearson (1955) describe the psychological development of persons, and imply that this aspect of trust is important throughout the whole development of human personality, from earliest days, and the need for a trustworthy parent, to maturity and the need for trust in the adjustments of marriage.

Interest-Care

According to Fromm (1956) one of the major requirements for a loving relationship is a genuine care of one person for another. This care is far more than a simple wish for well-being. It is a deep concern for the happiness and welfare of the other. It is an important part of interpersonal dealings, since as Satir states (1967, p. 90), "Man is insatiable. He can never be loved enough, valued enough, be safe enough, [or] powerful enough." All he hopefully can do is acquire in his life

the confidence that those with whom he deals care for him and have his best interests at heart.

A lack of interest-care is detrimental to relationships. Lederer and Jackson (1968) state that in marriage, a spouse who is not sure of his mate's love, care, or interest, may find it very difficult to let the other out of sight. At its highest level, care is unconditional (Jourard, 1958). It is not the questioning of motives behind statements or actions, but accepting them as the expression of another person who may have tastes or values that differ from him (Lederer and Jackson, 1968). Satir (1967) states that expressing interest in a child's growth (both developmental and sexual) will result in the child learning to esteem himself as a total person. This acceptance by the individual of himself, with his strengths and limitations, is judged by some to be among the important learnings of life (Dobson, 1974), and necessary in the development of the feelings of comfortableness with those around him. (Powell, 1969).

Respect

According to Bowman (1970), it is possible for one person to penetrate the world of another to only a slight degree. Since this is the case, a necessary aspect in successful interpersonal relations would be respecting those feelings and drives which are beyond our knowledge, but are the other individual's possessions. Fromm (1956) states that respect is accepting the unique individuality of another person and allowing him to develop and grow as he is.

Respect is important to all of life's stages. Satir (1972) stresses that the facilitating of adequate child development requires accepting

and respecting where he or she is in personal growth. Bowman (1970) states that respecting an adolescent means allowing the freedom to "cut the apron strings". Studies by Stinnett (1970) and by Stinnett, Collins and Montgomery (1972) found that for both college students and older husbands and wives, respect is felt to be the most important characteristic of successful marriage. Lederer and Jackson (1968) listed respect as the first of three major elements that result in a satisfactory marriage.

How is respect shown? In a study of marital competency, Stinnett (1969) defined the actions characteristic to showing respect for one's mate or future mate, as treating the other person as an individual, avoiding habits which annoy the person, being a good listener and providing encouragement and understanding.

Criticalness-Hostility

Bowman (1970) suggests that a constant habit of criticism, sarcasm or hostility is one of the negative characteristics that adults may need to change. There is a difference between hostility and anger. As Lederer and Jackson (1968, p. 79) point out, anger in a marriage is normal. They insist that a false assumption of marriage is: "...if you tell your spouse to go to Hell you have a poor marriage." Anger is a feeling or an emotion that one can recognize and accept. Expressions of anger clear the air and result in the relationship's growth. As Lederer and Jackson (1968, p. 80) ask:

How can spouses trust each other if they never have any disagreements? How does each know what the other really thinks and feels if he's accommodating and thoughtful all the time?

Hostility, on the other hand, is a deep festering that lasts, and eats the individual's personal growth, and growth in his relationships. Williams and Smith (1974, p. 249) indicate that hostility or aggressive behavior "...is different from simply expressions of anger. It may be described as behavior that results in injury to or destruction of animal or human or inanimate objects and is intentional in nature." English and Pearson (1955) point out that hostility can result in such dysfunctional characteristics as accident proneness, impotency or frigidity, and at the very least, retards the development of one's growth and relationships.

Hostility results from the suppressing of one's emotions and losing touch with the real, underlying self (Rogers, 1961). It then surfaces in undercutting ways, harmful both to the individual himself and those around him. Hostility can be expressed in any number of ways, and many actions that may "appear" to result from "kindness" may in fact be the result of emerging suppressed hostility (Williams and Smith, 1974).

It harms the individual himself, from feelings of depression and loneliness, to emotional breakdown, when the personality no longer can cope successfully with its suppression (Rogers, 1961). In addition, criticalness-hostility destroys relationships with people--whether they are partners in marriage, or family, or friends (Hindman, 1972). Dobson in his book Hide or Seek (1974), which deals with the importance of self-esteem, indicates that criticalness by others can cause serious damage to the individual, whatever his or her age, and asserts that the most serious problem faced by most adults is "low self-esteem".

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 143 couples who had publicly announced their engagement and future plans to marry. Eleven additional questionnaires were returned by individuals, but were not used in the study, since one member of the couple (usually the male) failed to return his completed copy.

Names of couples in the study were selected by examining the Women's or Social Sections of 71 local Oklahoma newspapers, printed over approximately a five week period in the spring of 1974. The newspapers selected for examination included all that are received in the Department of Journalism and the Office of Public Information at Oklahoma State University, and compose approximately 30 per cent of the total number of 264 newspapers printed within the state of Oklahoma (Weis, 1973). (See Appendix A for a listing of the newspapers used in the sample selection.)

Every couple listed in the newspaper were included in the sample unless no address for the couple, or at least one of the parents, was given. From the engagement announcements, a total of 510 couples were located and a contact attempted by letter. (See Appendix C for a copy of the letter sent each couple.) Of the number contacted, questionnaires were completed and returned from 29 per cent.

One hundred and fifteen of the selected couples did not have a complete address given in their engagement announcement. Rather, the address would be listed simply as: Miss Mary Smith, Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma, or: Miss Mary Smith, Holdenville, Oklahoma. The decision was made to include these couples even though the address might be inadequate. Bulk mailing was used to distribute the questionnaires, which meant that the letter would not be forwarded if the address was lacking essential information. Several letters were returned to us as undeliverable (though this is not the usual post office policy). Therefore, it is probable that some of the questionnaires sent out did not reach their destination at all. With this in mind, the percentage of return was actually higher than the 29 per cent.

The decision was made to avoid an attempted follow-up of the non-returned questionnaires. This decision was reached for several reasons. (a) It was the feeling of the researchers that if the original letters were undelivered because of an incomplete address, a follow-up with the same address would be futile. (b) A number of the engaged couples were planning spring weddings. It was felt that if the couple were unwilling to complete the first questionnaire mailed, then the chances were great that they would also ignore a second letter, arriving even closer to the wedding date and the hectic last-minute arrangements. (c) And finally, the decision was made that a failure to return a questionnaire could very well be due to wedding preoccupation or lack of postal delivery rather than any effecting bias.

Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study consisted of 89 items in three categories (See Appendix B for a sample of the questionnaire form used). The first portion of the questionnaire was designed to obtain background information such as age, religious preference, and social class. The level of social class was determined by the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955), which uses source of income, occupation and education as indicators of social status.

The questionnaire also contained questions adapted from the Marriage Prediction Scale, developed by Burgess (Burgess, Locke, and Thomas, 1963), which used predictive factors of six major studies published in the area of marriage and family life as a basis for the scale.

Reliability and validity of the Burgess Scale was established by:

(a) a longevity study of 85 per cent of the original subjects. This included the administering of a Marital Adjustment Scale to 666 of the 784 original subjects approximately three years after the marriage. Burgess obtained a correlation between the marital-adjustment and the engagement-prediction scores of .43 for men and .41 for women. (b) At the time of securing the engagement data, additional personal information was secured, including interviews with 226 of the couples. Later, 30 judges, using a 14-point scale, forecasted the probability of marriage success for each couple. The marital-adjustment study three years after marriage found a correlation score of .42 for men and .39 for women, which was about the same as those secured from the engagement-prediction scores. Burgess sums up his presentation of the value of his study by stating (1963, p. 331), "These studies...indicate that the

level of marital adjustment at a later time can be predicted with considerable accuracy from data secured during engagement or marriage."

Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale

The third aspect of the questionnaire was a series of questions based on the Interpersonal Comfortableness Orientation Scale developed by Hindman (1972). This instrument was adapted to measure the degree of interpersonal comfortableness within each couple, and consisted of 36 statements representing six different qualities, which a review of literature indicated were related, and contributed to comfortableness in interpersonal relationships. On the basis of the review of literature, and an examination of the instrument by Hindman, the investigator developed six items which were considered relevant to each of the six comfortableness categories.

Three of the six items in each category were intended to indicate the degree that the individual tried to make his or her fiancé(e) feel comfortable. These eighteen items composed the first section of the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale (hereafter called the CCOS). The second section of the CCOS intended to indicate the degree of comfortableness the individual felt with, and because of, his or her fiancé(e). Items for each of the six categories comprised the two sections and the 36 items on the scale.

The six qualities represented by the items were: (a) empathy, which refers to the ability to mentally place oneself in the position of another and see things from that person's viewpoint; (b) spontaneity, which deals with the open expression of natural feelings, and freedom from extreme guardedness; (c) trust, or the willingness to entrust

one's self to the other person's care, and to be trustworthy in his own actions; (d) interest-care, which refers to having a genuine interest and acceptance for the other person's concerns and welfare; (e) respect, which is a consideration and regard for the uniqueness of the other individual; and (f) criticalness-hostility, which deals with the tendency to criticize others and express hostility when another's actions are different or undesirable.

Thirty-four of the thirty-six items in the CCOS scale were characterized by five degrees of response: (VO) Very Often, (O) Often, (?) Undecided, (S) Seldom, and (VS) Very Seldom. The remaining two questions (number 18 and 25 in the instrument) dealt with the degree of change in the marriage partner that might be attempted after the marriage occurred.

The responses were scored so that a favorable response was given the highest score. The scores were ranked and the upper and lower quartiles obtained. All the couples whose individual scores fell within the higher quartile were considered as having a high degree of comfortableness orientation with their fiancé(e). Those couples whose individual scores fell within the lower quartile were considered as having a low degree of comfortableness orientation with their fiancé(e).

Analysis of the Data

A percentage and frequency count was used to analyze background information obtained in the returned questionnaires. The chi-square test was used in the item analysis of the CCOS as an index of validity. Reliability was measured by the split-half reliability coefficient test. The Pearson r was used to examine the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between the male's self-rating of his CCOS and the CCOS rating given him by his fiancée.
2. There is no significant relationship between the female's self-rating of her CCOS and the CCOS rating given her by her fiancé.
3. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating of CCOS and the individual's CCOS rating for his or her fiancé(e).
4. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's combined CCOS rating score of self and fiancé(e) and the score obtained on the scale developed by Burgess (1963).
5. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's self CCOS ratings and the marriage prediction score.
6. There is no significant relationship between the CCOS scores of the males as rated by his fiancée and the marriage prediction score of the male.
7. There is no significant relationship between the CCOS scores of the female as rated by her fiancé and the marriage prediction score of the female.
8. There is no significant relationship between the male's CCOS rating for his fiancée and his marriage prediction score.
9. There is no significant relationship between the female's CCOS rating for her fiancé and her marriage prediction score.
10. There is no significant relationship between the combined CCOS scores for the couple (the male's rating of his fiancée's CCOS behavior, and the female's rating of her fiancé's CCOS behavior) and the combined marriage prediction score for the couple.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

Table one presents a detailed description of the 286 subjects who participated in this study. Forty-nine per cent of the respondents were male, and fifty-one per cent were female. Ages of the respondents ranged from 14 to over 29, with the largest number (59.32%) falling in the 23-24 year category. The great majority, 71.78 %, were between the ages of 19-24, while the smallest group, less than one per cent of the respondents, were under age 17.

The majority of the subjects (47.90%), considered themselves to be moderately religious. Thirty-five per cent of the respondents indicated that they attended church services four or more times a month. Twenty-four per cent reported that they usually did not attend at all, as compared to 5.94 per cent who indicated that religion was unimportant in their lives.

The greatest proportion of the sample (45.96%) stated that their engagement period was between six and eleven months in length. Eighteen per cent had an engagement of a year or more.

Social level of the sample was predominately middle class (79.30%), largely indicated a feeling of comfortableness with their fiancé(e) (98.60%), and reported little conflict (62.59%) or jealousy (75.53%).

TABLE I
CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SUBJECTS

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Sex	Male	139	48.60
	Female	144	51.40
Age	14 and under	1	.25
	15 - 16	1	.25
	17 - 18	30	7.39
	19 - 20	79	19.46
	21 - 22	92	22.66
	23 - 24	35	29.66
	25 - 26	9	7.63
	27 - 28	6	5.09
	29 and over	8	6.78
Degree of Religiosity	Very much	42	14.69
	Much	90	31.47
	Moderately Religious	137	47.90
	Very little, if any	15	5.24
	Anti-religious	2	.70
Frequency of monthly church attendance	No times	69	24.21
	Once	43	15.09
	Two or three times	71	24.91
	Four or more times	101	35.44
Length of Engagement	Less than a month	2	.70
	1 to 5 months	102	35.79
	6 to 11 months	131	45.96
	12 months or more	50	17.54
Degree of self-satisfaction with the kind of person he or she is	Highly satisfied	52	18.25
	Satisfied	189	66.32
	Undecided	33	11.58
	Dissatisfied	11	3.86
	Highly dissatisfied	0	0
Educational Level	Elementary (8th grade)	0	0
	High school	75	26.32
	Two years of college	103	36.14
	College graduate	81	28.42
	Graduate work	26	9.12
Degree of Parental Happiness	Very happy	95	33.33
	Happy	102	35.79
	Average	53	18.60
	Unhappy	19	6.67
	Very unhappy	16	5.61

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	%
Social Class	Upper Class	23	8.07
	Upper Middle	121	42.46
	Lower Middle	105	36.84
	Upper Lower	32	11.23
	Lower Lower	4	1.40
Degree of comfortableness felt with the fiance(e)	Always very comfortable	191	67.02
	Usually comfortable	90	31.58
	Uncertain	2	.70
	Usually uncomfortable	1	.35
	Always uncomfortable	1	.35
Degree of conflict within the couple	None	47	16.43
	A little	179	62.59
	Moderate	52	18.18
	A good deal	8	2.80
	Very great	0	0
Degree of childhood happiness	Very happy	105	36.71
	Happy	120	41.96
	Average	49	17.13
	Unhappy	11	3.85
	Very unhappy	1	.35
Frequency of jealousy with the fiance(e)	Very often	10	3.50
	Often	41	14.34
	Uncertain	19	6.64
	Seldom	100	34.97
	Very seldom	116	40.56

The Item Analysis

The six categories of the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale (hereafter referred to as the CCOS), are divided into two sections. Section one determines the degree the individual tries to make the fiance(e) feel comfortable. Section two determines how comfortable the fiance(e) makes the individual feel.

The chi square test was employed in obtaining an index of validity on the CCOS items. First, the difference of those scoring in the lower quartile was compared with those scoring in the higher quartile. In the first section, the degree to which the individual tries to make his or her fiancé(e) feel comfortable was examined. Seventeen of the 18 items were significantly discriminating at the .001 level, with one of the items significant at the .01 level as indicated in Table II. In the second section, which attempts to determine how comfortable the fiancé(e) makes the individual feel, all 18 of the items were significant at the .001 level as indicated in Table III. A split-half reliability coefficient was computed to assess the reliability in each of the two sections of the CCOS. In the first section (the respondent's attempts in producing comfortableness) a reliability of .77 was reached. In the second section (the respondent's perceptions of the degree to which the fiancé(e) makes him or her feel comfortable) the reliability level attained was .88.

TABLE II

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF UPPER AND LOWER QUARTILES
IN SECTION ONE OF CCOS SCORES REFLECTING THE INDIVIDUAL'S
BEHAVIOR IN MAKING HIS OR HER FIANCE(E) COMFORTABLE

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
<u>Empathy</u>			
I try to see things from my fiancé(e)'s point of view, even when we differ.	4	38.89	.001
I try to understand my fiancé(e)'s feelings when he/she becomes angry	3	35.65	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
I try to express to my fiancé(e) that I recognize his/her feelings.	4	55.29	.001
<u>Spontaneity</u>			
I feel free to be open in expressing inner feelings or emotions when with my fiancé(e).	4	50.55	.001
I feel free to express differences of opinion with my fiancé(e).	4	24.65	.001
I feel I am putting on an act or a front when with my fiancé(e).	2	23.21	.001
<u>Trust</u>			
I discuss with others personal problems my fiancé(e) reveals to me in confidence.	3	11.71	.01
I am honest with my fiancé(e).	3	36.35	.001
I trust my fiancé(e).	4	28.83	.001
<u>Interest - Care</u>			
I have a difficult time being interested in things my fiancé(e) finds interesting.	4	70.74	.001
I am committed to promoting the welfare of my fiancé(e) even when we are unhappy with each other.	4	37.57	.001
I question the motives behind things my fiancé(e) says or does.	4	39.85	.001
<u>Respect</u>			
I respect the wishes of my fiancé(e) when making important decisions.	2	53.91	.001
I am considerate of my fiancé(e)'s feelings.	4	58.29	.001

TABLE II (Continued)

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
The degree of change I hope to make in my fiancé(e) after our marriage.	4	30.42	.001
<u>Criticalness - Hostility</u>			
I see faults in my fiancé(e).	4	61.44	.001
I say or do things which may tend to "put down" my fiancé(e).	4	74.61	.001
I feel hostile toward my fiancé(e) when he/she does not act as I feel he/she should.	4	64.59	.001

TABLE III

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISONS OF UPPER AND LOWER QUANTILES
IN SECTION TWO OF CCOS SCORES REFLECTING THE FIANCE(E)'S
BEHAVIOR IN MAKING THE INDIVIDUAL COMFORTABLE

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
<u>Empathy</u>			
My fiancé(e) tries to see things from my point of view, even when we differ.	4	70.93	.001
My fiancé(e) tries to <u>understand</u> my feelings when I become angry with him/her.	4	76.05	.001
My fiancé(e) lets me know he/she is aware of my feelings.	3	63.94	.001

TABLE III (Continued)

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
<u>Spontaneity</u>			
My fiancé(e) feels free to openly express his/her inner feelings or emotions when with me.	4	60.22	.001
My fiancé(e) feels free to express differences of opinion he/she has with me.	4	36.60	.001
My fiancé(e) puts on an act or front when with me.	4	26.33	.001
<u>Trust</u>			
My fiancé(e) tells others personal problems I share with him/her in confidence.	3	30.13	.001
My fiancé(e) is honest with me.	4	51.37	.001
My fiancé(e) trusts me.	3	47.95	.001
<u>Interest - Care</u>			
My fiancé(e) has a difficult time being interested in things that interest me.	4	70.30	.001
My fiancé(e) is committed to promoting my welfare, even when we are unhappy with each other.	4	82.56	.001
My fiancé(e) questions the motives behind what I say or do.	4	72.58	.001
<u>Respect</u>			
My fiancé(e) respects my wishes when making important decisions.	4	73.06	.001
My fiancé(e) is considerate of my feelings.	4	71.44	.001
The degree of change my fiancé(e) hopes to make in me after our marriage.	4	25.52	.001

TABLE III (Continued)

Item	df	χ^2	Level of Sig.
<u>Criticalness - Hostility</u>			
My fiance(e) sees "faults" in me.	4	59.96	.001
My fiance(e) says or does things which tend to make me feel that I have been "put down".	4	58.63	.001
My fiance(e) expresses hostility toward me when I do not act as he/she thinks I should.	4	73.65	.001

Mean Subscores of the CCOS

The CCOS consisted of six questions in each of six categories: Empathy, Spontaneity, Trust, Interest-Care, Respect, and Criticalness - Hostility. These six questions were divided into two sections of three questions each. Section one in each category was a self-rating of the individual effort to make his or her fiance(e) feel comfortable. Items in section two reflected the individual's evaluation of the fiance(e)'s effort to make him or her feel comfortable.

The responses to each item were scored on a continuum of one to five, with one representing the least degree of comfortableness orientation, and five representing the highest degree of comfortableness orientation. The scores for each of the six items representing the six CCOS categories were totaled in order to obtain a subscore for each category. Mean subscores were then obtained to determine those areas in which the

individuals had the highest and lowest degree of comfortableness orientation. The highest scores represented the highest degree of comfortableness orientation, and the lowest scores represented the lowest degree of comfortableness orientation. Table IV shows the total mean subscores, mean subscores for the males and mean subscores for the females in the two sections in each of the six CCOS categories. In each category, females indicated a higher sense of acceptance and approval than the males. The respondents, as a total sample, rated themselves, as well as their fiancé(e) highest in the area of trust and lowest in the area of criticalness-hostility.

TABLE IV

CCOS SUB-SCORE MEANS

Category	Mean subscore for total sample	Mean subscore for males	Mean subscore for females
<u>Empathy</u>			
Self-rating	12.66	12.49	12.80
Rating of fiancé(e)	12.30	11.86	12.71
<u>Spontaneity</u>			
Self-rating	13.58	13.43	13.72
Rating of fiancé(e)	13.30	13.12	13.47
<u>Trust</u>			
Self-rating	14.22	14.02	14.37
Rating of fiancé(e)	13.90	13.68	14.07
<u>Interest-Care</u>			
Self-rating	12.51	12.29	12.70
Rating of Fiancé(e)	11.98	11.51	12.33

TABLE IV (Continued)

Category	Mean subscore for total sample	Mean subscore for males	Mean subscore for females
<u>Respect</u>			
Self-rating	13.16	12.97	13.28
Rating of fiancé(e)	12.80	12.62	12.94
<u>Criticalness - Hostility</u>			
Self-rating	12.14	12.05	12.14
Rating of fiancé(e)	12.12	11.74	12.37

CCOS Item Responses

The subjects responded most favorably to items in the areas of trust and spontaneity in both sections of the scale. Almost 99% of those replying felt they seldom put on an act or front when with their fiancé(e) and over 96% felt that an act or false front was seldom displayed by the fiancé(e) in dealing with them. Over 98% indicated that they were honest and trusting with the fiancé(e) and over 90% feeling that the fiancé(e) was honest and trusting in return.

Criticalness and hostility tended to have the most negative responses with over 10 per cent indicating that they feel hostile toward their fiancé(e) for undesired actions, and approximately the same percentage indicating that hostility is expressed by the fiancé(e) toward them. A detailed description of responses to items in both sections of the CCOS are presented in Table V and VI.

TABLE V
SELF-RATING RESPONSES TO THE CCOS ITEMS

Item	Often		Uncertain		Seldom	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
<u>Empathy</u>						
I try to see things from my fiancé(e)'s point of view, even when we differ.	251	88.01	20	7.02	14	4.91
I try to understand my fiancé(e)'s feelings when he/she becomes angry with me.	256	89.51	18	6.29	12	4.20
I try to express to my fiancé(e) that I recognize his/her feelings.	264	92.63	14	4.91	7	2.46
<u>Spontaneity</u>						
I feel free to be open in expressing inner feelings or emotions when with my fiancé(e).	252	88.12	15	5.24	19	6.64
I feel free to express differences of opinion with my fiancé(e).	263	92.60	9	3.17	12	4.22
I feel I am putting on an act or a front when with my fiancé(e).	0	0	3	1.05	283	98.95
<u>Trust</u>						
I discuss with others personal problems my fiancé(e) reveals to me in confidence.	6	2.10	5	1.75	275	96.15
I am honest with my fiancé(e).	278	98.23	5	1.77	0	0
I trust my fiancé(e).	277	98.23	2	.71	3	1.06

TABLE V (Continued)

Item	Often		Uncertain		Seldom	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
<u>Interest - Care</u>						
I have a difficult time being interested in things my fiancé(e) finds interesting.	24	8.42	17	5.96	244	85.62
I am committed to promoting the welfare of my fiancé(e) even when we are unhappy with each other.	226	80.14	43	15.25	13	4.61
I question the motives behind things my fiancé(e) says or does.	28	9.79	21	7.34	237	82.87
<u>Criticalness - Hostility</u>						
I see faults in my fiancé(e).	46	16.14	29	10.18	210	73.68
I say or do things which may tend to "put down" my fiancé(e).	19	6.66	27	9.47	239	83.86
I feel hostile toward my fiancé(e) when he/she does not act as I feel he/she should.	31	10.87	30	10.53	224	78.60

TABLE VI

RESPONSES TO CCOS ITEMS CONCERNING RATING OF FIANCE(E)

Item	Often		Uncertain		Seldom	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
<u>Empathy</u>						
My fiancé(e) tries to see things from my point of view even when we differ.	239	84.16	18	6.34	27	9.51

TABLE VI (Continued)

Item	Often		Uncertain		Seldom	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
My fiance(e) respects my wishes when making important decisions.	263	91.96	12	4.20	11	3.85
My fiance(e) is considerate of my feelings.	266	93.60	11	3.85	9	3.15
The degree of change my fiance(e) hopes to make in me after our marriage.	16	5.63	30	10.56	238	83.81
<u>Criticalness - Hostility</u>						
My fiance(e) sees "faults" in me.	52	18.25	54	18.95	179	62.81
My fiance(e) says or does things which tend to make me feel that I have been "put down".	20	6.99	14	4.90	252	88.11
My fiance(e) expresses hostility toward me when I do not act as he/she thinks I should.	31	10.84	23	8.04	232	81.12

Examination of Hypotheses and Discussion of Results

Each of the hypotheses were examined, using the Pearson r correlation coefficient.

Hypothesis I. There is no significant relationship between the male's self-rating of his CCOS and the CCOS rating given him by his fiancée.

A positive correlation of .38 was obtained when this hypothesis was examined as shown in Table VII, indicating a significant relationship at the .001 level. Thus, the male's rating of his effort to

make his fiancée comfortable, tended to agree with the fiancée's rating of his efforts to make her comfortable. Males who indicated a high rating of their efforts generally received an equally high rating by their fiancée, and males rating their efforts low, tended also to receive a low rating by their fiancée.

TABLE VII

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION WITHIN
EACH COUPLE BETWEEN THE MALE'S SELF - RATING OF HIS
CCOS AND THE CCOS RATING GIVEN HIM BY
HIS FIANCEE

Description	Pearson <u>r</u> score Males Self-Rating on CCOS	Level of Sig.
CCOS rating given by the fiancée	.38	.001

Hypothesis II. There is no significant relationship between the female's self-rating of her CCOS and the CCOS rating given her by her fiancée.

Table VIII indicates that a positive correlation of .38 and a level of significance of .001 was found in the way the female rates her efforts at producing comfortableness, and the rating given her by her fiancée for her comfortableness producing behavior. Females who rated

themselves highly in comfortableness orientation also received a high rating by their fiances.

TABLE VIII

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION WITHIN
EACH COUPLE BETWEEN THE FEMALE'S SELF-RATING OF HER
CCOS AND THE CCOS RATING GIVEN HER BY
HER FIANCE

Description	Pearson r score Females Self-Rating on CCOS	Level of Sig.
CCOS rating given by the fiance	.38	.001

Hypothesis III. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating of CCOS and the individual's CCOS rating for his/her fiance(e).

As shown in Table IX, each individual tended to rate his/her efforts at producing comfortableness similar to the way he/she rated efforts of the fiance(e) to produce comfortableness. A positive correlation of .69, and a significance level of .001 indicates that the individual saw the CCOS efforts of the fiance(e) in much the same way as his/her own efforts. This finding is related to the suggestion of English and Pearson (1955), that individuals tend to see in others the same characteristics they see in themselves. The present finding

also coincides with the report of Dobson (1974) who indicates that children often react to others in the same way others act toward them.

TABLE IX
PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION
BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL'S SELF-RATING AND
THE RATING FOR THE FIANCE(E)

Description	<u>Pearson r score</u> Self-Rating CCOS Score	Level of Sig.
CCOS rating for the fiance(e)	.69	.001

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's combined CCOS rating score of self and fiance(e) and the marriage prediction score as developed by Burgess (1963).

The relationship between the individual's evaluation of his/her over-all comfortableness was correlated with their answers to an adapted marriage prediction scale, developed by Burgess (1963). As indicated in Table X, a positive correlation of .43 reflects a significant condition at the .001 level. Thus, those couples who expressed a high combined CCOS score also tended to receive a high combined marriage prediction score.

TABLE X

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION
BETWEEN THE RESPONDENTS COMBINED CCOS RATING
AND THE MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCORE

Description	<u>Pearson r score</u> Combined CCOS Score	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score	.43	.001

Hypothesis V. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's self-CCOS ratings and the marriage prediction score.

In order to determine if there was a significant relationship between an individual's rating of his/her efforts to make the fiance(e) comfortable, and his/her score on the marriage prediction scale, a Pearson r was computed and a positive correlation between the two scales of .32 was revealed, which was significant at the .001 level, as indicated in Table XI. Thus, individuals who perceive they are successful in making the fiance(e) comfortable, also tend to score high on the marriage prediction scale. Those who rate their efforts at making the fiance(e) comfortable at a low level would also tend to score low on the marriage prediction scale.

TABLE XI

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
SELF-CCOS RATINGS AND THE MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCALE

Description	Pearson r score Self CCOS Rating	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score	.32	.001

Hypothesis VI. There is no significant relationship between the individual's evaluation of the fiancé(e)'s CCOS rating and that individual's marriage prediction score.

A high relationship was found between the individual's marriage prediction score and the rating of the fiancé(e)'s CCOS behavior. As indicated in Table XII, a correlation of .47 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. A high CCOS rating for the fiancé(e) was associated with a high marriage prediction score for the individual.

TABLE XII

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
THE INDIVIDUAL'S EVALUATION OF THE FIANCE(E)'S
CCOS RATING AND THE MARRIAGE
PREDICTION SCORE

Description	Pearson r Score Evaluated CCOS of Fiance(e)	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of Individual	.47	.001

Hypothesis VII. There is no significant relationship between the CCOS scores of males as rated by their fiancée and the marriage prediction score of the male.

An examination of the association between the marriage prediction score of the male and the CCOS score of the male as rated by their fiancée revealed a correlation coefficient of .30. As Table XIII indicates, this correlation was significant at the .01 level. Those males who score high on the marriage prediction scale also tended to receive a high CCOS rating by their fiancée.

TABLE XIII

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE CCOS
RATING OF THE MALE BY THE FEMALE AND THE MARRIAGE
PREDICTION SCORE OF THE MALE

Description	Pearson r Score Male CCOS Rating by Female	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of the Male	.30	.01

Hypothesis VIII. There is no significant relationship between the CCOS scores of the females as rated by their fiancé and the marriage prediction score of the female.

A Pearson r was used to examine the relationship between the way the males rated their fiancée's CCOS behavior and the marriage prediction score of the female. As Table XIV shows, a correlation coefficient

of .25 was obtained, which was significant at the .01 level. Those females who expressed a high marriage prediction score were also likely to receive a high CCOS rating by their fiancée.

TABLE XIV

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT REFLECTING ASSOCIATION BETWEEN
THE CCOS RATING OF THE FEMALE BY THE MALE AND THE
MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCORE OF THE FEMALE

Description	Pearson r Score Female CCOS Rating by the Male	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of the Female	.25	.01

Hypothesis IX. There is no significant relationship between the male's CCOS rating for his fiancée and his marriage prediction score.

A correlation of .52 was obtained between the male's CCOS rating for his fiancée, and his score on the marriage prediction scale. The correlation was significant at the .001 level, as indicated in Table XV. Males who had a high score on the marriage prediction scale also tended to give their fiancées a high CCOS rating. A negative CCOS evaluation for the fiancée was correlated with a low score on the marriage prediction scale.

TABLE XV

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT SCORE REFLECTING ASSOCIATION
BETWEEN THE FEMALE'S CCOS RATING BY THE MALE AND HIS
MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCORE

Description	Pearson r Score Female CCOS rating by the male	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of the Male	.52	.001

Hypothesis X. There is no significant relationship between the female's CCOS rating for her fiance and her marriage prediction score.

The female's rating of her fiance's CCOS efforts was positively correlated with her marriage prediction score. As indicated in Table XVI, the correlation was significant at the .001 level. Those females who expressed positive CCOS ratings for their fiances tended to receive more positive marriage prediction scores.

TABLE XVI

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT ASSOCIATION BETWEEN THE
MALE'S CCOS RATING BY THE FEMALE AND HER
MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCORE

Description	Pearson r Score Male CCOS rating by the female	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of the Female	.33	.001

Hypothesis XI. There is no significant relationship between the combined CCOS scores for the couple (the male's rating of his fiancée's CCOS behavior, and the female's rating of her fiancé's CCOS behavior) and the combined marriage prediction score for the couple.

As can be seen in Table XVII, a positive correlation of .43 existed between the CCOS scores and the combined marriage prediction scores. This correlation was significant at the .001 level. Those couples who had a high combined CCOS score also tended to have a high combined marriage prediction score, and those couples with a low combined CCOS score also tended to have a low combined marriage prediction score.

TABLE XVII

PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT CCOS REFLECTING ASSOCIATION
BETWEEN THE COUPLE'S COMBINED CCOS SCORES AND THE
COUPLE'S COMBINED MARRIAGE PREDICTION SCORE

Description	<u>Pearson r score</u> Combined CCOS rating by the couple	Level of Sig.
Marriage Prediction Score of the couple	.43	.001

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to design an instrument, the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale (CCOS), to measure the degree of psychological comfortableness between the couple, and to relate this comfortableness score with their score on the marriage prediction scale as developed by Burgess (1963). The sample was composed of 143 engaged couples who had publically announced their engagement and future marriage plans. The couples were selected from the Social and Women's Sections of 71 local Oklahoma newspapers in the spring of 1974. The sample members were primarily between the ages of 19 and 24, and were predominantly middle class.

The questionnaire consisted of three categories which were utilized in the study: (a) a background information section; (b) questions adapted from the marriage prediction scale, as developed by Burgess and (c) the CCOS Scale, designed in two sections to assess (1) the attempt of each individual to make his or her fiancé(e) feel comfortable, and (2) the degree of effort that each individual felt the fiancé(e) gave in making him or her feel comfortable.

The chi square test was used in an item analysis of the CCOS Scale to determine those items that significantly differentiated between the individuals scoring in the upper quartile and those scoring in the lower quartile, on the basis of the total scale scores. Mean subscores

were established for each of the six aspects of comfortableness which effect the degree of the rating. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to examine various hypotheses.

The results and conclusions of this study were as follows:

1. Thirty-five of the 36 items of the CCOS Scale were significantly discriminating between the upper and lower quartile groups at the .001 level. One of the 36 items was significant at the .01 level.
2. A Split-half reliability coefficient was computed. In the first section, dealing with the individual's behavior in making his or her fiance(e) comfortable, a reliability of .77 was reached. In the second section, dealing with the degree of comfortable-ness felt by the individual with his or her fiance(e), the established reliability level was .88.
3. Mean subscores on the CCOS indicated that females gave themselves, as well as their fiancées, a more favorable comfortableness rating in all six areas than did the males. Also, all respondents tended to rate themselves higher than their fiance(e) in the comfortableness orientation.
4. In analyzing the percentages of responses to each item on the CCOS Scale, it was found that individual's responded most positively to the items of spontaneity and trust, and least positively to the items of criticalness and hostility.
5. There was a significant correlation at the .001 level between the male's rating of his efforts in making the fiancée comfortable, and the rating given his efforts by the fiancée.

6. The relationship between the female's rating of her efforts to encourage comfortableness, and the rating given her efforts by the fiance correlated to the .001 significance level.
7. The individual's rating of his or her efforts to encourage comfortableness was correlated to that individual's rating of the fiance(e)'s efforts to encourage comfortableness. This correlation was significant at the .001 level.
8. The individual's rating of his or her efforts to encourage comfortableness was combined with his or her rating of the fiance(e)'s efforts to encourage comfortableness. This combined score was correlated with the individual's marriage prediction score and a significance level of .001 was reached.
9. There was a significant correlation at the .001 level between the individual's rating of his or her own efforts to encourage comfortableness and that individual's marriage prediction score.
10. The marriage prediction score of each individual was correlated with his or her evaluation of the fiance(e)'s attempt to encourage comfortableness. This correlation was significant at the .001 level.
11. The female's rating of her fiance's attempt to make her comfortable was found to correlate with his score on the marriage prediction scale at the .01 level.
12. The males rating of his fiancée's attempt to encourage his comfortableness was correlated with her score on the marriage prediction scale, and was found to be significant at the .01 level.

13. The male's rating of his fiancée's attempt to encourage his comfortableness was correlated with his score on the marriage prediction scale. The two scores correlated at the .001 level.
14. The female's rating of her fiancé's attempt to encourage her comfortableness was correlated with her score on the marriage prediction scale. The significance between the two scores reached the .001 level.
15. The couple's combined score on the marriage prediction scale was correlated with their combined CCOS scores (the male's rating of his fiancée's effort to encourage his comfortableness, and the female's rating of the male's effort to encourage her comfortableness). The correlation between the scores was found to be significant at the .001 level.

Discussion

One problem faced by those involved in marriage counseling is the lack of instruments to give guidance in the direction that the counseling should take (Locke, 1951). These findings suggest that the CCOS might serve as a counseling tool. In view of the high correlation between the CCOS and the marriage prediction scale, it appears that the CCOS has merit as a prediction instrument in the area of marriage success.

The scale would also appear to be of great benefit as a counseling tool, by helping a couple identify those areas in which they feel most and least comfortable with each other. Awareness and discussion of those areas in which a couple feels least comfortable may help to avoid

future problems. As Satir (1972) points out, one of the more serious problems in today's marriage is a breakdown in the communication process, and any instrument which will help increase meaningful communication can be a great benefit.

The CCOS might also be helpful as an instrument used with dating couples in marriage classes. After completing the scale, the class could engage in discussion of the importance of comfortableness, and the means by which its various aspects might be improved in their relationships.

Areas of Possible Future Study

A primary need at this point is a longitudinal study to determine how accurate the scale predictions are for individual couples. To this end, the 143 couples participating in the study were asked if they would be interested in knowing the results of the research. One hundred twenty-one couples indicated that they would be interested, and gave an address where they later might be contacted. These 121 couples have been written and asked if they would be willing to complete another questionnaire in approximately three years. Those responding affirmatively will be re-contacted at that time and asked to complete a marriage satisfaction scale. In this way the predictive ability of the CCOS will be established by correlating the degree of marriage satisfaction with the CCOS.

Respondents in this study were primarily from middle class families. Future research involving the CCOS should include individuals from various socio-economic levels.

The concept of comfortableness as an indicator of marital satisfaction merits further study. A number of instruments (Hicks and Platt, 1970), deal with marriage satisfaction. However, many of these are based on the degree to which the couple internalizes various conventional practices. It seems logical that more important than agreeing with established norms in marital life, would be the couple's feeling of comfortableness with each other in whatever life style is followed. Future research efforts might concentrate on the development of a comfortableness instrument which could measure the couple's degree of comfortableness with each other in whatever life style was adopted, without reflecting a bias of conventional values and practices.

Since primitive times, man has been interested in improving his success in family relationships (Leder and Jackson, 1968). The aspect of comfortableness is important to that success, and the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale is one way of measuring the comfortableness within a couple.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, Gerald. "Marriage Prediction Revisited." Long Island Consultation Center Journal, V, No. 2 (1967), 38-46.
- Axelson, Leland. "Marital Adjustment and Marital Role Definitions of Husbands of Working and Non-Working Wives." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (1963), 189-195.
- Barrett-Lennard, G.T. "The Mature Person." Mental Hygiene, XLVI, No. 1 (1962), 98-102.
- Benson, Purnell. "The Interests of Happily Married Couples." Marriage and Family Living, XIV (1952), 276-280.
- Bern, Eric. Games People Play. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.
- Bernard, Jessie. "Factors in the Distribution of Success in Marriage." American Journal of Sociology, XL (1934), 49-60.
- Bernard, Jessie. "Marital Stability and Patterns of Status Variables." Journal of Marriage and the Family. XXVIII (1966), 421-439.
- Bernard, Jessie. The Future of Marriage. New York: World Publishing Co., 1972.
- Elatty, William P. The Exorcist. New York: Bantam Books, Inc., 1971.
- Blood, Robert O. Marriage. 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Bowman, Henry A. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1970.
- Brown, James W., and James W. Thornton. College Teaching: A Systematic Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Trends and Prospects for Young Marriages in the United States." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVII (1965), 243-254.
- Burgess, Ernest W., Harvey J. Locke, and Mary M. Thomas. The Family From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Co., 1963.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and P. Wallin. "Predicting Adjustment in Marriage From Adjustment in Engagement." American Journal of Sociology, IL (1944), 737-751.

- Burgess, Ernest W., P. Wallin, and G.D. Shults. Courtship, Engagement, and Marriage. New York: Lippincott, 1954.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Paul Wallin. Engagement and Marriage. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1951.
- Burr, Wesley R. "An Expansion and Test of a Role Theory of Marital Satisfaction." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII, (1971), 368-372.
- Cavin, Ruth S. Marriage and Family in the Modern World. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1969.
- Cutright, Phillips. "Income and Family Events: Marital Stability." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1971), 291-306.
- Disciples Curriculum Project Committee. The Christian and the Changing Family. St. Louis, Mo.: Christian Board of Publication, 1973.
- Dobson, James. Hide or Seek. Old Tappan, N.J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1974.
- Ellis, Albert. "The Value of Marriage Prediction Tests." American Sociological Review, XIII (1948), 710-718.
- English, O.S., and G.H.J. Pearson. Emotional Problems of Living. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1955.
- Erikson, Erik H. "Eight Stages of Man." Readings in Child Development. Martin and Stendler, eds. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1954.
- Flomenhaft, Kalman, and David M. Kaplan. "Clinical Significance of Current Kinship Relationships." Social Work, XXIII (January, 1968), 75.
- Folkman, Jerome D., and Nancy Clatworthy. Marriage Has Many Faces. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.
- Fromm, Eric. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.
- Gibb, Jack R. "Defensive Communication." A Review of General Semantics, XXII (1965), 221-229.
- Gurion, Gerald, Joseph Veroff, and Sheila Feld. Americans View Their Mental Health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Hicks, Mary W., and Marilyn Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1970), 553-574.

- Hindman, Nora Rivers. "Interpersonal Comfortableness Orientation of College Students." (Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, May, 1972.)
- Holtz, Robert Franklin. "Similarity Versus Complementary of Needs in Mate Selection." (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1968.)
- Jourard, Signey. The Transparent Self. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., 1964.
- Karma, J. Lawrence. "Family and Kinship Relationships: A Study of Intergenerational Solidarity." (Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School, 1973.)
- Katz, Robert L. Empathy, Its Nature and Uses. London: The Free Press of Glencoe Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1963.
- Keeler, R. "A Marriage Readiness Rating Scale." Journal of Home Economics, LIV (1962), 217-218.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford. The Family. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1963.
- La Haye, Tim. How To Be Happy Though Married. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndall House Publishers, 1968.
- Landis, Judson, and Mary Landis. Building A Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1973.
- Landis, Judson, and Mary Landis. Building A Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1963.
- Landis, Judson and Mary Landis. Building A Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Landis, Paul H. Making the Most of Marriage. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1970.
- Lanz, Herman R., and Eloise C. Snyder. Marriage. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Lederer, William J. and Don D. Jackson. The Mirages of Marriage. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968.
- Lewis, Howard R. and Harold S. Streitfeld. Growth Games. New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1970.
- Linton, R. "Natural History of the Family." In The Family. Ruth N. Anshen, ed. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

- Locke, Harvey J., and C. Karlsson. "Marital Adjustment and Prediction in Sweden and the United States." American Sociological Review, XVII (1952), 10-17.
- McGuire, C., and G.D. White. The Measurement of Social Status. Research Paper in Human Development No. 3. (revised). (Austin: University of Texas), 1955.
- Maltz, Maxwell. Psycho-Cybernetics: The New Way To A Successful Life. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Maslow, A.H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.
- Matthews, Vincent C., and Clement S. Milhanovich. "New Orientations on Marital Maladjustment." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (1963), 300-304.
- Mead, Margaret. "Marriage in Two Steps." Redbook, CXXVIII, No 3. (1966), 48ff.
- Mead, Margaret. "A Continuing Dialogue on Marriage--Why Just Living Together Won't Work." Redbook, CXXX, No 6, (1968), 44-ff.
- Monahan, Thomas P. "Does Age at Marriage Matter in Divorce?" Social Forces, XXXII (1953), 81-87.
- Moreno, Jacob L. "The Prediction and Planning of Success in Marriage." Marriage and Family Living, III (1941), 83-84.
- Morris, J. Kenneth. Premarital Counseling. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Nevran, Leslie. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, VI (1967), 173-184.
- O'Neill, Nena, and George O'Neill. Open Marriage: A New Life Style For Couples, New York: M. Evans and Company, Inc., 1972.
- Orden, Susan R. and Norman M. Bradburn. "Working Wives and Marriage Happiness." American Journal of Sociology, LXXIV (1969), 392-407.
- Powell, John. Why Am I Afraid To Tell You Who I Am? Niles, Ill.: Angus Communications, 1969.
- Ridley, Carl A. "Exploring the Impact of Work Satisfaction and Involvement on Marital Interaction When Both Partners Are Employed." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXV (1973), 229-273.
- Robb, George P., L.C. Bernardoni, and Ray W. Johnson. Assessment of Individual Mental Ability. New York: In text Educational Publishers, 1972.

- Rogers, Carl R. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1970.
- Rogers, Carl R. "Communication: Its Blocking and Its Facilitation." A Review of General Semantics, IX No. 2 (1952), 83-93.
- Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming A Person. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- Rogers, Dorothy. The Psychology of Adolescence. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.
- Roundtree, Griselda. "Some Aspects of Marriage Breakdown in Britain During the Last Thirty Years." Population Studies, XVIII (1964) 147-163.
- Satir, Virginia. Peoplemaking. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1972.
- Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, 1967.
- Saxton, Lloyd. The Individual, Marriage, and the Family. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1968.
- Schutz, William C. Joy. New York: Grace Press, Inc., 1967.
- Smith, H.C. Sensitivity to People. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Spock, Benjamin. "Teaching Lovingness to Children." Redbook, CXXXVII (1971), 26-27.
- Sporakowski, Michael J. "Marital Preparedness, Prediction, and Adjustment." The Family Coordinator. XVII (1968), 155-161.
- Stein, Joseph. Effective Personality: A Humanistic Approach. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.
- Stephens, William. Reflections of Marriage. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.
- Stinnett, Nick, Janet Collins, and James E. Montgomery. "Marital Need Satisfaction of Older Husbands and Wives." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXII (1970), 428-433.
- Stinnett, Nick, and Jim Walters. "Together in Marriage and the Family." (Unpublished Manuscript, Oklahoma State University, 1974.)
- Stinnett, Nick. "Readiness for Marital Competence." Journal of Home Economics, LXI (1969), 683-686.

- Stinnett, Nick, Janet Collins, and James E. Montgomery. "Older Person's Perceptions of Their Marriages." (Unpublished Study, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)
- Strauss, Anself. "The Ideal and the Chosen Mate." American Journal of Sociology, LII (1946), 204-208.
- Taylor, Ken. The Living New Testament. Wheaton, Ill.: Tyndale House, 1967.
- Terman, L.M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Terman, L.M., and Paul Wallin. "The Validity of Marriage Prediction and Marital Adjustment Tests." American Sociological Review, XIV (1949), 497-504.
- Traux, Charles B., and Robert R. Carkhuff. Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Alden Publishing Co., 1967.
- Udry, L. Richard. The Social Context of Marriage. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1966.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. Current Population Reports, Series p-20 No. 255. "Marital Status and Living Arrangements." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March, 1973.
- Walters, Jim, Karol K. Parker, and Nick Stinnett. "College Students: Perceptions Concerning Marriage." Family Perspective, Vol. VII (1972), 43-49.
- Weis, Albert E. ed. Editor and Publisher, International Yearbook, 1973, New York: Editor and Publisher, 1973.
- Williams, Joyce W. and Marjorie Smith. Middle Childhood: Behavior and Development. New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Williamson, Robert A. Marriage and Family Relations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1972.

APPENDIX A

NEWSPAPERS USED IN THE SAMPLE SELECTION

Ada Evening News	Latimer County News-Tribune
Ardmoreite	Lawton Community Guide
Atoka Co. Times	Lawton Constitution
Bartlesville Examiner Enterprise	Lincoln Co. News
Beaver Co. Democrat	Lindsay News
Big Pasture News	Logan Co. News
Bixby Bulletin	McAlester News-Capital
Black Dispatch	Medford Patriot Star
Blackwell Journal Tribune	Miami News Record
Blanchard News	Mountain View
Boise City News	Pauls Valley Democrat
Cherokee Messenger and Republican	Pawhuska Journal Capitol
Claremore Progress	Pawnee Chief
Cordell Beacon	Ponca City News
Daily and Sunday Oklahoman	Pond Creek Herald
Dewey News Record	Poteau News and Valley
Drumright Derrick	Purcell Register
Drumright Journal	Sapulpa Daily Herald
Duke Times	Sayre Sun
Duncan Banner	Seminole Producer
Duncan Eagle	Sequoyah County Times
Edmond Sun and Booster	Shawnee News-Star
El Reno American	Stillwater News Press
Eldorado Courier	Tipton Tribune
Elk City News	Tonkawa News
Enid Morning News	Tulsa Daily World
Fredrick Daily Leader	Vici News
Harper Co. Journal	Wagoner Record-Democrat
Hartshorne Sun	Wagoner Tribune
Hinton Record	Watonga Republican
Hominy News-Progress	Waurika News Democrat
Hughes Co. Times	Weatherford Daily News
Kingfisher Free Press	Wewoka Times
Kingfisher Times	Woodward Co. Journal
Kiowa County Democrat	Yale News
LaFlore County Sun	

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE RESEARCH

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY DRAWING A CIRCLE
AROUND YOUR SELECTION

Example:

Are you now engaged?

4. Yes
5. No

1. Your sex
 - a. Male
 - b. Female
2. As a child, did your parents encourage you to respect the feelings of others?
 - a. Often
 - b. Moderately
 - c. Rarely
3. Do you consider yourself to be a religious person?
 - a. Very much
 - b. Much
 - c. Moderately religious
 - d. Very little, if any
 - e. Anti-religious
4. Do you consider your fiancé(e) to be a religious person?
 - a. Very much
 - b. Much
 - c. Moderately religious
 - d. Very little, if any
 - e. Anti-religious
5. Rate the degree of your own determination to make your marriage endure.
 - a. I am going to have my marriage endure even though I experience great unhappiness
 - b. I am going to have my marriage endure even though I experience some unhappiness
 - c. I am going to have my marriage endure only if it gives me satisfaction
 - d. I am undecided
6. Rate the degree you feel your fiancé(e) would be determined to make the marriage endure.
 - a. He/she would be determined to have our marriage endure even though he/she experiences great unhappiness
 - b. He/she would be determined to have our marriage endure even though he/she experiences some unhappiness
 - c. He/she would be determined to have our marriage endure only if it gives him/her satisfaction
 - d. I am undecided
7. What is the primary source of income of the head of your present family?
 - a. Inherited savings & investments
 - b. Earned wealth, transferrable investments
 - c. Profits, royalties, fees
 - d. Salary, commissions (regular, monthly, or yearly)
 - e. Hourly wages, weekly checks
 - f. Odd jobs, seasonal work
 - g. Public relief or charity
8. What is the occupation of the principal earner of your present family?

9. What is the highest educational attainment of the principal earner of your present family?
 - a. Less than grade 8
 - b. Completed grade 8, but did not attend beyond grade 9
 - c. Attended high school, completed grade 9, but did not graduate
 - d. Graduated from high school
 - e. Attended college or university for 2 or more years
 - f. Graduated from 4-year college
 - g. Completed graduate work for profession
10. Please rate how comfortable you feel with your fiancé(e).
 - a. I always feel very comfortable with him/her
 - b. I usually feel comfortable with him/her
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. I usually feel uncomfortable with him/her
 - e. I always feel uncomfortable with him/her
11. Rate how comfortable you think your fiancé(e) is with you.
 - a. He/she always feels very comfortable with me
 - b. He/she usually feels comfortable with me
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. He/she usually feels uncomfortable with me
 - e. He/she always feels uncomfortable with me
12. What do you think the length of time will be between your engagement and marriage?
 - a. Less than a month
 - b. 1 to 5 months
 - c. 6 to 11 months
 - d. 12 months or more
13. How much conflict is there between you and your fiancé(e)?
 - a. None
 - b. A little
 - c. Moderate
 - d. A good deal
 - e. Very great
14. Rate your degree of satisfaction with the kind of person you are.
 - a. Highly satisfied
 - b. Satisfied
 - c. Undecided
 - d. Dissatisfied
 - e. Highly dissatisfied
15. Do you and your fiancé(e) both desire to have children during marriage?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
16. How happy would you rate your childhood?
 - a. Very happy
 - b. Happy
 - c. Average
 - d. Unhappy
 - e. Very unhappy
17. Do you feel that the strength of your interest in sex, as compared with that of your fiancé(e) is:
 - a. Very much greater
 - b. Much greater
 - c. About the same
 - d. Much less intense
 - e. Very much less intense
18. Are there practices and opinions of your fiancé(e) that you hope to change after your marriage?
 - a. There are very many changes I will try to make
 - b. There are many changes I will try to make
 - c. I am undecided
 - d. There are few changes I will try to make
 - e. There are no changes I will try to make
19. What was the degree of happiness of your parent's marriage?
 - a. Very happy
 - b. Happy
 - c. Average
 - d. Unhappy
 - e. Very unhappy
20. What is the highest level of education you will have completed by the time of your marriage?
 - a. Elementary (8th grade)
 - b. High school
 - c. Two years of college
 - d. College graduate
 - e. Graduate work
21. Is your fiancé(e) jealous of you?
 - a. Very often
 - b. Often
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. Seldom
 - e. Very seldom
22. Are you jealous of your fiancé(e)?
 - a. Very often
 - b. Often
 - c. I am not sure
 - d. Seldom
 - e. Very seldom
23. What is the church affiliation of you and your fiancé(e)?
 - a. Only one of you is a church member
 - b. Neither belongs to a church
 - c. Both belong to same church
 - d. Belong to different churches
24. What is the frequency of your monthly church attendance
 - a. No times
 - b. Once
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. Four or more times
25. Do you think you have practices and opinions that your fiancé(e) will try to change after you are married?
 - a. There are very many changes he/she will try to make
 - b. There are many changes he/she will try to make
 - c. I am undecided
 - d. There are few changes he/she will try to make
 - e. There are no changes he/she will try to make.
26. Please write your age: _____

RATE YOURSELF IN THE FOLLOWING TRAITS BY CIRCLING THE PROPER LETTER.

ANSWER SELECTIONS:

(Very often: VO), (Often: O), (Undecided: ?), (Seldom: S), (Very Seldom: VS)

Example: "I think of my fiancée) VO O ? S VS

1. I try to see things from my fiancée's point of view, even on occasions when our views differ VO O ? S VS
2. I try to understand my fiancée's feelings when he/she becomes angry with me VO O ? S VS
3. I try to express to my fiancée that I recognize his/her feelings VO O ? S VS
4. I feel free to be open in expressing inner feelings or emotions when with my fiancée) VO O ? S VS
5. I feel free to express differences of opinion with my fiancée). VO O ? S VS
6. I feel I am putting on an act or a front when with my fiancée). VO O ? S VS
7. I discuss with other friends personal problems my fiancée) has revealed to me in confidence VO O ? S VS
8. I am honest with my fiancée) VO O ? S VS
9. I trust my fiancée) VO O ? S VS
10. I have a difficult time being interested in things my fiancée) finds interesting VO O ? S VS
11. I am committed to promoting the welfare of my fiancée) even when we are unhappy with each other VO O ? S VS
12. I question the motives behind things my fiancée) says or does . VO O ? S VS
13. I respect the wishes of my fiancée) when making important decisions VO O ? S VS
14. I am considerate of my fiancée's feelings VO O ? S VS
15. I see "faults" in my fiancée) VO O ? S VS
16. I say or do things which may tend to "put down" my fiancée) ... VO O ? S VS
17. I feel hostile toward my fiancée) when he/she does not act as I feel he/she should VO O ? S VS

RATE YOUR FIANCE(E) IN THE FOLLOWING TRAITS
USING THE SAME CHOICES AS ABOVE

My fiancée)

1. ...tries to see things from my point of view, even on occasions when our views differ VO O ? S VS
2. ...tries to understand my feelings when I become angry with him/her VO O ? S VS
3. ...lets me know he/she is aware of my feelings VO O ? S VS
4. ...feels free to openly express his/her inner feelings or emotions when with me VO O ? S VS

My fiancée)

5. ...feels free to express differences of opinion he/she has with me VO O ? S VS
6. ...puts on an act or front when with me VO O ? S VS
7. ...tells others personal problems I share with him/her in confidence VO O ? S VS
8. ...is honest with me VO O ? S VS
9. ...trusts me VO O ? S VS
10. ...has a difficult time being interested in things that interest me VO O ? S VS
11. ...is committed to promoting my welfare, even when we are unhappy with each other VO O ? S VS
12. ...questions the motives behind what I say or do VO O ? S VS
13. ...respects my wishes when making important decisions VO O ? S VS
14. ...is considerate of my feelings VO O ? S VS
15. ...sees "faults" in me VO O ? S VS
16. ...says or does things which tend to make me feel that I have been "put down" VO O ? S VS
17. ...expresses hostility toward me when I do not act as he/she thinks I should VO O ? S VS

CIRCLE THE APPROPRIATE CHOICES AS YOU JUDGE THEY APPLY TO YOU AND YOUR FIANCE(E)

Choices: Very much so 1
Considerably 2
Somewhat 3
A little 4
Not at all 5

Trait	My Fiance(e)					Myself				
1. Takes responsibility willingly	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
2. Dominating	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
3. A leader in school or other group	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
4. Able to make decisions readily	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
5. Easily influenced by others	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
6. "Gives in" in arguments	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
7. Gets angry easily	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
8. Gets over anger quickly	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
9. Affectionate	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
10. Demonstrative	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
11. Sociable - makes friends easily	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
12. Likes belonging to organizations	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
13. Cares what people say and think	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
14. Has a sense of humor	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF REQUEST SENT WITH QUESTIONNAIRE



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

Department of Family Relations & Child Development
405) 372-6211, Ext. 6084

74074

April, 1974

The two of you have been selected as an engaged couple who would be well qualified and willing to cooperate in a state-wide research effort being conducted through the Department of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University. The research is concerned with personal comfortableness among engaged couples.

It is hoped that the information gained from this research will have at least two benefits. First, out of this study will come a means of helping engaged couples better evaluate their own feelings of comfort with each other, as a means of determining later marriage success. Second, your opinions will help develop an instrument to be used by ministers and marriage counselors as they meet with engaged couples in preparation for marriage.

If you would be kind enough to assist us in this research, each of you is asked to complete one of the two enclosed identical questionnaires. You are asked to return the questionnaires to us at the earliest possible date. Please do return them by no later than April 30.

As you answer the questions, please do not consult with each other or compare your answers. We will, if you wish, send you a brief summary of the findings of the study when it is completed.

For your convenience we have included two stamped, addressed envelopes. If you and your fiancé can return your questionnaires in one envelope, it will be appreciated (just throw the extra envelope away). If, however, you and your fiancé will not be together before April 30, would you please mail your completed copy back to us. Then, include your fiancé's copy of the questionnaire (with the second stamped envelope) in the next letter you write him, and ask him to complete it and drop it in the mail.

We ask you not to put your name on the questionnaire. The return envelope has your name so we can know that your mailing has arrived here, but we do not need the questionnaires themselves identified.

If you would like a summary of our findings, place an "X" in the box printed on the envelope and indicate your proper address. We will send you a summary when it is ready later this summer.

Your assistance with this research is greatly appreciated. It is through the participation of individuals such as you that we gain greater knowledge and understanding of engaged couples' personal comfort and marriage desires.

Yours sincerely,
David L. Haun
David L. Haun
Clergyman

Nick Stinnett
Dr. Nick Stinnett
Associate Professor
Dept. of Family Relations
and Child Development

V I T A

David Lee Haun

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERPERSONAL COMFORTABLENESS AND
THE PREDICTION OF MARRIAGE ADJUSTMENT

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Grafton, West Virginia, April 14, 1937,
the son of Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth Dale Haun. Married on
May 31, 1959 to Twylah Kay Arning. Father of two daughters.

Education: Graduated from Fort Lauderdale (Florida) High School
in May, 1955. Attended Phillips University in Enid, Oklahoma,
from 1955 to 1963. Received the Bachelor of Arts degree from
Phillips in 1959, with majors in Philosophy and Drama.
Received the Bachelor of Divinity degree from the Graduate
Seminary at Phillips University in May, 1963. Completed the
requirements for the Master of Science degree in July, 1974
at Oklahoma State University.

Professional Experience: Served as pastor of the Central Christian
Church in Beaufort, South Carolina, from 1963 to 1967. Served
as pastor of the First Christian Church in Cushing, Oklahoma,
from 1967 to 1973. Served as pastor of the First Christian
Church in Tecumseh, Oklahoma, 1973-present.

Professional Organizations: Member of the State Board, Oklahoma
Lung Association; Regional Board, Oklahoma Lung Association;
Board of the Churchman's Foundation; Certified minister, The
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ).