

AN INVENTORY DEVELOPED TO MEASURE MUTUALITY
IN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR OF
MIDDLE-AGED MARRIED PAIRS

By

LOUISE McCRUMMEN CROW

Bachelor of Science

Texas Tech University

Lubbock, Texas

1940

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
May, 1970

Thesis
1970
0953i
0002

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
OCT 12 1970

AN INVENTORY DEVELOPED TO MEASURE MUTUALITY
IN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR OF
MIDDLE-AGED MARRIED PAIRS

Thesis Approved:

Hazel L. Ingersoll
Thesis Adviser

James J. Eckert

D. Burhan
Dean of the Graduate College

762180

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

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

Special thanks go to Dr. Hazel Ingersoll whose guidance and encouragement made this study possible.

The writer would also like to thank Dr. James Walters and Dr. Nick Stinnett for their helpful suggestions and assistance. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. Josephine Hoffer, Acting Head of the Department of Family Relations and Child Development, for her interest and encouragement as the study has progressed.

Acknowledgement is also given to the parents of the college students who participated in the study and to the students who encouraged their parents to do so. Great appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Iris McPherson for her help in the analysis of the data at the Computing Center.

Deep appreciation is expressed to my husband and children for their patience and understanding that prevailed throughout the period of graduate study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Statement of Purposes	3
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	4
Summary	9
III. PROCEDURE	11
Selection of Subjects	11
Development of Instrument	11
Analysis of the Data	14
IV. RESULTS	16
Description of Subjects	16
The Item Analysis	17
Examination of Hypotheses	19
V. SUMMARY	31
Limitations of the Study and Recommendations	36
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
APPENDIX	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Description of the Subjects by Age and Sex	17
II. Additional Description by Couples	18
III. Item Analysis Based on Comparison of the Upper and Lower Quartile Scores on <u>The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u>	20
IV. Item Analysis Based on Comparison of the Upper and Lower Quartile Scores on <u>The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u>	22
V. z Scores Reflecting Differences in Perceived Social- Emotional Behavior of Husbands and Their Wives According to Each Item in <u>The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u> .	24
VI. z Score Reflecting the Difference Between Discrepancy Scores of Husbands and Their Wives on <u>The Social- Emotional Behavior Inventory</u> and <u>The Ideal Social- Emotional Behavior Inventory</u>	26
VII. Spearman r Reflecting the Relationship and the t Score, the Level of Significance, of Husbands' Scores on <u>The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u> and <u>The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u>	27
VIII. Spearman r Reflecting the Relationship and the t Score, the Level of Significance, of Wives' Scores on <u>The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u> and <u>The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory</u>	28
IX. Chi-Square Values Reflecting Association of the Husbands' Discrepancy Scores with the Husbands' Self-Evaluated Marital Satisfaction Rating	29
X. Chi-Square Values Reflecting Association of the Wives' Discrepancy Scores with the Wives' Self-Evaluated Marital Satisfaction Rating	30

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Marriage relationships in the American culture are dynamic in character. Changes occur which require the marital dyad to adapt to the internal and external forces of the modern age. Whereas, once the husband was an authority figure in most homes, today the relationship between husband and wife has become one of greater equality. Some social scientists see the interaction that exists between husbands and wives assuming the character of companionship with the primary functions of the relationship being social-emotional in nature. (Burgess, Locke, and Thomes, 1963)

Within a marriage there are many aspects of interaction involved in the development of a satisfactory or unsatisfactory relationship. Since it is impossible to study all areas of marital interaction within the scope of this research, the decision was made to concentrate on the social-emotional aspects of marriage. Levinger (1964) defines social-emotional behavior as "activity that maintains the relationship between the members." (p. 434) Zelditch (1955) elaborates on the definition by suggesting that it is ". . . the expression of affection . . . and a symbolization of common membership through supportive, accepting behavior." (p. 311) For the purposes of this research social-emotional

behavior is defined as activity that results from intangible interaction between the husband and wife which maintains the relationship.

Parsons (1955), in writing about family interaction, has suggested that generally the "husband-father" role is that of the task specialist while the "wife-mother" role is that of the social-emotional or expressive specialist. Levinger (1964) questions whether divisions hold true when considered in the marriage relationship alone. He reports results from his research showing men and women to be equally concerned with social-emotional goals in their marriage; that neither spouse is a social-emotional specialist as social-emotional behavior is a mutual matter. Therefore, the writer believed that there was a need to develop an instrument to measure mutuality and satisfaction in the social-emotional area of interaction between the husband and wife within the marital relationship.

In spite of the fact that social-emotional behavior is a complex factor in marital interaction, the writer believed that an instrument could be constructed to measure such behavior. An instrument based on social-emotional factors alone would reflect an adequate sampling of social-emotional behavior to provide a valid measure. An adaptation and combination of factors from Farber (1957), Burgess, Locke and Thoms (1963), and Levinger (1964) were used in this research. The factors and their definitions are:

- (a) Understanding - spouses know and accept each other.
- (b) Communication - spouses express their ideas and feelings to each other.
- (c) Affection and sexual gratification - spouses show tender regard for each other and find pleasure in their intimate relations.

- (d) Sociability - spouses do things together and with other people.

It was assumed that couples who have been married at least fifteen years or more would have a relatively stable relationship and would have established certain habits in their social-emotional behavior. Therefore the decision was made to limit this study to middle-aged couples who had been married at least fifteen years and were living together at the time the study was made.

Statement of Purposes

The purposes of this research were to:

1. Develop an instrument to measure (a) the social-emotional behavior which results from the interaction between a husband and wife and (b) the degree of satisfaction which the husband and wife derive from the social-emotional aspects of marriage.
2. Test the instrument by using it in an exploratory study to determine:
 - a. Whether both husbands and wives mutually participate in social-emotional behavior within their marital relationship.
 - b. The degree of satisfaction that husbands and wives derive from the social-emotional aspects of their relationship.
 - c. The reported importance of satisfaction in the social-emotional area in marriage to the over-all marital satisfaction of husbands and wives.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

No longer do traditional patterns of family living fit the majority of modern families. Both internal and external factors in the changing American culture exerted a force on the marriage relationship to effect changes in patterns of marital interaction.

More than 40 years ago Burgess (1926) was suggesting that the unity of family life has its existence in the interaction of its members. Survival of the family doesn't depend on the harmony that exists between its members. Neither does it dissolve as a result of conflict. The family exists as long as interaction takes place. Burgess also says that in a changing society one is not likely to find a single, common pattern of interaction, but instead

. . . our American society presents what at first sight seems to be a chaotic conglomeration of every conceivable pattern of family organization and disorganization, from the patriarchal kinship groups of our Southern Mountain highlands to the free unions of our Greenwich Villages.
(p. 31)

Sorokin (1937) predicted that the sacred union of husband and wife would disintegrate. He believed the time would come when there would be little difference between socially sanctioned marriages and illicit sex-relationships. He suggested that the main functions of the family would decrease until the family is merely a cohabitation of male and female and the home a base for the sex-relationship. Ten years later

Zimmerman (1947) predicted that so many of the family's functions had been assumed by other agencies that there was question about the family's survival as a social institution. However, recognizing the great changes that are occurring in family organization, many social scientists at the present time see the family unit as being important in the present structure of society. What they do recognize is that, as social change occurs, the functions and goals of the family also are changing to conform to the demands of living in a modern age.

Some authorities of marriage research claim that the American marriage has become concerned predominantly with companionship. Burgess, Locke and Thomes (1963) suggest that the family has been in transition from an institution to a companionship, with behavior characterized by equality, mutual affection, and common consensus of its members. It is suggested that the companionship form of the family is not to be thought of as being but as emerging. We still have the "conglomeration of every conceivable pattern," but, according to Burgess (1963) the companionship form of interaction is becoming predominant. According to Petersen (1956) the emerging family is a result of many major changes in our American society. However, he believes that there are two remaining functions--those being the giving of affection and the sharing of companionship. Burgess and Locke (1953, p. 470) summarize the importance of the present family functions as follows:

In spite of the loss of the historical functions of the family--economic, protective, educational recreational, and religious--it is necessary to realize that the family still retains two intrinsic functions. While various forces are shearing from the family its institutional significance, it still maintains its affectional and cultural activities. More and more the American family is becoming a union of

husband and wife, parents and children, based on the sentiment of love, common interests, and companionship.

Cavan (1959) asserts that "the solid stuff of marriage is companionship." (p. 6) Companionship is, according to Cavan, the enjoyment of each other's presence and implies a comfortable relationship of deciding, planning, and doing things together. Furthermore, it leads to the development of mutual appreciation and tolerance of each other within the marital bonds.

Other family specialists have approached their study from another point of view suggesting that families have two primary kinds of activity, one being task oriented, the other being emotionally oriented. Parsons (1955) theorized that all members of a family are involved in these two kinds of activities at one time or another. At times they are involved in task activities which demand inhibitions of emotions. However, he also believes that there comes a time when attitude and behavior must change to integrative-expressive activity such as the release of inhibited emotions, the expression of affection for one another, and the showing of accepting behavior. He also proposed that for the middle-class family, consisting of father, mother, and children, the male adult will assume leadership in the task activities, while the female adult will play the role of expressive leader.

Farber (1964) suggests that Burgess' concept of companionship closely resembles the concept of expressive behavior as used by Parsons, in that both concepts refer to ways of maintaining personal relationships. Other research specialists have sought to study these same aspects of personal relationship between husband and wife within the marital bonds. Both Farber (1959) and Levinger (1964) use the term "social-emotional aspects of marriage" which approaches Parsons'

"expressive behavior" and Burgess' "companionship" in similar meaning. Levinger defines social-emotional behavior as "activity that maintains the relationship between the members." (p. 434) Another social scientist, Zelditch (1955), defines it also as ". . . the expression of affection . . . and a symbolization of common membership through supportive, accepting behavior." (p. 311)

Farber (1959) and Levinger (1964) have conducted related studies to determine the importance of the social-emotional aspects of the marital relationship. Farber developed an Index of Marital Integration to test the relative importance of social-emotional and task oriented aspects of marriage. When this index was used with 99 couples in Illinois the wives of the sample tended to rank values related to social-emotional aspects of marriage higher than their husbands did. Levinger asserts that if the marriage research specialists are correct in their claim that American marriage has become concerned predominantly with companionship the findings suggest that men and women are equally concerned with the social-emotional aspects of marriage. In Levinger's study each respondent ranked a set of nine general marital goals adapted from Farber's Index. The results indicated that there was no significant difference between husbands' and wives' ranking of the items of affection and companionship. Levinger believes the difference between his and Farber's findings was predominantly one of social class. He concluded that the companionship marriage is more a reflection of middle or upper-middle than of lower class position. He further states that as a couple acquires economic security and occupational stability, the husband will be freed to share his wife's concern with social-emotional matters. These views are also shared by other

authorities such as Komarovsky (1964) and Maslow (1954).

There are other results in the Levinger study that pertain to the social-emotional aspects of the marriage. When a correlation was made between husbands' and wives' performance on task items and social-emotional items, it was revealed that the respondents felt that "task items" were specialized while "social-emotional items" were a mutual matter. Tests were also made to determine the relationship between task and social-emotional aspects of marriage and marital happiness. Results indicated very little relationship between satisfaction with the husband's work or the couple's division-of-labor and either spouse's general happiness. In contrast, feelings of affection, use of leisure time, and each other's social supportiveness were highly related to general happiness. For husbands, sexual satisfaction was more related to general satisfaction while marital communication was of greater importance to the wives. As a general conclusion it was suggested that social-emotional performance is (1) the essence of middle-class American marriages and (2) a mutual rather than a specialized matter.

Other evidence of the mutuality of the social-emotional aspects of marriage is available.

Truxall and Merrill (1953) believe conjugal roles to be the most clearly reciprocal of all relationships, since they depend upon behavior by one of the spouses and the expectation of appropriate behavior in return. They further suggest that conjugal roles are expressions of marital interaction and one person cannot play them unless the other cooperates.

Based on years of clinical experience, Goodwin and Mudd (1966) suggest that modern marriages remain stable only as long as the partners are able to offer at least minimal gratification of each other's emotional needs. It is when either spouse begins to feel that his or her emotional needs are not met that frustration, rejection, and conflict occur.

McMillen (1969) administered a Marriage Counseling Inventory to 108 couples undergoing marriage counseling in an effort to find out more about the problems that existed in the marriages. Mentioned most often were these socio-psychological needs: (1) lack of communication, (2) lack of understanding, and (3) lack of love and affection. There were sex differences in the ratings as the wives believed that lack of communication was the most important cause of problems, while the husbands rated lack of understanding as the most important. Although there were sex differences, both husbands and wives ranked the socio-psychological needs as being of prime importance.

Summary

The review of literature of the social-emotional aspects of marriage suggests the following:

1. There is no one single common pattern of interaction in the changing family organization in America today.
2. Some social scientists believe the family unit will become obsolete if family organizational patterns continue the present trend.
3. The most valued relationship in middle-class American marriages is companionship.

4. Family activities are divided into two categories, task oriented and social-emotional oriented.
5. There is a close relationship between the concept of companionship and what is defined as social-emotional behavior.
6. Evidence and authoritative opinion differ as to whether or not the social-emotional aspect of marriage is a mutual matter. Findings are inconclusive.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The 140 couples selected for this study were the parents of students attending Family Relations and Child Development classes at Oklahoma State University in the fall term of the 1969-1970 school year. These courses, being electives, enroll students of both sexes, junior and senior level, from all fields of study on the campus. No attempt was made to control marital status, background factors, or socio-economic levels. The names and addresses of five hundred parents who had been married fifteen years and were living together were obtained from the students in their classes.

A cover letter explaining the research and assuring anonymity was sent to 500 couples. Included in each letter were the family data sheet, two of The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory, and two of The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory (one each for each husband and wife).

Of the 175 responses received, 35 were incomplete or otherwise unusable. Therefore, 140 couples' responses were used in this research.

Development of the Instrument

As previously stated, the purposes of this research were (1) to develop an instrument to measure the social-emotional aspects of

marriage and (2) to do an exploratory study testing selected hypotheses. The study proceeded in two phases, the development of the instrument and the analysis of the major findings. The procedures used in constructing the instrument are listed below.

1. A survey of literature was made to determine the factors relating to the social-emotional aspects of the marital relationship.
2. Forty-five items were developed to be used in a trial instrument. These items were based on critical factors found in a study of previous research to be associated with marital integration. These factors were understanding, communication, affection and sexual gratification, and sociability.
3. The trial instrument, consisting of forty-five items, was submitted to a panel of six judges for evaluation and suggested improvement. Four of the judges responded with detailed evaluations and suggestions, while two gave some general suggestions that were very helpful in developing the instruments.
4. Using the judges' suggestions, certain items were deleted or changed to establish the twenty-six items finally selected to be used for the preliminary instrument. There was no attempt to have exactly the same number of items for each factor. It was thought that some items would be eliminated with an item analysis that was used to determine discriminating items.
5. Two parallel instruments were developed using the twenty-six items in each. One, known as The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory, was designed to measure one spouse's perception of the other's social-emotional behavior. The other instrument,

- known as The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory, was designed to measure the spouse's ideas of the desired or ideal social-emotional behavior of his mate. The degree of response possible for each item was (1) Almost Never, (2) Rarely, (3) Occasionally, (4) Frequently, and (5) Almost Always. Some of the items were expressed in an inverse manner so that the desired answer was directly opposite to most of the items. Scoring for all items was arranged so that a high score on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory indicated that the respondent perceived his or her mate as actively participating in social-emotional behavior. Furthermore a high score on The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory indicated that the respondent desired active participation in social-emotional behavior by his mate. An index reflecting each individual's satisfaction with the social-emotional behavior of his mate was obtained by computing the difference between the total scores on each of the inventories for each husband and each wife. This index was known as a discrepancy score.
6. A rating scale representing five degrees of marital satisfaction was developed to measure the general marital satisfaction of each spouse. The degrees of response possible on this scale were: (1) Highly Satisfied, (2) Fairly Satisfied, (3) Indifferent, (4) Fairly Dissatisfied, and (5) Highly Dissatisfied. (See rating scale in Appendix.)
 7. A cover letter, family data sheet, and the inventories were sent to 500 couples. (See Appendix.) Usable responses were received from 140 couples.

8. The chi-square test of significance was used in an item analysis of both The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory to determine the discriminating ability of the items.
9. All of the items in both inventories proved to discriminate significantly between the upper and lower quartile groups either at the .01 or .001 level; therefore all items were retained for the final instrument.
10. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown Formula, was obtained in determining the reliability of the items in both The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory.

Analysis of the Data

A chi-square test was used in an item analysis of the instrument. All items proved to be significantly discriminating; therefore, the results of all items were used in testing the hypotheses listed below.

A z score was computed to test the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference between the responses of husbands and wives concerning the perceived social-emotional behavior.
2. There is no significant difference between the discrepancy scores of husbands and their wives.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed to test the following null hypotheses and a t score was computed to determine the level of significance:

3. There is no relationship between the responses of husbands concerning the perceived and ideal social-emotional behavior of their wives.
4. There is no relationship between the responses of wives concerning the perceived and ideal social-emotional behavior of their husbands.

A chi-square test was used to test the following hypotheses:

5. The husbands' self-evaluated marital satisfaction rating is independent of the husbands' discrepancy scores.
6. The wives' self-evaluated marital satisfaction rating is independent of the wives' discrepancy scores.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A description of subjects by sex and age is presented in Table I, while Table II gives additional information concerning the couples participating in this study. The sample consisted of 140 couples, who were parents of college students enrolled at Oklahoma State University in the fall term of the 1969-70 school year.

The greatest proportion of both men's and women's ages fell within the 45-54 year category. There were 80 (57.14%) of the women and 98 (70%) of the men in this age range. The majority of the couples (76.40%) still had at least one child living at home, while 67.17% reported having a total of two or three children. The range of the years married varied from 16 to 37 years, with the majority (53.57%) falling in the 21-25 year category.

According to the McGuire-White Index of Social Status (Short Form), (1955), the sample was primarily middle class, with 55% classified as upper middle and 27.14% classified as lower middle. Regarding the education of the husbands, a total of 61.42% had either attended college, graduated from a four-year college, or done post-graduate work. Farm and country residence was represented by 19.28% of the couples.

TABLE I
DESCRIPTION OF THE SUBJECTS
BY AGE AND SEX

Variables	Classification	Number	Per Cent	
Sex	Males	140	50.00	
	Females	140	50.00	
Age	Wives	35 - 44	48	34.28
		45 - 54	80	57.14
		55 - 64	11	7.85
		65 and over	1	.71
	Husbands	35 - 44	22	15.71
		45 - 54	98	70.00
		55-64	17	12.14
		65 and over	3	2.14

Observation of Tables I and II would lead to the conclusion that the sample was not representative of the total population. The educational level is higher than the total population, and all social classes are not represented proportionately.

The Item Analysis

The chi-square test was used to obtain an index of the validity of the items in The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory by determining if each item significantly discriminates between the respondents scoring in the upper quartile and those scoring in the lower quartile on the basis of the

TABLE II
 ADDITIONAL DESCRIPTION BY COUPLES

Variables	Classification	Number	Per Cent
Number of children	1	6	4.38
	2	42	30.00
	3	52	37.17
	4	26	18.57
	5	9	6.42
	6 or more	5	4.28
Children living at home	Yes	107	76.40
	No	33	23.57
Number of years married	16 - 20	11	7.85
	21 - 25	75	53.57
	26 - 30	41	29.27
	31 - 37	13	9.28
Education of husband	Post-graduate work	22	15.71
	Graduate of four-year college	33	23.57
	Attended college	31	22.14
	High school graduate	33	23.57
	Some high school	11	7.85
	Completed grade 8	8	5.71
	Less than grade 8	2	1.42
Social class status	Lower upper	5	3.57
	Upper middle	77	55.00
	Lower middle	38	27.14
	Upper lower	18	12.85
	Lower lower	2	1.42
Place of residence	Farm	27	19.28
	City	113	80.71

total scores of each inventory. Table III shows that, of the 26 items in The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory, one item was significantly discriminating at the .01 level, and the other 25 items were significantly discriminating at the .001 level. As Table IV indicates, all 26 items in The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory were significantly discriminating at the .001 level.

A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown Formula, of +0.9973 was obtained for The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and +0.9986 for The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory in determining an index of reliability of the items in the two scales. Both inventories, according to the measure, are reliable measures.

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I: There is no significant difference between the responses of husbands and wives concerning the perceived social-emotional behavior.

In order to examine this hypothesis, a z score was calculated for each item on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory. Table V shows there were fourteen items with no significant difference between the perceived social-emotional behavior of husbands and their wives. Significant differences were found in six items at the .05 level, two items at the .01 level, and four items at the .001 level. Items indicating a significant difference reflect a lack of mutuality in husband-wife interaction in those areas of social-emotional behavior. Items showing no significant difference indicate a mutuality of participation in social-emotional behavior of husbands and wives.

TABLE III

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISON OF THE UPPER AND
LOWER QUARTILE SCORES ON THE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL
BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

My Spouse -	Item	df	χ^2	Level of Signifi- cance
1.	... tries to change my behavior.	4	49.21	.001
2.	... listens attentively when I want to explain my feelings.	4	72.83	.001
3.	... tells me about his (her) daily activities.	4	36.15	.001
4.	... shows affection for me in our everyday relationship.	4	57.83	.001
5.	... shares activities outside the home with me.	4	68.83	.001
6.	... gives me sympathy when I am ill or have physical problems.	4	44.87	.001
7.	... praises me for things I do.	4	92.65	.001
8.	... gives me a satisfactory amount of affection.	4	74.99	.001
9.	... spends evenings at home with me.	4	17.25	.01
10.	... is able to predict my feelings and behavior.	4	40.05	.001
11.	... is critical of my behavior.	4	37.17	.001
12.	... agrees with me on how often to have intimate relations.	4	71.32	.001
13.	... is interested in meeting new people that we can enjoy together.	4	65.11	.001
14.	... gives me emotional support when I am upset or anxious.	4	85.70	.001
15.	... discusses plans for the future with me.	4	70.40	.001
16.	... is a satisfying lover and sexual partner.	4	65.02	.001

TABLE III (Continued)

My Spouse -	Item	df	χ^2	Level of Significance
17.	... encourages me to have a life of my own when we are apart.	4	33.20	.001
18.	... explains his (her) feelings to me when bothered or upset.	4	47.61	.001
19.	... uses various ways to evade our having intimate relations.	4	35.88	.001
20.	... will participate in an activity with me, even though he (she) does not enjoy it, just so he (she) can share my company.	4	61.31	.001
21.	... avoids confiding to me his (her) real feelings concerning our marriage.	4	73.05	.001
22.	... shows love and affection when we have intimate relations.	4	60.70	.001
23.	... encourages me to develop some individual interests that can enrich our lives together.	4	73.34	.001
24.	... irritates me with his (her) talking.	4	40.72	.001
25.	... chooses an appropriate time to discuss controversial topics.	4	69.21	.001
26.	... and I are as comfortable silent as when talking.	4	42.68	.001

TABLE IV

ITEM ANALYSIS BASED ON COMPARISON OF THE UPPER
AND LOWER QUARTILE SCORES ON THE IDEAL
SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

I Wish My Spouse Would - Item	df	χ^2	Level of Signifi- cance
1. ... try to change my behavior.	4	31.48	.001
2. ... listen attentively when I want to explain my feelings.	4	55.35	.001
3. ... tell me about his (her) daily activities.	4	58.90	.001
4. ... show affection for me in our daily relationship.	4	79.44	.001
5. ... share activities outside the home with me.	4	53.36	.001
6. ... give me sympathy when I am ill or have physical problems.	4	80.01	.001
7. ... praise me for things I do.	4	77.73	.001
8. ... give me a satisfactory amount of affection.	4	104.29	.001
9. ... spend evenings at home with me.	4	83.92	.001
10. ... be able to predict my feelings and behavior.	4	64.09	.001
11. ... be critical of my behavior.	4	30.58	.001
12. ... agree with me on how often to have intimate relations.	4	72.21	.001
13. ... be interested in meeting new people that we can enjoy together.	4	65.15	.001
14. ... give me emotional support when I am anxious or upset.	4	97.32	.001
15. ... discuss plans for the future with me.	4	100.46	.001
16. ... be a satisfying lover and sexual partner.	4	68.21	.001

TABLE IV (Continued)

I Wish My Spouse Would -				Level of
	Item	df	χ^2	Signifi- cance
17.	... encourage me to have a life of my own when we are apart.	4	58.45	.001
18.	... explain his (her) feelings to me when bothered or upset.	4	69.56	.001
19.	... use various ways to evade our having intimate relations.	4	29.23	.001
20.	... participate in an activity with me, even though he (she) does not enjoy it, just so he (she) can share my company.	4	65.67	.001
21.	... avoid confiding to me his (her) real feelings concerning our marriage.	4	37.45	.001
22.	... show love and affection when we have intimate relations.	4	45.53	.001
23.	... encourage me to develop some individual interests that would enrich our lives together.	4	69.34	.001
24.	... irritate me with his (her) talking.	4	31.91	.001
25.	... choose an appropriate time for us to discuss controversial topics.	4	60.00	.001

TABLE V
 z SCORES REFLECTING DIFFERENCES IN PERCEIVED SOCIAL-
 EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR OF HUSBANDS AND THEIR WIVES
 ACCORDING TO EACH ITEM IN THE SOCIAL-
EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

My Spouse -	Item	N	z	Level of Signifi- cance
1.	... tries to change my behavior.	89	-4.01	.001
2.	... listens attentively when I want to explain my feelings.	68	-2.59	.01
3.	... tells me about his (her) daily activities.	84	-0.41	n.s.
4.	... shows affection for me in our daily relationship.	77	-2.05	.05
5.	... shares activities outside the home with me.	79	-0.99	n.s.
6.	... gives me sympathy when I am ill or have physical problems.	62	-0.01	n.s.
7.	... praises me for things I do.	100	-0.10	n.s.
8.	... gives me a satisfactory amount of affection.	100	-2.70	.01
9.	... spends evenings at home with me.	38	-1.81	n.s.
10.	... is able to predict my feelings and behavior.	91	-1.89	n.s.
11.	... is critical of my behavior.	90	-2.50	.05
12.	... agrees with me on how often to have intimate relations.	75	-2.40	.05
13.	... is interested in meeting new people that we can enjoy together.	85	-0.46	n.s.
14.	... gives me emotional support when I am upset and anxious.	73	-1.06	n.s.
15.	... discusses plans for the future with me.	79	-0.48	n.s.

TABLE V (Continued)

My Spouse -				Level of
	Item	N	z	Signifi- cance
16.	... is a satisfying lover and sexual partner.	50	-2.09	.05
17.	... encourages me to have a life of my own when we are apart.	94	-3.30	.001
18.	... explains his (her) feelings to me when bothered or upset.	85	-1.34	n.s.
19.	... uses various ways to evade our having intimate relations.	85	-5.48	.001
20.	... will participate in an activity with me, even though he (she) does not enjoy it, so he (she) can share my company.	93	-1.00	n.s.
21.	... avoids confiding in me his (her) real feelings concerning our marriage.	85	-0.56	n.s.
22.	... shows love and affection when we have intimate relations.	43	-2.27	.05
23.	... encourages me to develop some individual interests that can enrich our lives together.	104	-0.43	n.s.
24.	... irritates me with his (her) talking.	78	-1.32	n.s.
25.	... chooses an appropriate time for us to discuss controversial topics.	84	-2.44	.05
26.	... and I are as comfortable silent as when talking.	80	-4.89	.001

Hypothesis II: There is no significant difference between the discrepancy scores of husbands and their wives.

To determine the husbands' and wives' satisfaction with the social-emotional behavior within the marriage, a discrepancy score was computed for each husband and each wife. This was done by finding the difference between the total score on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory. A z score was calculated to compare the discrepancy scores of the husbands and their wives. Table VI shows that there was no significant difference between the husbands' and their wives' scores. This indicates that those husbands who are satisfied with their wives have wives who are satisfied with their husbands. And similarly, those husbands who are dissatisfied with their wives have wives who are dissatisfied with their husbands.

TABLE VI

z SCORE REFLECTING THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN DISCREPANCY SCORES OF HUSBANDS AND THEIR WIVES ON THE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY AND THE IDEAL SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Description	N	z Score Discrepancy scores of wives	Level of Significance
Discrepancy scores of husbands	134	-1.27	n.s.

Hypothesis III: There is no relationship between the responses of husbands concerning the perceived and the ideal social-emotional behavior of their wives.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the husbands' responses concerning the perceived and ideal social-emotional behavior of their wives. Since the sample was too large to read the level of significance for the Spearman r on the critical value table, a t score was computed to determine the level of significance. As shown in Table VII the Spearman rank correlation coefficient of 0.62 was significant at the .001 level, indicating that there is a significant, positive relationship between the husbands' scores on the two inventories. Generally the husbands were satisfied with their wives' social-emotional behavior.

TABLE VII

SPEARMAN r REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP AND THE t SCORE,
THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE, OF HUSBANDS' SCORES ON THE
SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY AND THE
IDEAL SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Description	Husbands' Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior of Their Wives		df	Level of Signifi- cance
	Spearman r	t Score		
Husbands' perceived social-emotional behavior of their wives	0.62	9.17	138	.001

Hypothesis IV: There is no relationship between the responses of wives concerning the perceived and the ideal social-emotional behavior of their husbands.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the wives' responses concerning the perceived and the ideal social-emotional behavior of their husbands. A t score was used to determine the level of significance. Table VIII shows the Spearman rank correlation coefficient to be 0.51, significant at the .001 level. This suggests that there is a relationship between the wives' scores on the two inventories. The wives indicated that they were satisfied with their husbands' social-emotional behavior.

TABLE VIII

SPEARMAN r REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP AND THE t SCORE, THE LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE, OF WIVES' SCORES ON THE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY AND THE IDEAL SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

Description	Wives' Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior of Their Husbands		df	Level of Significance
	Spearman r	t Score		
Wives' perceived social-emotional behavior of their husbands	0.51	6.96	138	.001

Hypothesis V: Marital satisfaction of husbands is independent of their discrepancy scores.

Assuming that a discrepancy score represented the degree of satisfaction a husband derives from the social-emotional behavior of his wife, a chi-square test was used to compare the husbands' discrepancy scores with their ratings on the marital satisfaction scale. Table IX shows that there is a significant association, at the .01 level, between the discrepancy scores of husbands according to their ratings on the marital satisfaction scale. The husbands were divided into two categories, the "highly satisfied" and the "less than highly satisfied." These results indicate that, proportionately, there are more "highly satisfied" husbands with low discrepancy scores and more "less than highly satisfied" husbands with high discrepancy scores. One could conclude that there is a relationship between general marital satisfaction and satisfaction of the husbands with their wives' social-emotional behavior.

TABLE IX

CHI-SQUARE VALUES REFLECTING ASSOCIATION OF THE HUSBANDS' DISCREPANCY SCORES WITH THE HUSBANDS' SELF-EVALUATED MARITAL SATISFACTION RATING

Husbands' Marital Satisfaction	Low Discrepancy Scores		Medium Discrepancy Scores		High Discrepancy Scores		χ^2	Level of Sig.
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
Less than highly satisfied	25	18.0	9	6.5	5	3.6	9.34	.01
Highly satisfied	109	60.4	23	10.1	2	1.4		

Hypothesis VI: Marital satisfaction of wives is independent of their discrepancy scores.

A chi-square test was used to compare the wives' discrepancy scores with their ratings on the marital satisfaction scale. Table X shows that there is a significant association, at the .01 level, between the discrepancy scores of wives according to their marital satisfaction ratings. The ratings were classified into two categories, the "highly satisfied" and the "less than highly satisfied." These results indicate that, proportionately, there are more "highly satisfied" wives with low discrepancy scores and more "less than highly satisfied" wives with high discrepancy scores. One could conclude that there is a relationship between the wives' marital satisfaction and their satisfaction with their husbands' social-emotional behavior.

TABLE X

CHI-SQUARE VALUES REFLECTING ASSOCIATION OF THE WIVES' DISCREPANCY SCORES WITH THE WIVES' SELF-EVALUATED MARITAL SATISFACTION RATING

Wives' Marital Satisfaction	Low Discrepancy Scores		Medium Discrepancy Scores		High Discrepancy Scores		x ²	Level of Sig.
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%		
Less than highly satisfied	26	18.6	5	3.6	3	2.1	11.39	.01
Highly satisfied	101	72.1	4	2.9	1	.7		

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The purpose of this research was to develop a two-part instrument, The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory. These inventories were devised to measure (1) the social-emotional behavior in husband-wife interaction and (2) the satisfaction they derive from the social-emotional aspects of their interaction.

The sample was composed of 140 couples who were the parents of students enrolled at Oklahoma State University in the fall term of the 1969-70 school term. The sample consisted of married couples, predominately 45-54 years of age, and of the middle class. A majority of the couples still have children living at home and have a total of two or three children. Over half of the husbands had attended college and a great majority lived in urban areas. The data were obtained in November and December, 1969.

The instrument included the following: (1) a family data sheet for securing background information, (2) The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory designed to measure perceived social-emotional behavior of each spouse, (3) the general marital satisfaction continuum designed to measure the marital satisfaction of each spouse, and (4) The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory designed to measure the ideal social-emotional behavior of each spouse.

The chi-square test was used in an item-analysis of The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory to determine those items that significantly differentiated between the subjects scoring in the upper quartile and the lower quartile groups on the basis of the total scores on each inventory. All items on both scales proved to be significantly discriminating and were used in testing the hypotheses.

A z score was computed to compare the responses of husbands and their wives on their perceived social-emotional behavior as indicated on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory. The z score was also utilized to compare the discrepancy scores of husbands and their wives, computed by figuring the difference between the total score of the two inventories for each husband and each wife. This was done to compare the satisfaction the spouses receive from the social-emotional aspects of their marriage.

A Spearman rank correlation coefficient was computed to determine the relationship between the husbands' scores on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory. A t score was obtained to determine the level of significance of the Spearman r. An identical comparison was applied to the wives' scores on the two inventories.

The chi-square test was used to compare husbands' marital satisfaction ratings with their discrepancy scores. An identical comparison was used to compare the wives' marital satisfaction ratings and their discrepancy scores.

The results and conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. All of the 26 items in The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory were significantly discriminating at the .001 level. Of the 26 items in The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory, one was significantly discriminating at the .01 level, and the other 25 items at the .001 level. Thus, all of the 26 items in both inventories were retained in the final instrument.
2. A split-half reliability coefficient, computed with the Spearman-Brown Formula, of +0.9976 for The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory and +0.9986 for The Ideal Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory are indications of the reliability of the items in both inventories.
3. When the husbands' and their wives' scores on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory were compared, using the z scores, a significant difference existed on twelve items, indicating a lack of mutuality in these areas. However, no significant difference existed on fourteen items, indicating a trend toward mutuality in those fourteen areas. A check was made of the factors and the items used in The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory* and it was noted that, of the twelve items found to be significantly different, six were related to affection and sexual gratification. Furthermore, three were related to communication, two were related to understanding, and one was related to sociability. One could conclude from these results that in some areas of husband-wife interaction

* Note: The number of items related to each factor on The Social-Emotional Behavior Inventory were as follows: (1) six items were related to affection and sexual gratification, (2) nine items were related to communication, (3) five items were related to understanding, and (4) six items were related to sociability.

there appears to be mutuality of social-emotional behavior, while in other areas there are indications of a lack of mutuality. The greatest difference between the spouses seems to be in the area of affection and sexual gratification.

4. No significant difference was found to exist between the discrepancy scores of husbands and their wives, therefore we accept the null hypothesis as being tenable. This suggests that those husbands who are satisfied with their wives have wives who are satisfied with their husbands. And similarly, those husbands who are dissatisfied with their wives have wives who are dissatisfied with their husbands. It was assumed that a low discrepancy score indicated a high degree of satisfaction and a high discrepancy score indicated dissatisfaction.
5. Perceived social-emotional behavior was found to be positively correlated with ideal social-emotional behavior at the .001 level for both husbands and wives. This is an indication that both husbands and wives are generally satisfied with the social-emotional behavior of their spouses. Those husbands and wives who perceive their spouses as participating on a low level of social-emotional behavior do not have as high expectations as those spouses who perceive their mates as participating on a higher level of social-emotional behavior.
6. A significant association, at the .01 level, was found between the discrepancy scores of the husbands and wives when they were compared to self-evaluated marital satisfaction ratings. The ratings were classified into two categories, "highly satisfied" and the "less than highly satisfied." These results

indicate that, proportionately, there are more "highly satisfied" husbands and wives with low discrepancy scores and more "less than highly satisfied" husbands and wives with higher discrepancy scores. One could conclude that there is a relationship between general marital satisfaction and the satisfaction of husbands and wives with their spouses' social-emotional behavior.

A general conclusion that could be drawn from the analysis of these data is that in some areas of social-emotional behavior there is mutuality of husband-wife interaction. In other areas of social-emotional behavior there is a lack of mutuality, especially in affection and sexual gratification. In spite of the lack of mutuality in some areas, there are other results that indicate that both husbands and wives tend to be satisfied with their spouses' social-emotional behavior. Those husbands and wives who perceive their spouses as participating on a low level of social-emotional behavior apparently have made adjustments to the situation as they do not have as high expectations as those spouses who perceive their mates as participating on a higher level of social-emotional behavior. Furthermore, those husbands who are satisfied with their wives' social-emotional behavior have wives who are satisfied with their husbands' social-emotional behavior. Finally, these results indicate that being satisfied or dissatisfied with one's marriage is positively related to satisfaction or dissatisfaction, respectively, with the social-emotional behavior of one's spouse.

Limitations of the Study and Recommendations

It is suggested that other studies using these instruments be conducted using a more representative sample. It would be particularly desirable to include all social classes since much of the literature indicates a difference between social classes in their attitude toward social-emotional behavior. Other studies that seem to have potential for increasing the understanding of middle-aged married couples would include statistical tests to determine those areas which reflect the greatest amount of satisfaction or dissatisfaction to husbands and wives. For example, these tests indicate a significant difference between husbands' and wives' perception of their mates' behavior in affection and sexual gratification. It would be desirable to determine the degree of satisfaction each sex derives from the perceived behavior in the aspect of social-emotional behavior.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Burgess, Ernest W. "The Family as a Unit of Interacting Personalities." The Family. Vol. 7 (March, 1926), 3-9.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Harvey J. Locke. The Family From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Co., 1953.
- Burgess, Ernest W., Harvey J. Locke, and Mary Margaret Thomes. The Family From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Company, 1963.
- Burgess, Ernest W., Paul Wallin, and Gladys Denny Shultz. Courtship Engagement and Marriage. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1954.
- Cavan, Ruth Shonle. American Marriage. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1959.
- Farber, Bernard, "An Index of Marital Integration." Sociometry. Vol. 20 (June, 1957), 117-134.
- Farber, Bernard. Family. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1964.
- Goodwin, Hila M. and Emily H. Mudd. "Indication for Marriage Counseling." Comprehensive Psychiatry. Vol. 7 (October, 1966), 451-452.
- Komarovsky, Mirra. Blue Collar Marriage. New York: Random House, 1964.
- Levinger, George. "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry. Vol. 27 (April, 1964), 433-448.
- Maslow, A. H. Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper, 1954.
- McGuire, C. and G. D. White. "The Measurement of Social Status." Research paper in Human Development No. 3 (Revised). University of Texas, Austin, 1955.
- McMillen, Emile L. "Problem Build-up: A Description of Couples in Marriage Counseling." The Family Coordinator. Vol. 18 (July, 1969), 260-267.
- Ogburn, William F. "The Changing Family." The Family. Vol. 19 (1938), 139-143.

- Parsons, Talcott. "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child." Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Eds. Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Petersen, James A. Education for Marriage. New York: Charles Scribner's & Sons, 1956.
- Sorokin, P. I. Social and Cultural Dynamics. New York: Harper and Row, 1937.
- Stone, Abraham and Lena Levine. "The Dynamics of the Marital Relationship." Marriage and Family in the Modern World. Ed. Ruth Shonle Cavan. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1960.
- Truxall, Andrew G. and Francis E. Merrill. Marriage and the Family in American Culture. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1953.
- Zelditch, Morris, Jr. "Role Differentiation in the Nuclear Family." Family Socialization and Interaction Process. Eds. Talcott Parsons and Robert Bales. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955.
- Zimmerman, Carle C. Family and Civilization. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1948.

APPENDIX


OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

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

74074

November 10, 1969

Dear Parent,

As the parent of a selected OSU student, you have been chosen as a person who would be qualified to participate in a research project which is being conducted in the Department of Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University.

Previous research suggests that many stresses may occur during the middle years of life. We believe that a husband and wife can and do give each other support that may minimize their stresses. We are interested in how you do this.

To participate in this research you (both husband and wife) are asked to fill out the enclosed data sheet. Then each of you should complete your set of inventories without comparing answers or consulting each other.

Do not put your name on any of the material you return to us. Since your name will not be on the returned forms, we hope you will not hesitate to fill out the inventories as honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers since different married couples achieve a satisfactory relationship in many different ways.

We would appreciate having the data sheet and both of your inventories returned to us no later than December 1. A business reply envelope which requires no postage is enclosed for your convenience.

If you would like a brief summary of the findings of this research when it is completed next spring, we will be happy to send it to you if you will send us a postal card or a request in a separate envelope giving your name and address.

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 family life as it is today.

Sincerely yours,

 (Mrs.) Louise Crow
 Graduate Student

 Dr. Hazel Ingersoll
 Professor
 Department of Family Relations
 and Child Development

FAMILY DATA SHEET

Check or fill in answers as appropriate to each question.

1. Number of children: birth to 6 yrs _____; 6-12 yrs _____;
13-19 yrs _____; 20 yrs or more _____.
2. How many children are living at home? _____
3. How many years have you been married to your present spouse? _____
4. Age (use "H" for husband and "W" for wife): Less than 35 yrs _____;
35 through 44 yrs _____; 45 through 54 _____;
55 through 64 yrs _____; 65 yrs or older _____.
5. Husband's occupation (be specific): _____
6. The main source of my family's income is:
 - _____ 1. inherited savings and investments.
 - _____ 2. earned wealth, transferable investments.
 - _____ 3. profits, royalties, and fees.
 - _____ 4. salary, commissions (regular, monthly, yearly).
 - _____ 5. hourly wages, weekly checks.
 - _____ 6. odd jobs, seasonal work, private charity.
 - _____ 7. public relief or charity.
7. What is the highest educational attainment of the husband?
 - _____ 1. completed graduate work for profession.
 - _____ 2. graduate from four-year college.
 - _____ 3. attended college or university one to 3 years.
 - _____ 4. graduated from high school.
 - _____ 5. attended high school, completed grade 9, but did not graduate.
 - _____ 6. completed grade 8 but did not attend beyond 9.
 - _____ 7. less than grade 8.
8. If you live on a farm, please check (✓) the statement below that describes the husband's occupation:
 - _____ 1. gentleman farmer or land owner who does not directly supervise his property.
 - _____ 2. land owner who supervises his property and has an active urban life.
 - _____ 3. farm owner with "hired help," or an operator of leased property who supervises.
 - _____ 4. small land owner; or an operator of rented property hiring hands.
 - _____ 5. tenant on a good farm; or a foreman; or an owner of a farm who "hires out."
 - _____ 6. share cropper; or an established farm laborer; or subsistence farmer.
 - _____ 7. migrant worker, or a "squatter," or a "nester."

THE SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

The following statements are designed to get your view of some of your spouse's marital activities. Remember there are no right or wrong answers. After each statement there is a set of responses as follows:

Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

You are asked to read each of the statements, then CIRCLE the response which best represents your immediate reaction to the statement.

1. My spouse tries to change my behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
2. My spouse listens attentively when I want to explain my feelings.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
3. My spouse tells me about his (her) daily activities.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
4. My spouse shows affection for me in our everyday relationship.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
5. My spouse shares activities outside the home with me.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
6. My spouse gives me sympathy when I am ill or have physical problems.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
7. My spouse praises me for things I do.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
8. My spouse gives me a satisfactory amount of affection.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
9. My spouse spends evenings at home with me.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
10. My spouse is able to predict my feelings and behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
11. My spouse is critical of my behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
12. My spouse agrees with me on how often to have intimate relations.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
13. My spouse is interested in meeting new people that we can enjoy together.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
14. My spouse gives me emotional support when I am upset or anxious.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

15. My spouse discusses plans for the future with me.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
16. My spouse is a satisfying lover and sexual partner.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
17. My spouse encourages me to have a life of my own when we are apart.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
18. My spouse explains his (her) feelings to me when bothered or upset.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
19. My spouse uses various ways to evade our having intimate relations.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
20. My spouse will participate in an activity with me, even though he (she) does not enjoy it, just so he (she) can share my company.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
21. My spouse avoids confiding to me his (her) real feelings concerning our marriage.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
22. My spouse shows love and affection when we have intimate relations.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
23. My spouse encourages me to develop some individual interests that can enrich our lives together.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
24. My spouse irritates me with his (her) talking.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
25. My spouse chooses an appropriate time for us to discuss controversial topics.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
26. My spouse and I are as comfortable silent as when talking.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always.

MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE

How satisfied are you with your marriage? Check () on the line below the degree of satisfaction you have derived from your marriage.

Highly Satisfied	Fairly Satisfied	Indifferent	Fairly Dissatisfied	Highly Dissatisfied

THE IDEAL SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL BEHAVIOR INVENTORY

These statements are designed to get a picture of your ideal marriage. There are no right or wrong answers as different people have different ideals. After each statement there is a set of responses as follows:

Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

You are asked to read each statement and then to **CIRCLE** the response which best represents your immediate response to the statement pertaining to your ideal.

I WISH MY SPOUSE WOULD

1.try to change my behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
2.listen attentively when I want to explain my feelings.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
3.tell me about his (her) daily activities.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
4.show affection for me in our everyday relationship.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
5.share activities outside the home with me.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
6.give me sympathy when I am ill or have physical problems.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
7.praise me for things I do.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
8.give me a satisfactory amount of affection.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
9.spend evenings at home with me.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
10.be able to predict my feelings and behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
11.be critical of my behavior.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
12.agree with me on how often to have intimate relations.
 Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

I WISH MY SPOUSE WOULD

13.be interested in meeting new people that we can enjoy together.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
14.give me emotional support when I am upset or anxious.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
15.discuss plans for the future with me.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
16.be a satisfying lover and sexual partner.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
17.encourage me to have a life of my own when we are apart.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
18.explain his (her) feelings to me when bothered or upset.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
19.use various ways to evade our having intimate relations.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
20.participate in an activity with me, even though he (she)
doesn't enjoy it, just so he (she) can share my company.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
21.avoid confiding to me his (her) real feelings concerning our
marriage.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
22.show love and affection when we have intimate relations.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
23.encourage me to develop some individual interests that would
enrich our lives together.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
24.irritate me with his (her) talking.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
25.choose an appropriate time for us to discuss controversial
topics.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always
26.be as comfortable silent as when talking.
Almost Never Rarely Occasionally Frequently Almost Always

VITA

2

Louise McCrummen Crow

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AN INVENTORY DEVELOPED TO MEASURE MUTUALITY IN SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL
BEHAVIOR OF MIDDLE-AGED MARRIED PAIRS

Major Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Lubbock, Texas, September 2, 1918, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde McCrummen.

Education: Graduated from Lubbock High School, Lubbock, Texas in
May, 1934. Graduated from Texas Tech University, Lubbock,
Texas in June, 1940, with a major in Home Economics Education.
Completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in
May, 1970.

Professional Experience: Taught home economics in high school in
Elkhart, Texas 1940-1943, and Lubbock, Texas 1944-1945.

Professional Organizations: National Council on Family Relations,
Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron.