

RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COMFORTABLENESS
TO SELECTED PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
AMONG ENGAGED COUPLES

By

MILDRED LOUISE MCKINLEY

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
June, 1951

Master of Education
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
August, 1955

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
May, 1976

Thesis
1976 D
M158jr
cop. 2



RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COMFORTABLENESS
TO SELECTED PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS
AMONG ENGAGED COUPLES

Thesis Approved:

Rich Stinnett

Thesis Adviser

Atkes Wright

Elaine Jorgenson

Thomas A. Cannon

N. N. Dutton

Dean of the Graduate College

968338

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

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

Grateful appreciation is extended to Dr. Nick Stinnett for his invaluable guidance through the bewildering process of research.

A special note of thanks goes to Dr. Tom Karman, Dr. Althea Wright, and Dr. Elaine Jorgenson for their participation as committee members and for their critical reading of the manuscript.

An expression of deep indebtedness goes to my friend, Mary Allen, for her invaluable editorial assistance and the many ways she has contributed during this involvement.

Special recognition is given to the Administration and the Home Economics Staff at Cameron University. Without the extra effort extended by my generous co-workers this study might never have been completed.

Finally, deepest love and gratitude goes to my family: To my mother, Mildred McWethy and my late father, Kay McWethy, who taught me the value of hard work and persistence; To my sons, Tracy and Brian, for their encouragement and support: To my husband, Paul, who kept the "home-fires" burning. This study is a tribute to their understanding and sacrifices.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	4
Definition	5
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Personality Traits	6
Responsibility	7
Dominance	8
Leadership	9
Ability to Make Decisions Readily	9
Easily Influenced by Others	10
"Gives in" in Arguments	10
Anger	11
Affection and Demonstrativeness	11
Sociability	13
Sense of Humor	14
Religion	14
Elements of Comfortableness	15
Empathy	15
Spontaneity	16
Trust	16
Interest-Care	16
Respect	17
Criticalness-Hostility	17
Comfortableness and Marriage Prediction	17
III. PROCEDURE	19
Selection of Subjects	19
Instrument	20
Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale	21
Burgess Personality Scales	22
Analysis of Data	23
IV. RESULTS	25
Description of Subjects	25
Examination of Hypotheses	28
Further Analyses According to Sex of Respondent	50

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY	57
Discussion	63
Conclusion and Recommendations	68
A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	70
APPENDIX A - NEWSPAPERS USED IN THE SAMPLE SELECTION	76
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE RESEARCH	78

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Characteristics of the Subjects	26
II. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self- Rating on the Personality Characteristic, Takes Responsibility Willingly	29
III. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self- Rating on Dominance	30
IV. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self-Rating on the Personality Characteristic, Being Easily Influenced by Others	31
V. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on the Personality Characteristic, Gets Angry Easily	32
VI. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self- Rating on the Personality Characteristic, Gets Over Anger Quickly	33
VII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on the CCOS and Self-Rating on the Personality Characteristic, is Affectionate	34
VIII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self- Rating on Demonstrativeness	35
IX. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self- Rating on the Personality Characteristic, Sociable-Makes Friends Easily	36

Table	Page
X. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondent's Self-Rating on CCOS and Self-Rating on Sense of Humor	37
XI. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and the Rating of Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Takes Responsibility Willingly	38
XII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and the Rating of Fiance(e) on Domiance	39
XIII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic Leadership	40
XIV. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Able to Make Decisions Readily	41
XV. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of the Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Being Easily Influenced by Others	42
XVI. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of the Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Gets Angry Easily	43
XVII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of the Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Gets Over Anger Quickly	44
XVIII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on Personality Characteristic, is Affectionate	45
XIX. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on Demonstrativeness	46

Table	Page
XX. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between the Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on the Personality Characteristic, Sociable-Makes Friends Easily	47
XXI. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between the Individual's Rating of the Fiance(e) on the CCOS and Rating of Fiance(e) on Sense of Humor	48
XXII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between Respondents Self-Rating on CCOS and Individual's Self-Rating on Religious Orientation	49
XXIII. H Score Reflecting the Relationship Between the Individual's Rating of Fiance(e) on the CCOS and the Individuals Rating of Fiance(e) on Religious Orientation	50

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

With social changes placing heavier demands on the marital relationship, marital happiness has become in recent years a prime concern of many social scientists. According to Bowman (1974, p. 25) "... there is much less emphasis upon the institutional aspects and much more upon the personality aspects."

A factor favoring success in marriage is the uniting of two people who are "in tune" with each other. Klemmer (1970, p. 474) suggests that "... marital adjustment may depend more on a 'fitting' of the two personalities than on the personalities themselves." Marital disillusionment frequently is intrapsychic in nature. Levinger (1966) found divorce applicants concerned with psychological and emotional interaction problems. Dahms (1974, p. 91) also views divorce "... as the failure to evolve and/or maintain emotional intimacy."

Since the divorce ratio has increased from one out of 12 in 1900 to approximately one out of three today (U. S. Census Bureau, 1975), the engagement period is becoming an important function as a period of testing how successful the relationship between the prospective spouses will actually be. Williamson (1972, p. 309) has stated, "The engagement period enables the individual to discover his relationship to the other

party and to determine their potential of interplay with fairly wide social universe." Relationships that emerge during courtship and engagement can serve as predictors of marital adjustment (Landis, 1975). With a considerable measure of realism, individuals then can project themselves into the future and consider the engagement period as a rehearsal for marriage.

If the engagement period is to be a testing period for the future marital success, it becomes imperative that this period be subjected to closer scrutiny. LeMasters (1959, p. 81) states in a concise way: "We need some way to measure the depth and intensity of courtship rather than just its duration in time."

If the potentials of pre-marital counseling are to be fully realized, couples must receive greater assistance in counseling. In support of this position Winch (1971, p. 541), has stated:

Where so much of the individuals happiness is expected to come from the marital relationship, it is necessary to have some technique for testing interpersonal relationships before contracting one of such paramount importance.

One important aspect of the engagement period is the extent to which engaged couples feel psychologically comfortable with each other. Reiss (1960) theorizes love as a progression starting with rapport (being relaxed and feeling at ease with each other). Hindman (1972) defines psychological comfortableness in interpersonal relationships as a process in which people become aware that in the presence of a particular person they feel "at home" and secure, and feel a sense of understanding or emotional atunement. For those who have relationships in which they can relax and simply be as they are, life requires little effort when they are together because little time is spent in attacking,

defending, demanding, attempting to frustrate or be destructive of each other (Coutts, 1973).

Haun and Stinnett (1974) have found prediction of marriage success to be significantly and positively associated with the degree to which engaged couples feel psychologically comfortable with each other. It seems logical that the degree to which a couple feels psychologically comfortable is a very important factor contributing to their marital success; however, very little is known concerning the factors that are related to the degree of psychological comfortableness a couple experiences with each other. It appears logical that personality characteristics, as well as the degree of religious orientation which research indicates to be significantly associated with marriage success (Kelly, 1974), might play an important role in determining how comfortable engaged persons feel with each other; however, no research has been done to examine such relationships.

The importance of choice in mate selection can hardly be over emphasized as it is apparent marital happiness rests to an appreciable degree on a "good" choice. This possible choice bears careful thought. Gaining greater knowledge concerning the factors that are related to the degree of comfortableness that a couple experiences with each other, especially the factors of personality traits and religious orientation could be of benefit in pre-marital counseling situations. Couples can be assisted in examining their relationships as to possible interactions of personality characteristics that can be detrimental to their relationship.

Research in the prediction of happiness or failure in marriage may

be reached with a greater degree of reliability as more significant items indicative of comfortableness are isolated. Such research would do much toward improving our knowledge in the whole area of interpersonal relationships and would benefit not only those planning to marry but also provide valuable information for those working in the area of marriage and family

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of psychological comfortableness orientation of engaged couples to selected personality characteristics and religious orientation.

The specific purposes of this study were:

1. To determine the relationship between the respondent's self rating on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the respondent's self rating on each of the 14 personality characteristics included in the Burgess Personality Scales (Burgess, Locke, Thomas, 1963).
2. To determine the relationship between the respondent's rating of the fiance(e) on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the respondent's rating of the fiance(e) on certain personality characteristics.
3. To determine the relationship between the respondent's self rating on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the respondent's self rating on his or her degree of religious orientation.
4. To determine the relationship between the rating of the

fiance(e) on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the rating of the fiance(e) concerning the degree of religious orientation.

Definition

Couples Comfortableness Orientation: refers to "the degree to which the individual is inclined to help his fiance(e) feel secure, unthreatened, and respected" (Hindman, 1972).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research has found that prediction of marriage success is related to various personality traits and religion. Some research (Haun and Stinnett, 1974) has also indicated that prediction of marriage success is correlated with the degree to which engaged couples feel psychologically comfortable with each other. The following review of literature includes the areas of: (a) personality traits, (b) religion, (c) elements of psychological comfortableness, and (d) psychological comfortableness and marriage prediction

Personality Traits

In any marital situation two personalities must harmonize. The personality traits of the engaged couple must be understood and accepted by each partner if there is to be continued success in their relationship. Character orientations are important in the psychodynamic formulation of marriage because they determine the nature of the needs and expectations a person brings to the marriage (Crosby, 1973).

The pre-marital pairing experience preceding marriage which emphasizes recreation, leisure, and romance may give a distorted perspective of the prospective mate's personality since the individual's

observable behavior may represent only a small portion of his total personality. There are subtle interactions among many phases of the total personality. Individuals planning marriage should look ahead and consider if the person they have chosen to marry has the kind of personality they can live with the rest of their life.

Various studies concerning personality traits indicate certain elements contribute to positive interpersonal relationships. An individual's personality is a complex combination of traits which are more or less flexible within a psychological milieu; therefore, it is difficult to isolate the functioning of any one trait. However, Himes (1949) concludes that the personality is the chief determiner of successful and happy marriages. In his classic study, Terman (1938) has found numerous elements of marital un-happiness associated with personality traits. He has found unhappily married women are characterized by emotional tenseness and unhappy husbands are inclined to be moody and somewhat neurotic. General studies have consistently shown that certain personality characteristics is associated with marriage success (Hicks and Platt, 1970).

Responsibility

Responsibility denotes care and concern. A responsible person feels responsible for his fellowman as he feels responsible for himself (Fromm, 1956). Shared responsibility in marriage is desirable. If one partner has to carry more than a normal share of the responsibilities the marital adjustment may be affected. The results of Luckey's (1964) empirical study showed satisfied married couples viewed their spouses

as responsible. Locke (1951) also found marital adjustment is positively associated with a sense of responsibility.

In looking at the reasons for marriage breakdown, Palmer (1971) concluded the couples were characterized by an unreadiness for the responsibilities of marriage. Marriage requires a mature person, capable of and assuming responsibility (Peterson, 1971).

Dominance

With the emancipation of women today marriage is characterized by more sharing and cooperation on the basis of equality. Studies indicate the general trend is toward democratically functioning marriages with both the husband and wife involved in all decisions affecting the family (Blood, 1960; Johannis, 1956; McCary, 1975). However, an exploitative orientation (people who constantly need to maintain a feeling of being 'one-up' in all relationships) cannot tolerate equality with others and in attempting to maintain control they become manipulative (McCary, 1975). Bowman (1974, p. 291) observes:

An individual who makes marriage a power struggle because he insists upon exercising masculine authority or she has as a personality need to dominate is seeking to get his or her own way rather than to contribute to the success of marriage.

If a power struggle becomes the focus of the marriage, the marriage may not survive (Fullerton, 1972). "People who reveal marked tendencies to dominate threaten the happiness of any relationship, and certainly a marriage relationship" (Crosby, 1973, p. 18). Landis (1968) reported in his study of 3,000 marriages that the democratic marriages are more often happy than those where either spouse was definitely dominant. Other studies have confirmed similar findings. Luckey (1964)

found that satisfied husbands and wives saw each other as moderate in dominance; whereas, those dissatisfied reported one partner being extremely dominating.

Leadership

To achieve a position of leadership and to gain the admiration of one's associates, certain qualities must be displayed that would also be beneficial to the marital relationship. Locke (1951, p. 181) reported: "Leadership is positively associated with marital adjustment and its absence with marital maladjustment."

Among the qualities that tend to earn for the person who possesses them the respect and admiration of his associates can be included: Attractive appearance...cheerfulness...a sense of humor; good sportsmanship; sincerity; trustworthiness; cooperation; modesty;...and ability to keep confidence (Crow, 1969, p. 145).

Ability to Make Decisions Readily

Much of family discord can be attributed to the inability of family members to make decisions. A well-adjusted person organizes his thinking processes and attacks problems objectively without attempting to dodge issues or resort to tricks or subterfuge. Building a decision-making process in which one can have confidence is an important task for all couples, regardless of the particular decisions they will have to make (Schulz and Rodgers, 1975). Ignoring the difficulties and retreating only make subsequent problems increasingly difficult to solve.

Happily married men and women in Locke's (1951) study has rated their mates' ability to make decisions readily as "markedly" and "considerably" in contrast, divorced men and women rated their former

mates' ability as "a little" and "not at all".

Easily Influenced by Others

According to Luckey (1964) many dissatisfied, married subjects claim their spouses are too passive (too easily influenced). The research of Locke (1951) found that marital adjustment correlated with the absence of being easily influenced by others. Similarly, the findings of Terman's (1938) classic study indicated happily married women were not unduly concerned about the impressions they make upon others.

"Gives in" in Arguments

To succeed in interpersonal relationships depends on the flexibility of the personality. A rigid personality characterized by the trait of "stubbornness" is detrimental to any relationship and particularly to the marital relationship. In marriage one is required to adjust to conflicting facets of the two personalities. Kieren and Tallman (1972) found the personality characteristic of adaptability to be strongly associated with marriage success. Burgess and Wallin (1953, p. 623) call attention to the factor of adaptability as a highly significant factor in the success of the marriage relationship. They define adaptability as: "... the capacity of a person to change ... his attitudes and his behavior to adjust to those of the other person or to a new or modified situation." In comparing happily and unhappily married persons Landis and Landis (1973) have found the ability to give or change play an important part in the success of marital relationships.

Anger

A study by Palmer (1971) revealed that low frustration tolerance, and rebellion appear to be specific reasons for marital failure. It is to be expected that hostile feelings will be generated in an emotionally charged atmosphere that is created between husband and wife; however, it is important that tempers be held under control as things that lower self-esteem and pride which are said in anger are often detrimental to a relationship. Self-control under trying circumstances can be highly constructive as "... the ability to express, channel and discharge tensions in marriage is as important as the ability to express affection (Fullerton, 1972, p. 380)."

Some people may choose a marriage characterized by habitual conflict (Cuber and Harroff, 1965) but most seek some democratic or equalitarian balance. Even though one has to take the initiative, both partners must be able to control hostile feelings. Lack of self-control has been found to be associated with marriage failure (Hicks and Platt, 1970). If an argument is to be constructive and helpful it does not end where it begins; instead, compromises and solutions replace the hostility (Kelly, 1974).

Solutions to problems and reconciliations are delayed if married partners have the tendency to stay angry. Locke's (1951) findings indicate that those who get over anger quickly are a better marriage risk.

Affection and Demonstrativeness

The ability to demonstrate affection has been found to be

positively associated with marriage success (Hicks and Platt, 1970). Levinger (1964) found that both husbands and wives ranked affection equally with companionship as the two most important goals for a good marriage and for the fulfillment of social-emotional roles.

In a study on marital maladjustment, Mathews and Mihanovich (1963) found lack of affection as one of the top five problems distinguishing the happy and the unhappy. Deburger's (1967) data suggest that poor affectional relations were one of the major problems among seriously disturbed couples. "Since approval and acceptance are vitally important to any love relationship, withholding approval and acceptance can be as devastating as aggressive shouting and yelling--if not more so" (Klemer, 1970, p. 195).

When studying preferred traits in marriage partners, Hewitt (1958) finds the trait of affection regarded as crucial by more than 80 percent of both men and women. In summing up how vital emotional exchanges are in successful interactions McCary (1973, p. 293) states:

When men and women recognize that free expression of affection is certainly nothing to fear, nor a barometer of weakness . . . all their human relationships . . . will be much fuller and happier.

Being demonstrative means expressing special care through actions that show consideration, acceptance, approval or appreciation for another (Coutts, 1973).

Mathews and Mihanovich (1963, p. 302) in explaining marital problems among unhappy marriages state: "Neglect, lack of affection, understanding, appreciation and companionship are the lot of the unhappy." Other investigations corroborate this. For example, Blood (1960) has found a wife's happiness is clearly associated with the

amount of attention given her by her husband.

Sociability

Picford, Signori and Rempel (1966) propose that sociability promotes marital happiness. Locke's (1951) findings support the conclusion that sociability is a positive factor in marital adjustment.

Many studies have found affiliation with church, relatives, friends and the community at large aids marital cohesiveness and acts as a restraint on marital dissolution (Ackerman, 1963; Blood, 1962). In a study of 4,452 households in Alameda County California, Renne (1970) concludes that the correlation between the number of intimate associates and marital satisfaction suggests that people involved in unhappy marriages are unable to maintain satisfactory relations outside the marriage and tend to withdraw. From his study of alienation and marital adjustment, Gerber (1968) maintains that social and self-estrangement are related negatively to marital adjustment. Palmer (1971) concludes that social inexperience characterized couples whose marriages had failed.

Among an individual's social needs is the need to earn the esteem and respect from associates in organizations. To be an effective member he has to adapt himself to the groups attitudes. "Participation in organized or informal group activity is a test of an individual's power to adjust his own attitudes and interest to the interest, needs, or rights of other people" (Crow, 1969, p. 12).

When Burgess and Cottrell (1939) investigated the extent of membership in organizations and adjustment in marriage they found the number

of organizations of which the married pair were members or regular attendants was positively correlated with marital adjustment. Both married men and women gave significantly higher ratings on their mate's interest in belonging to organizations than did those who were divorced in Locke's (1951) study.

Good relationships are promoted by being sensitive to thoughts and statements of others. Various research studies support this position by finding unhappy husbands and wives often are inconsiderate and disregard the feelings of others (Hicks and Platt, 1970).

Sense of Humor

Humor is useful in relieving tensions. As Wright (1935, p. 161) so aptly remarked, "... it is a gentle pouring of oil on the agitated waters." It is much gentler to call attention to a conflict through humor than through an angry confrontation. Coser's (1956) and Locke's (1951) findings stress the fact that successful marital adjustment is associated with a sense of humor. Over 75 percent of the subjects in Hewitt's (1958) study ranked a sense of humor as "crucially important" to themselves in their selection of dating and marriage partners.

Religion

Although contribution to the individual personality will vary from religion to religion and from individual to individual, there are certain contributions which religion typically makes to a personality. The social function of religion provides continuity to the community or a social group through fellowship activities. The moral religious system

gives support to developing such personality traits as kindness, cooperation, humility and fidelity. Religion produces the type of personality structure which is productive of marital happiness as it shifts the attention from the self to others. It is a binding force which can contribute to the stability of marriage (Blood, 1969).

Religious people internalize values and beliefs that further marital success. These values and beliefs contribute to family integration, family growth, and family happiness. The findings of Burchinal (1957) indicate statistically the importance of religion to family life. His study reported consistently higher marital satisfaction scores for church members than those who were not church members. Numerous research studies have consistently found religious orientation and participation to be positively associated with marriage success (Blood, 1969; Peterson, 1964; Landis, 1960; Burgess and Cottrell, 1939).

Elements of Comfortableness

The review of literature has indicated that certain qualities of behavior contribute to comfortableness in interpersonal relationships. Among these qualities are: Empathy; Spontaneity; Trust; Interest-Care; Respect; and absence of Criticalness-Hostility.

Empathy

Empathy involves the ability to recognize another's feelings thoughts and behavior as similar to our own (Smith, 1966). Blood (1969) and Katz (1963) define it as being the recognition of the other person's "inner position." Allen and Martin (1974) maintain it is a prerequisite

to intimacy because empathetic people tend to withhold judgment out of simple respect for other's differences and weaknesses.

Spontaneity

Spontaneity is defined as being free and open in the expression of feelings without extreme concern of what "others might think" (Maltz, 1960). If we are too consciously concerned about what others think we become inhibited, or as Coutts (1973, p. 191) says: "Those who censor all their potential responses to be sure they will gain acceptance and approval come off in interpersonal relationships as if they are pre-recorded." A full relationship cannot exist when one is living to please others (Satir, 1964). It is only as we become aware of the small and subtle aspects of another's behavior that we begin to feel we truly know them.

Trust

Baldwin (1955) maintains trust is a confident attitude that comes from feeling life is pleasant and manageable. "When trust is missing from a relationship one or both of the persons involved may tend to feel isolated and anxious - in a sense, uncomfortable" (Hindman, 1972, p. 7). Schultz (1967) has found directness and trust deepens and enriches interpersonal relationships and promotes feelings of closeness.

Interest-Care

Fromm (1956) maintains genuine care of one person for another is a major component of a loving relationship. It is unconditional and

there is a genuine desire to promote the happiness of the other person (Jourard, 1958). When behavior is perceived as uncaring and disinterested, feelings of defensiveness and uncomfortableness are aroused.

Respect

Studies have found respect to be an important characteristic of successful marriage (Stinnett, Collins and Montgomery, 1970; Lederer and Jackson, 1968). Fromm (1956) depicts respect as one of the major components of a loving relationship. He defines respect as the ability to see a person as he is and to accept his unique individuality.

Criticalness-Hostility

Criticalness-hostility destroys relationships with people-whether they are friends, members of a family or partners in marriage (Hindman, 1972). Williams and Smith (1974) describe hostility as a behavior trait that is intentional in nature and results in injury or destruction. It can result from suppression of emotions and losing touch with the real, underlying self (Rogers, 1961). People learn to keep their distance or keep up defensive facades. As it surfaces it can be harmful to an individual and those around him. Probably the most serious damage that can result from criticalness to others is "low-self-esteem" (Dobson, 1974).

Comfortableness and Marriage Prediction

Very little research has been done to examine relationships between psychological comfortableness orientation and marriage success. To the

investigators knowledge only one such study has been conducted.

Haun and Stinnett (1974) developed the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale in order to measure psychological comfortableness orientation. They correlated Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale scores with Marriage Prediction Scale scores and found the following:

1. Individual's responded most positively to the items of trust and spontaneity and least positive to the items of hostility and criticalness.
2. A significant correlation at the .001 level was found between the respondent's CCOS self-rating and his or her score on the Marriage Prediction Scale. Those who rated themselves favorable on the CCOS tended also to receive a favorable score on the Marriage Prediction Scale, while those who rated themselves unfavorably on the CCOS tended to receive unfavorable marriage prediction scores.
3. The respondent's marriage prediction scores correlated significantly (.001) and positively with the fiance(e)'s CCOS rating.
4. A significant (.001) positive relationship was found to exist between the individual's marriage prediction score and his or her rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS.
5. All respondents in the study tended to rate themselves higher than their fiance(e) in comfortableness orientation. Mean subscores indicated that females gave themselves and their fiance(e)s a more favorable comfortableness rating in all six areas than did the males.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Selection of Subjects

The subjects for this study consisted of 143 couples who were engaged and had announced their plans to marry publicly. The names 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 percent of the total numbers 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, who's address was given or at least one of the parents, were included in the sample. A total of 510 couples were located and contact was attempted by letter. Of the number contacted, questionnaires were completed and returned from 29 percent (143 couples).

The percentage of return was probably actually higher than the 29 percent as bulk mailing was used to distribute the questionnaires, which meant that the letter would not be forwarded if the address was lacking essential information. One hundred and fifteen of the selected couples

did not have a complete address given in their engagement announcement. For example, the address would be listed simply as Miss Judy Harmon, Cameron University, or Miss Judy Harmon, Lawton, Oklahoma. Those with incomplete addresses were included and several letters were returned as undeliverable (though this is not the usual post office policy).

Follow-up of the non-returned questionnaires was not attempted for several reasons: (a) Since a number of the engaged couples were planning a spring wedding 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. (b) If the original letters were undelivered because of an incomplete address, a follow-up with the same address would be futile. (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 was developed and reported by Haun and Stinnett (1974). It consisted of three sections (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 McGuire-White Index of Social Status (1955) was used to determine the level of income, occupation and education as indicators of social status.

The second portion of the questionnaire contained questions adapted

from the Marriage Prediction Scale developed by Burgess (Burgess, Locke, and Thomas, 1963). Predictive factors of six major studies published in the area of marriage and family life were incorporated into the scale.

Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale

The third aspect of the questionnaire was the Couple Comfortableness Orientation Scale developed by Haun and Stinnett (1974) which was designed to measure the degree of psychological comfortableness the couple felt with each other. This scale consisted of 36 statements representing six different qualities contributing to comfortableness in interpersonal relationships. These 36 statements were characterized by five degrees of responses ranging from "very often" to "very seldom". Eighteen of the 36 questions were designed to determine the degree to which the individual's behavior was oriented toward making the fiance(e) feel psychologically comfortable and the remaining 18 questions were designed to assess the respondent's evaluation concerning the degree to which the fiance(e)'s behavior was oriented toward making the respondent feel psychologically comfortable.

Six qualities were identified as playing an important part in interpersonal comfortableness. These qualities were:

1. Empathy- defined as involving the ability to recognize the other person's inner position by interpreting and appreciating their feelings, thoughts and behaviors.
2. Spontaneity- The ability to be open, natural, warm and free from extreme concern of what "others might think".
3. Trust- Implies a sense of truthfulness in dealing with

others to the extent that behavior is dependable and predictable.

4. Interest-Care- Deep concern for the happiness and welfare of the other.
5. Respect- Acceptance of another's unique individuality and allowing him to develop and grow as he is.
6. Criticalness-Hostility- Constant, intentional, destructive behavior which can cause serious damage to the individual's self-esteem or to relationships with other people.

When the Chi-square test was employed in an item analysis of the CCOS, as a measure of validity, Haun and Stinnett (1974) found that all of the items in Section 1 and Section 2 of the CCOS were significantly discriminating at the .001 level, with the exception of one item which was significant at the .01 level. The validity of the self-rating on the CCOS was supported by the finding of a significant positive relationship between individual's self-rating on the CCOS and the CCOS rating given the individual by the fiance(e). The split-half reliability coefficients were .88 for items in Section 2 and .77 for items in Section 1.

Burgess Personality Scales

Another section of the questionnaire used in the analysis of the data consisted of the personality scales used by Burgess, Locke and Thomas (1963). These personality scales consist of fourteen personality traits: (a) Takes responsibility willingly, (b) Dominating, (c) A leader in school or other group, (d) Able to make decisions readily,

(e) Easily influenced by others, (f) "Gives in" in arguments, (g) Gets angry easily, (h) Gets over anger quickly, (i) Affectionate, (j) Demonstrative, (k) Sociable-makes friends easily, (l) Likes belonging to organizations, (m) Cares what people say and think, (n) Has a sense of humor. Locke (1951) found that for both men and women, 12 of the above traits had chi square values of better than the .001 level of significance and two were at the .01 level in differentiating between happily married and divorced individuals.

The subjects in the present study were asked to rate both themselves and their fiancée on each of the fourteen personality traits on a five point continuum ranging from possessing the personality trait "very much" to "not at all".

Analysis of Data

A percentage and frequency count was used to analyze various background characteristics of the subjects.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the following null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self rating on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the individual's self rating on each of the following personality characteristics:
 - (a) Takes responsibility willingly
 - (b) Dominating
 - (c) A leader in school or other group
 - (d) Able to make decisions readily
 - (e) Easily influenced by others

- (f) "Gives in" in arguments
 - (g) Gets angry easily
 - (h) Gets over anger quickly
 - (i) Affectionate
 - (j) Demonstrative
 - (k) Sociable-makes friends easily
 - (l) Likes belonging to organizations
 - (m) Cares what people say and think
 - (n) Has a sense of humor
2. There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the individual's rating of fiance(e) on each of personality characteristics listed in Hypothesis 1.
 3. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self rating on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the individual's self rating on his or her degree of religious orientation.
 4. There is no significant relationship between the rating of the fiance(e) on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the rating of the fiance(e) concerning the degree of religious orientation.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A detailed description of the 286 subjects who participated in this study is presented in Table I. Forty-nine percent of the respondents were male, and 51 percent were female. The respondents ranged in ages from 14 to over 29, with the largest number falling in the 23-24 year category (59.32%). The great majority, 71.78%, were between the ages of 19-24, while the smallest group, less than one percent of the respondents, were under age 17.

The majority of the respondents (47.90%) reported themselves to be moderately religious. Thirty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they attended church services four or more times a month while 24 percent reported that they usually did not attend at all. The smallest percentage (5.94%) indicated religion was unimportant in their lives.

The largest proportion of the subjects (45.96%) stated that their engagement period was between six and 11 months in length while 18 percent had an engagement of a year or more.

The subjects were predominantly (79.30%) from the middle class social level, largely (98.60%), reported a feeling of comfortableness with their fiance(e) and reported little jealousy (75.53%), or conflict (62.59%).

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

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Classification	No.	%
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
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

Examination of Hypotheses

Hypothesis I. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale and the individual's self-rating on each of the following personality characteristics: (a) Takes responsibility willingly, (b) Dominating, (c) A leader in school or other group, (d) Able to make decisions readily, (e) Easily influenced by others, (f) "Gives in" in arguments, (g) Gets angry easily, (h) Gets over anger quickly, (i) Affectionate, (j) Demonstrative, (k) Sociable-makes friends easily, (l) Likes belonging to organizations, (m) Cares what people say and think, (n) Has a sense of humor.

This hypothesis was examined using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. The following variables were not found to be significantly related to the self-rating on the CCOS:

1. A leader in school or other group
2. Able to make decisions readily
3. "Gives in" in arguments
4. Likes belonging to organizations
5. Cares what people say and think

Those variables that were found to be significantly related to the individual's rating on the CCOS are presented below:

Hypothesis I (a). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, takes responsibility willingly.

Examination of this hypothesis indicates that there was a significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the personality characteristic, takes responsibility willingly and self-rating on the CCOS. As shown in Table II, an H score of 14.98 was obtained, indicating a significant relationship at the .01 level. Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on the personality characteristic of taking responsibility willingly expressed significantly more favorable CCOS scores than did respondents who rated themselves as having lower degrees of responsibility.

TABLE II

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF RATING ON CCOS AND SELF RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, TAKES RESPONSIBILITY WILLINGLY

Degrees of Responsibility	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	122	163.14		
Considerably	112	128.60		
Somewhat	43	118.07	14.98	.01
A Little	5	150.60		

Hypothesis I (b). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic of dominance.

The relationship between the individual's CCOS and their self-rating on dominance was significant at the .05 level. An H score of 9.64 was obtained as shown in Table III. Those respondents who rated themselves a little or not at all on the personality characteristic of dominance reported the most favorable CCOS scores. With one exception, the lower the degree of self-rating on dominance the higher the self-rating on the CCOS.

TABLE III

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON DOMINANCE

Degrees of Dominance	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	44	137.66		
Considerably	84	134.43		
Somewhat	81	129.44	9.64	.05
A little	52	167.14		
Not at all	22	166.41		

Hypothesis I (e). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic of being easily influenced by others.

When this hypothesis was examined, an H score of 12.48 was obtained indicating there is a significant difference in the individual's self-rating on the CCOS according to the degree to which the individual

perceives himself as being easily influenced by others. The difference was significant at the .02 level as illustrated in Table IV. Those respondents who rated themselves as being influenced by others as not at all, also rated themselves significantly more favorably on the CCOS than did those rating themselves as being influenced by others to a greater degree.

TABLE IV

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, BEING EASILY INFLUENCED BY OTHERS

Degree to Which Individual Is Easily Influenced by Others	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	9	133.56		
Considerably	54	124.65		
Somewhat	73	124.33	12.48	.02
A little	110	155.47		
Not at all	38	167.36		

Hypothesis I (g). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily.

Table V indicates that when the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was utilized in determining the relationship between an individual's self-rating of comfortableness orientation and their

self-rating on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily, an H score of 25.45 was obtained. This represents a significant difference at the .001 level. Those respondent's who rated themselves as not at all on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily, expressed the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those who rated themselves considerably on this personality characteristic rated themselves least favorably on the CCOS.

TABLE V

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, GETS ANGRY EASILY

Degree to Which a Person Gets Angry Easily	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	18	124.72		
Considerably	45	103.52		.001
Somewhat	77	129.68	25.45	
A little	110	154.50		
Not at all	32	188.09		

Hypothesis I (h). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, gets over anger quickly.

The examination of this hypothesis revealed an H score of 12.33 which was significant at the .02 level as shown in Table VI. Those

respondents who rated themselves very much so on the personality characteristic, gets over anger quickly expressed the most favorable CCOS self-rating. Those who rated themselves a little on this personality characteristic rated themselves least favorably on the CCOS.

TABLE VI

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, GETS OVER ANGER QUICKLY

Degrees to Which a Person Gets Over Anger Quickly	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	101	159.70		
Considerably	91	143.86		
Somewhat	58	118.45	12.33	.02
A little	22	113.30		
Not at all	11	145.73		

Hypothesis I (j). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, is affectionate.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance revealed an H score of 42.83 as illustrated in Table VII. This represents a significant relationship at the .001 level between the personality characteristic, is affectionate, and the individual's self-rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated themselves as having the highest degree of being

affectionate also rated themselves most favorably on the CCOS, while those respondents who rated themselves lowest on their personality characteristic also rated themselves most unfavorably on the CCOS.

TABLE VII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON THE CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, IS AFFECTIONATE

Degrees of Being Affectionate	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	167	167.00		
Considerably	86	118.65		
Somewhat	26	82.15	42.83	.001
A little	5	48.30		

Hypothesis I (j). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, demonstrativeness.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated a significant relationship between an individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, demonstrativeness. As indicated in Table VIII an H score of 25.01 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on demonstrativeness expressed the most favorable CCOS

scores. These results indicated that the higher the degree of demonstrativeness, the more favorable were the CCOS scores.

TABLE VIII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON DEMONSTRATIVENESS

Degrees of Demonstrativeness	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	72	177.76		
Considerably	90	137.05		
Somewhat	87	119.14	25.01	.001
A little	22	104.14		

Hypothesis I (k). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, sociable-makes friends easily.

Examination of this hypothesis indicates that there was a significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the personality characteristic, sociable-makes friends easily and self-rating on the CCOS. An H score of 23.36 was obtained, indicating a significant relationship at the .001 level as shown in Table IX. Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic expressed significantly more favorable CCOS scores than did respondents who rated themselves as having lower degrees of sociability. This

finding indicated the higher the degree of sociability, the more favorable are the CCOS scores.

TABLE IX

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, SOCIABLE-MAKES FRIENDS EASILY

Degrees of Sociability	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	102	169.78		
Considerably	95	138.99		
Somewhat	64	120.85	23.36	.001
A little	18	102.56		
Not at all	5	77.30		

Hypothesis I (n). There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, has a sense of humor.

The results indicated a significant relationship existed between an individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the personality characteristic, has a sense of humor. As Table X shows an H score of 27.85 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic also expressed the more favorable CCOS scores.

TABLE X

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND SELF-RATING ON SENSE OF HUMOR

Degrees of Sense of Humor	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	136	164.88		
Considerably	113	130.59		
Somewhat	29	86.29	27.85	.001
A little	4	109.50		

Hypothesis II. There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the following personality characteristics: (a) Takes responsibility willingly, (b) Dominating, (c) A leader in school or other group, (d) Able to make decisions readily, (e) Easily influenced by others, (f) "Gives in" in arguments, (g) Gets angry easily, (h) Gets over anger quickly, (i) Affectionate, (j) Demonstrative, (k) Sociable-makes friends easily, (l) Likes belonging to organizations, (m) Cares what people say and think, (n) Has a sense of humor.

This hypothesis was examined using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance. The following variables were not found to be significantly related to the rating of fiance(e) on the CCOS.

1. "Gives in" in arguments

2. Likes belonging to organizations
3. Cares what people say and think

Those variables that were found to be significant to the rating of fiance(e)s on the CCOS are presented below.

Hypothesis II (a). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, takes responsibility willingly.

When this hypothesis was examined an H score of 23.78 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. The results, as illustrated in Table XI, indicate that individuals who rated their fiance(e) very much so on the personality characteristic, takes responsibility willingly, gave their fiance(e) the most favorable CCOS rating.

TABLE XI

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND THE RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, TAKES RESPONSIBILITY WILLINGLY

Degrees of Responsibility	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	145	166.06		
Considerably	99	121.34	23.78	.001
Somewhat	37	114.28		

Hypothesis II (b). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic of dominance.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic of dominance. As Table XII illustrates, an H score of 13.09 was obtained which was significant at the .02 level. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on dominance as not at all gave their fiance(e) the most favorable CCOS rating.

TABLE XII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCCS AND THE RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON DOMINANCE

Degrees of Dominance	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	41	118.80		
Considerably	63	135.37		
Somewhat	88	142.26	13.09	.02
A little	52	141.97		
Not at all	22	184.56		

Hypothesis II (c). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, leadership.

The examination of this hypothesis revealed there is a significant relationship between the rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, leadership. An H score of 22.49 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level as illustrated in Table XIII. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as very much so on the characteristic of leadership reported the most favorable scores for their fiance(e) on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) a little or not at all on this personality characteristic gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS.

TABLE XIII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC LEADERSHIP

Degrees of Leadership	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	67	178.64		
Considerably	66	144.93		
Somewhat	68	136.98	22.49	.001
A little	53	111.55		
Not at all	30	123.63		

Hypothesis II (d). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, able to make decisions readily.

The results indicated that a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, able to make decisions readily. As Table XIV shows, an H score of 19.90 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e)'s degree of ability to make decisions readily as very much so gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as not at all gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS. These results indicate that the higher the degree of ability to make decisions, the higher the rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS.

TABLE XIV

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, ABLE TO MAKE DECISIONS READILY

Degrees of Decision Making	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	76	163.99		
Considerably	112	153.02		
Somewhat	59	121.44	19.90	.001
A little	29	113.00		
Not at all	9	79.11		

Hypothesis II (e). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic of being easily influenced by others.

The examination of the hypothesis revealed a significant relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, easily influenced by others. An H score of 11.98 was obtained, indicating significance at the .02 level as illustrated in Table XV. This finding indicates that those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on this personality characteristic as not at all also gave their fiance(e) the most favorable CCOS rating, while those who rated their fiance(e) as very much so on this characteristic gave their fiance(e) the least favorable CCOS rating.

TABLE XV

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, BEING EASILY INFLUENCED BY OTHERS

Degrees to Which an Individual Influenced by Others	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	13	104.08		
Considerably	24	127.27		
Somewhat	79	125.41	11.93	.02
A little	107	155.65		
Not at all	62	157.83		

Hypothesis II (g). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily.

When this hypothesis was examined, an H score of 37.84 was obtained, indicating a significant relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily, and the rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS. The relationship was significant at the .001 level as illustrated in Table XVI. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as not at all on this personality characteristic gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiance(e) as very much so gave their fiance(e) the least favorable CCOS scores.

TABLE XVI

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, GETS ANGRY EASILY

Degrees to Which an Individual Gets Angry Easily	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	20	89.15		
Considerably	19	119.71		
Somewhat	60	103.29	37.84	.001
A little	117	152.38		
Not at all	65	177.49		

Hypothesis II (h). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, gets over anger quickly.

The relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, gets over anger quickly, was significant at the .001 level. An H score of 25.87 was obtained as shown in Table XVII. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on this personality characteristic as very much so gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as not at all gave their fiance(e) the least favorable CCOS scores. These results indicate that the higher the degree of being able to get over anger quickly, the more favorable were the CCOS scores.

TABLE XVII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, GETS OVER ANGER QUICKLY

Degrees to Which an Individual Gets Over Anger Quickly	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	93	172.75		
Considerably	89	146.33		
Somewhat	59	115.38	25.87	.001
A little	33	112.08		
Not at all	11	105.45		

Hypothesis II (i). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, is affectionate.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance revealed an H score of 28.39 as illustrated in Table XVIII. This represents a significant relationship at the .001 level between the rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, is affectionate and the rating of the fiance(e) on the COOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as having the highest degree of being affectionate also rated their fiance(e) most favorably on the CCOS, while those respondents who rated their fiance(e) lowest on this personality characteristic also rated their fiance(e) least favorably on the CCOS.

TABLE XVIII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, IS AFFECTIONATE

Degrees of Being Affectionate	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	197	160.11		
Considerably	66	112.21		
Somewhat	17	104.15	28.39	.001
A little	5	50.10		

Hypothesis II (j). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on demonstrativeness.

The results indicated a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on demonstrativeness. As Table XIX shows, an H score of 17.13 was obtained which was significant at the .01 level. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on demonstrativeness as very much so gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as not at all gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS. These results indicate that the higher the degree of demonstrativeness the higher the rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS.

TABLE XIX

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON DEMONSTRATIVENESS.

Degrees of Demonstrativeness	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	82	168.45		
Considerably	80	138.30		
Somewhat	79	124.96	17.13	.01
A little	25	114.66		
Not at all	13	111.15		

Hypothesis II (k). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, sociable-makes friends easily.

The examination of the hypothesis revealed a significant relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, sociable-makes friends easily. An H score of 19.75 was obtained, indicating a significant relationship at the .001 level as illustrated in Table XX. This finding indicates that those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on sociability as very much so also rated their fiance(e) significantly more favorable on the CCOS. As indicated by the average rank scores, the lower the degree of rating on this personality characteristic the lower the rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS.

TABLE XX

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTIC, SOCIABLE-MAKES FRIENDS EASILY

Degrees of Sociability	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	147	157.18		
Considerably	71	144.51		
Somewhat	48	128.01	19.75	.001
A little	19	80.50		

Hypothesis II (n). There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, had a sense of humor.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of the fiance(e) on sense of humor. As Table XXI illustrates, an H score of 37.78 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on sense of humor as very much so gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS while those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as a little and somewhat gave their fiance(e) the least favorable CCOS rating.

TABLE XXI

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF THE FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON SENSE OF HUMOR

Degrees of Sense of Humor	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much so	157	164.12		
Considerably	98	130.05		
Somewhat	23	67.48	37.78	.001
A little	5	77.60		

Hypothesis III. There is no significant relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and the individual's self-rating concerning degree of religious orientation.

The results indicated there was no significant relationship between an individual's self rating on the CCOS and the self-rating on religious orientation. As shown in Table XXII, an H score of 7.74 was obtained which was not significant.

TABLE XXII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RESPONDENT'S SELF-RATING ON CCOS AND INDIVIDUAL'S SELF-RATING ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Degree of Religious Orientation	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much	42	167.08		
Much	90	147.59		
Moderately religious	137	131.54	7.74	N.S.
Very little, if any	15	154.47		

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on religious orientation.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated that a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on religious orientation.

Table XXIII reveals that an H score of 17.25 was obtained which was significant at the .001 level. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e)'s degree of religious orientation as very much gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e)'s degree of religious orientation as very little, if any also gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS.

TABLE XXIII

H SCORE REFLECTING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE INDIVIDUAL'S RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON THE CCOS AND THE INDIVIDUALS RATING OF FIANCE(E) ON RELIGIOUS ORIENTATION

Degrees of Religious Orientation	No.	Average Rank	H	Level of Sig.
Very much	56	183.04		
Much	85	139.35		
Moderately religious	117	129.18	17.25	.001
Very little, if any	27	131.30		

Further Analyses According to Sex of Respondent

Additional analysis was performed to determine if sex differences existed in the respondent's self-rating and respondent's rating of fiance(e) concerning each of the 14 personality characteristics examined in this study. Further analysis was also conducted to determine if significant relationships existed within each sex group between the

respondent's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and rating of the fiance(e) on each of the 14 personality characteristics.

When the chi-square test was used to determine if sex differences existed concerning the respondent's rating of the fiance(e) on each of the 14 personality characteristics in the Burgess Personality Scales it was found that significant differences existed between the males and females concerning their rating of the fiance(e) on each of the following personality characteristics:

- (a) Takes responsibility willingly (.01). Twice as many males (18.8%) as females (7.5%) rated their fiance(e) as somewhat on this personality characteristic. A greater proportion of females (59.9%) than males (41.3%) rated their fiance(e) as very much so.
- (b) Dominance (.01). Twice as many males (68.6%) as females (31.4%) rated their fiance(e) as not at all on the personality characteristic of dominance, while a higher proportion of females (27.2%) as males (16.8%) rated their fiance(e) as considerably on this characteristic.
- (c) Able to make decisions readily (.001). Three times as many males (31.7%) as females (10.3%) rated their fiance(e)'s ability to make decisions as somewhat. Also, almost three times as many females (39.0%) as males (13.7%) rated their fiance(e)'s ability to make decisions as very much so.
- (d) Easily influenced by others (.03). Over three times as many males (76.9%) as females (23.1%) rated their fiance(e) as very much so on this personality characteristic, while nearly twice as many females (27.2%) as males (15.9%) rated their

fiance(e) as not at all.

- (e) Gets angry easily (.03). Twice as many females (30.1%) as males (15.9%) rated their fiance(e) as not at all on this personality characteristic, while a greater proportion of the males (26.8%) as females (16.1%) rated their fiance(e) as somewhat on gets angry easily.
- (f) Demonstrative (.01). More than twice as many of the males (6.7%) as females (2.8%) rated their fiance(e) not at all on the personality characteristic, demonstrativeness. A larger proportion of females (36.8%) than males (21.5%) rated their fiance(e) as very much so on this personality characteristic.
- (g) Cares what people say and think (.001). More than three times as many females (21.4%) as males (6.5%) rated their fiance(e) a little on the personality characteristic, cares what people say and think. More than twice as many of the males (40.6%) as females (16.6%) rated their fiance(e) very much so on this characteristic.

When the chi-square test was used to determine if sex differences existed concerning the respondent's rating of the fiance(e) on each of the 14 personality characteristics in the Burgess Personality Scales, it was found that significant differences existed between the males and females concerning the self-rating on each of the following personality characteristics:

- (a) Dominance (.003). Almost three times as many of the females (26.5%) as males (9.6%) rated themselves a little on the personality characteristic of dominance.
- (b) Easily influenced by others (.01). More than twice as many of

the males (19.6%) as females (7.5%) rated themselves as not at all on this personality characteristic and more than three times as many females (4.8%) as males (1.4%) rated themselves very much so on being easily influenced by others.

- (c) Affectionate (.02). Almost three times as many males (13.9%) as females (4.8%) rated themselves as somewhat on the personality characteristic, affectionate.
- (d) Likes belonging to organizations (.02). Almost twice as many females (21.8%) as males (11.7%) rated themselves as very much so on this personality characteristic.
- (e) Has a sense of humor (.02). A larger proportion of females (47.9%) than males (31.4%) rated themselves considerably on the personality characteristic, has a sense of humor.

The investigator conducted additional analysis to determine if a significant relationship existed within each sex group between the respondent's rating of the fiancé(e) on the CCOS and the respondent's rating of the fiancé(e) on each of the 14 personality characteristics.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was applied a significant relationship was found to exist between the females' rating of the fiancé on the CCOS and their rating of the fiancé on each of the following personality characteristics:

- (a) Able to make decisions readily (.05). Those who rated the fiancé as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancé most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancé a little on this characteristic rated the fiancé the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (b) Gets angry easily (.001). Those who rated the fiancé not

at all on this personality characteristic also rated the fiance most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiance as very much also rated the fiance the least favorable on the CCOS.

- (c) Gets over anger quickly (.05). Those who rated the fiance as very much so on this characteristic also rated the fiance most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiance as not at all on this personality characteristic rated the fiance the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (d) Demonstrative (.001). Those who rated the fiance as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiance most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiance as not at all rated the fiance the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (e) Has a sense of humor (.01). Those who rated the fiance as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiance most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiance as not at all rated the fiance the least favorable on the CCOS.

When the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was applied a significant relationship was found to exist between the males' rating of the fiancee on the CCOS and their rating of the fiancee on each of the following personality characteristics:

- (a) Responsibility (.001). Those who rated the fiancee as very much so and considerably on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancee most favorable on the CCOS.
- (b) Leadership (.05). Those who rated the fiancee as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancee most

favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancée as a little also rated the fiancée the least favorable on the CCOS.

- (c) Able to make decisions readily (.05). Those who rated the fiancée as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancée most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancée as a little also rated the fiancée the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (d) Easily influenced by others (.001). Those who rated the fiancée as a little on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancée most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancée as somewhat also rated the fiancée the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (e) "Gives in" in arguments (.05). Those respondents who rated the fiancée as a little on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancée most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancée as considerably also rated the fiancée the least favorable on the CCOS.
- (f) Affectionate (.02). Those respondents who rated the fiancée as very much so and considerably on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancée the most favorable on the CCOS.
- (g) Sociable (.02). Those respondents who rated the fiancée as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancée most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancée as a little also rated the fiancée least favorable on the CCOS.
- (h) Has a sense of humor (.001). Those respondents who rated the

fiancee as very much so on this personality characteristic also rated the fiancee most favorably on the CCOS while those who rated the fiancee as somewhat also rated the fiancee the least favorable on the CCOS.

The results of this analysis showed that there were differences by sex concerning personality factors which were significantly associated with how favorable the respondents rated their fiance(e)s on the CCOS. Personality characteristics which were significant for the males, but not the females, were: (a) Takes responsibility willingly, (b) A leader in school or other group, (c) Easily influenced by others, (d) "Gives in" in arguments, and (e) Affectionate.

Those personality characteristics which were significant for the females but not for the males were: (a) Gets angry easily, (b) Gets over anger quickly, (c) Demonstrative, and (d) Has a sense of humor. These differences provide interesting possibilities for future research.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

The general purpose of this study was to determine the relationship of psychological comfortableness orientation of engaged couples to selected personality characteristics and religious orientation. The sample was composed of 143 engaged couples who had publicly 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 members of the sample were primarily between the ages of 19 and 24 and were predominately middle class.

The questionnaire utilized in this study consisted of: (a) a background information section; (b) questions adapted from the the Marriage Prediction Scale, developed by Burgess (Burgess, Locke, Thomas, 1963), (c) the Couples Comfortableness Orientation Scale (CCOS) designed by Haun and Stinnett (1974) which was designed in two sections to assess: (1) the attempt of each individual to make his or her fiance(e) feel comfortable, and (2) the degree of effort that each individual felt the fiance(e) gave in making him or her feel comfortable, and (d) Burgess Personality Scales (Burgess, Locke and Thomas, 1963).

The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance was used to examine the relationship between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on religious orientation and on each of the 14 personality traits included in the Burgess Personality Scales. Also, the Kruskal-

Wallis analysis of variance was utilized to determine the relationship between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on religious orientation and the same 14 personality traits previously mentioned.

1. The results indicated a significant relationship existed between the individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on the following personality characteristics:
 - a. Takes responsibility willingly (.01). Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic expressed significantly more favorable CCOS scores than did respondents who rated themselves as having lower degrees of responsibility.
 - b. Dominance (.05). Those respondents who rated themselves a little or not at all on this personality characteristic reported the most favorable CCOS scores.
 - c. Easily influenced by others (.02). Those respondents who rated themselves as being influenced by others as not at all also rated themselves significantly more favorably on the CCOS than did those rating themselves as being influenced by others to a greater degree.
 - d. Gets angry easily (.001). Those respondents who rated themselves as not at all on this personality characteristic expressed the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those who rated themselves considerably and very much so on this trait rated themselves least favorably on the CCOS.

- e. Gets over anger quickly (.02). Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic expressed the most favorable CCOS self-rating. Those who rated themselves a little on this characteristic rated themselves least favorably on the CCOS.
- f. Is affectionate (.001). Those respondents who rated themselves as having the highest degree of being affectionate also rated themselves most favorably on the CCOS, while those respondents who rated themselves lowest on this trait also rated themselves most unfavorably on the CCOS.
- g. Is demonstrative (.001). Those respondent's who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic expressed the most favorable CCOS scores. The results indicated that the higher the degree of demonstrativeness, the more favorable were the CCOS scores.
- h. Sociable-makes friends easily (.001). Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic expressed significantly more favorable CCOS scores than did respondents who rated themselves as having lower degrees of sociability. This finding indicates the higher the degree of sociability, the more favorable were the CCOS scores.
- i. Has a sense of humor (.001). Those respondents who rated themselves very much so on this personality characteristic also expressed the more favorable CCOS scores.

2. There were no significant relationships between individual's self-rating on the CCOS and each of the personality characteristics; leadership, able to make decisions readily, "gives in" in arguments, likes belonging to organizations or cares what people say and think.
3. The results indicated a significant relationship existed between the individual's rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS and the rating of the fiance(e) on the following personality characteristics.
 - a. Takes responsibility willingly (.001). The results indicated that individuals who rated their fiance(e) very much so on this personality characteristic gave their fiance(e) the most favorable CCOS rating.
 - b. Dominance (.02). Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) on dominance as not at all gave their fiance(e) the most favorable CCOS rating.
 - c. Leadership (.001). Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as very much so on this characteristic reported the most favorable scores for their fiance(e) on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) a little or not at all gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS.
 - d. Able to make decisions readily (.001). Those respondents who rated their fiance(e)'s degree of ability to make decisions readily as very much so gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who

rated their fiancée as very little, if any gave their fiancée the least favorable rating on the CCOS. These results indicated that the higher the degree of ability to make decisions, the higher the rating of the fiancée on the CCOS.

- e. Easily influenced by others (.02). The findings indicated that those respondents who rated their fiancée on this personality characteristic as not at all also gave their fiancée the most favorable CCOS rating, while those who rated their fiancée as very much so on this characteristic gave their fiancée the least favorable CCOS rating.
- f. Gets angry easily (.001). Those respondents who rated their fiancée as not at all on this characteristic gave their fiancée the most favorable rating on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiancée as very much so gave their fiancée the least favorable CCOS scores.
- g. Gets over anger quickly (.001). Those respondents who rated their fiancée on this characteristic as very much so gave their fiancée the most favorable rating on the CCOS. Those respondents who rated their fiancée as not at all gave their fiancée the least favorable CCOS scores. The results indicated that the higher the degree of being able to get over anger quickly the more favorable were the CCOS scores.
- h. Is affectionate (.001) Those respondents who rated their fiancée as having the highest degree of being affectionate

also rated their fiancée most favorably on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiancée lowest on this characteristic also rated their fiancée least favorably on the CCOS.

- i. Is demonstrative (.01). Those respondents who rated their fiancée as very much so on this characteristic gave their fiancée the most favorable rating on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiancée as not at all gave their fiancée the least favorable rating on the CCOS. The results indicated that the higher the degree of demonstrativeness the higher the rating of the fiancée on the CCOS.
 - j. Sociable-makes friends easily (.001). The findings indicate that those respondents who rated their fiancée as very much so on this characteristic also rated their fiancée most favorable on the CCOS. The results indicate that the lower the degree of rating on sociability, the lower the rating of the fiancée on the CCOS.
 - k. Has a sense of humor (.001). Those respondents who rated their fiancée on sense of humor as very much so gave their fiancée the most favorable rating on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiancée as a little and somewhat gave their fiancée the least favorable CCOS rating.
4. There were no significant relationships between individual's rating of fiancée on the CCOS and the personality characteristics "gives in" in arguments, likes belonging to organizations

- and cares what people say and think.
5. There was no significant relationship between individual's self-rating on the CCOS and self-rating on religious orientation.
 6. The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance indicated that a significant relationship (.001) existed between the individual's rating of fiance(e) on CCOS and the rating of fiance(e) on religious orientation. Those respondents who rated their fiance(e) as very much concerning the degree of religious orientation gave their fiance(e) the most favorable rating on the CCOS, while those who rated their fiance(e)'s degree of religious orientation as very little, if any gave their fiance(e) the least favorable rating on the CCOS.

Discussion

The findings that the personality characteristic, takes responsibility willingly, was significantly related to both the individual self-rating and rating of the fiance(e) on the CCOS are supported by Luckey's (1964) and Locke's (1951) findings that happily married couples view their mates as being more responsible than do unhappily married couples. Similarly, Palmer (1971) found unreadiness for the responsibilities of marriage as a factor in the breakup of marriages. The present results also coincide with a study by Stinnett, Hall and Walters (1973) which found that readiness for marriage among highschool youth was significantly and positively related to the degree to which their parents had emphasized the values, "a genuine concern and

responsibility toward others" and "accepting the responsibility for the consequences of one's actions."

The finding that those respondents who rated themselves and their fiancée as having a low degree of dominance coincides with Coutts' thesis (1968) that intimate relationships are often prevented from developing by coercion and domination. The finding is also supported by Landis's (1968) and Luckey's (1964) research which found happier marriages were characterized by a democratic form of problem solving. Aller (1962) found dominance in wives threatened the self-concepts of husbands and affected the marriages adversely. In another study, Sporakowski (1968) found students with democratic family authority patterns had relatively higher preparedness for marriage. Various other studies have indicated the marriage relationship is adversely affected when either spouse is extremely dominant (Bell, 1971).

The affectionate function of marriage has increased as American society has become depersonalized and individuals entering marriage assume their future mates will bring into marriage expressive capabilities that will make the relationship work (Balswick and Peek, 1971). Therefore, the findings that affection and demonstrativeness were significantly related to high CCOS scores for both the self-rating of individuals and the ratings given their fiancée(s) was not surprising. Numerous studies (Levinger, 1964; Mathews and Mihonovich, 1963; Westley and Epstein, 1960) have found these personality characteristics are important to marital happiness and satisfaction. Further, Nevrin (1967) found that happily married couples make more use of supplementary non-verbal techniques of communication.

As Schulz and Rodgers (1973, p. 42) explain

To communicate with another person is to make contact with him or her. In intimate partnerships, actual physical touching is an important part of the way the couple communicates, but in a sense any two people who try to communicate with each other are trying to touch.

The finding that individuals who are sociable and make friends easily had significantly more favorable CCOS scores supports the research done by Renne (1970) who found marital satisfaction correlated with the number of intimate associates individuals had outside of marriage. Likewise, both Gerber (1968) and Palmer (1971) concluded that social estrangement characterized marital maladjustment.

The results would seem to indicate that sociability is not necessarily related to the personality characteristic, likes belonging to organizations as it was found that there was no significant relationship between the self-rating or the rating of the fiance(e) on this characteristic and the CCOS scores. Corroborating evidence comes from one recent research study (Whitehurst, 1968) where it was found that lower marital adjustment was associated with intensive peer-group socialization before marriage. It can be hypothesized that family oriented individuals have less need to belong to organizations yet may easily possess the traits of sociability.

Self-ratings on the characteristic of leadership were not significantly related to the CCOS scores, yet a significant relationship was found to exist between this personality characteristic and CCOS ratings for the fiance(e). One plausible explanation is that the respondents in this study may have desired that their fiance(e) possess the quality of leadership; perhaps they wanted their fiance(e)s to take the

initiative in certain areas. Their perceptions that their fiance(e)s did in fact express leadership qualities may have made them feel more secure and comfortable about the relationship. The quality of leadership has been found to be positively associated with marital adjustment (Locke, 1951).

The finding that the rating of the fiance(e) on the personality characteristic, able to make decisions readily was significantly related to high CCOS scores coincides with the results of Strauss (1947) who found one of the 10 most frequently listed personality needs which the respondents wanted their marriage partners to fulfill was help in making important decisions. This finding also coincides with the previously discussed finding that a significant relationship existed between the rating of fiance(e) on the personality characteristic of leadership and CCOS for the fiance(e)'s.

In view of the findings on decision making it was not surprising to find the CCOS scores were significantly related to both the individual self-rating and the rating of the fiance(e) on the characteristic, easily influenced by others. Luckey's research (1964) lends credence to this finding as her results indicated that dissatisfied married subjects claimed their spouses were too easily influenced by others. Further, psychoanalyst Ernest Schachlel (1961) has observed clients suffering from what he calls "over-adaptation" or being overly concerned about what others think.

It was found that those who received a lower self-rating and gave their fiance(e) a low rating on the personality characteristic, gets angry easily had the most favorable CCOS scores. Likewise, those who

received the high self-rating and rated their fiance(e)s as having a high degree of the personality characteristic, gets over anger quickly, received the more favorable CCOS scores. Emotional stability has been found to be positively correlated with marital happiness in many studies (Dean, 1966 and 1968; Cattell and Nesselroad, 1967; Palmer, 1971). Udry (1967) found engagements were likely to be broken if one perceived the spouse as emotionally unstable. Locke (1951) found those who get over anger quickly are better marriage risks.

Perhaps the findings that a sense of humor was significantly related to high CCOS scores for both the individual's self-rating and the rating of the fiance(e) coincide with various studies which indicate a 'sense of humor' contributes to social acceptance at all ages (Coleman, 1961; Cunningham, 1962; Gessell and Ames, 1956). As Coutts (1973, p. 174) says: "You can dare to be open with those who can laughingly overlook your mistakes and for the same reason, they can be open with you." The present findings are similar to other research evidence (Coser, 1956; Locke, 1951; Hewitt, 1958; Lantz and Snyder, 1969) indicating a sense of humor is positively associated with successful marital adjustment and the selection of marriage partners.

The findings indicate that a positive relationship exists between high CCOS scores and the rating of the fiance on religious orientation. The results agreed with some of the relevant findings of marital success studies (Burgess and Cottrell, 1939; Landis, 1960; Burchinal, 1957) which have found a positive association between religious orientation and marriage success. It was interesting that there was a significant relationship between rating of fiance on religious orientation and the

CCOS rating for fiance(e), but no significant relationship was found to exist between the individual self-ratings on religious orientation and CCOS. Perhaps the perception of the fiance(e) as having a high degree of religious orientation contributes to a feeling on the part of the individual that the fiance(e) is committed to the relationship and to promoting the welfare of the individual. This possible explanation is supported by the fact that religion has traditionally emphasized values such as commitment, respect, mutual support, and responsibility for needs and welfare of others (Blood, 1969). The individual who perceives the fiance(e) as possessing these types of values would tend to feel comfortable in the relationship.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In analyzing the personality characteristics, nine out of 14 on the self-rating and 11 out of 14 on the rating of the fiance(e) were found to be significantly related to the psychological comfortableness among engaged couples. Also, a significant relationship was found to exist between the rating on religious orientation of the fiance(e) and the rating of the fiance(e) on psychological comfortableness. Thus, the results have demonstrated that psychological comfortableness orientation among engaged couples is significantly related to certain personality characteristics and religious orientation.

The findings of the study suggest that the CCOS could be a valuable tool in premarital counseling as a supplement to traditional marriage prediction instruments and personality tests. Couples could be helped to examine the compatibility of their relationship with respect to both

their degree of psychological comfortableness with each other and their personality characteristics. In the counseling process their perceptions of each other in these areas could be clarified and major incompatibilities could be determined.

The CCOS appears to have good potential as a counseling tool helping a couple identify those areas in which they feel most and least comfortable with each other. Awareness and discussion of the areas in which a couple does feel least comfortable may help to avoid or minimize future problems (Haun and Stinnett, 1974).

One implication suggested by the results of this study is the challenge to family life education to emphasize the importance of feeling psychologically comfortable with each other as well as determining the compatibility of individual personality characteristics in mate selection. Perhaps more effective mate selection as well as more positive interpersonal relationships could be promoted by family life educators place more emphasis on the types of behavior which contribute to psychological comfortableness. The CCOS could be helpful as an instrument in marriage and family life classes. After responding to the scale the students could discuss the importance of psychological comfortableness in relationships and the types of behavior which promote or retard it (Haun and Stinnett, 1974).

A longitudinal study of the couples included in this study would reveal valuable evidence concerning the relationship among personality variables, religious orientation and psychological comfortableness over a period of time extending from the engagement period through several years of marriage.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackerman, Nathan W. "Affiliations: Structural Determinants of Differential Divorce Rates. American Journal of Sociology, LXIX (July, 1963), 12-20.
- Allen, Gina and Clement Martin, M.D. "What's Your Intimacy Quotient?" in Williams, Carl E. and John F. Crosby. Choice and Challenge. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1974, 63-85.
- Aller, Florence A. "Role of Self-Concept in Student Marital Adjustment." Family Life Coordinator, XI (April, 1962), 43-45.
- Bach, George R. and Ronald M. Deutsch. "Conflict: The Key to Substained Reality" in Williams, Carl E. and John F. Crosby. Choice and Challenge. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1974, 182-200.
- Baldwin, Alfred. Behavior and Development in Childhood. New York: The Dryden Press, 1955.
- Balswick, Jack O. and Charles W. Peek. "The Inexpressive Male: A Tragedy of American Society." The Family Coordinator, XX No. 4 (Oct., 1971), 363-368.
- Bell, Robert R. Marriage and Family Interaction. Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1971.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. and Donald M. Wolfe. Husbands and Wives. New York: Free Press, 1960.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. Marriage. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1962.
- Blood, Robert O. Marriage. 2nd ed. New York: The Free Press, 1969.
- Bowman, Henry A. Marriage for Moderns. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.
- Burchinal, Lee G. "Marital Satisfaction and Religious Behavior." American Sociological Review, XXII (1957), 306-314.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Leonard S. Cottrell. Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1939.
- Burgess, Ernest W. and Paul Wallin. Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1953.

- Burgess, Ernest W., Harvey J. Locke, and Mary M. Thomas. The Family From Institution to Companionship. New York: American Book Co., 1963.
- Cattell, Raymond B. and John R. Nesselroads. "Likeness and Completeness Theories Examined by 16 Personality Factor Measures on Stably and Unstably Married Couples." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, VII (1967), 351-361.
- Coleman, J. S. The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press, 1961.
- Coser, Lewis. The Functions of Social Conflict. New York: Free Press, 1956.
- Coutts, Robert L. Love and Intimacy: A Psychological Approach. San Ramon, California: Consensus Publisher, Inc., 1973.
- Crosby, John F. Illusion and Disillusion: The Self in Love and Marriage. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Crow, Lester D. Psychology of Human Adjustment. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1969.
- Cuber, John F. and Peggy Harroff. The Significant Americans. New York: Appleton-Century Crofts, 1965.
- Cunningham, A. "Relation of Sense of Humor to Intelligence." Journal of Social Psychology, LVII (1962), 143-147.
- Dahms, Alan M. "Intimacy Hierarchy" in Edward A. Powers and Mary W. Lees (Ed.) Process in Relationship. New York: West Publishing Co., 1974, 73-92.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Emotional Maturity and Marital Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVIII (Nov., 1966), 454-457.
- Dean, Dwight G. "Alienation and Marital Adjustment." Sociological Quarterly, IX (Spring, 1968), 186-192.
- Deburger, James E. "Marital Problems-Help Seeking and Emotional Orientation as Revealed in Help-Request Letters." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXIX (1967), 712-721.
- Dobson, James. Hide or Seek. Old Tappan, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1974.
- Fromm, Eric. The Art of Loving. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Inc., 1956.

- Fullerton, Gail Putney. Survival in Marriage. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Gerber, Gerald. "Alienation and Marital Adjustment." Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX (4A) (1968), 1299-1300.
- Gesell, A. F. L. and L. B. Ames. Youth. The Years From Ten to Sixteen. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- Haun, David Lee and Nick Stinnett. "Does Psychological Comfortableness Between Engaged Couples Affect Their Probability of Successful Marriage Adjustment?" Family Perspective, VIII (Fall, 1974), 11-18.
- Hewitt, Lester E. "Student Perceptions of Traits Desired in Themselves as Dating and Marriage Partners." Journal of Marriage and Family Living, XX (November, 1958), 344-349.
- Hicks, Mary W. and Marilyn Platt. "Marital Happiness and Stability: A Review of the Research in the Sixties." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIII (1970), 553-574.
- Himes, Norman E. "Personality as the Chief Determiner of Successful and Happy Marriage." International Journal of Sexology, II (1949), 217-224.
- Hindman, Nora Rivers. "Interpersonal Comfortableness Orientation of College Students." (Unpublished M.S. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, May, 1972.)
- Johannis, Theodore B., Jr. "Teenager Perception of Family Decision-Making." Family Life Coordinator, VII (1959), 7-74.
- Jourard, Sidney M. Personal Adjustment. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.
- Katz, Robert L. Empathy, Its Nature and Uses. London: The Free Press of Glenco, Collier-Macmillan Limited, 1963.
- Kelly, Robert K. Courtship, Marriage and The Family. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1974.
- Kieren, Dianne and Irving Tallman. "Spousal Adaptability: An Assessment of Marital Competence." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXXIV (1972), 247-256.
- Klemer, Richard H. Marriage and Family Relationships. New York: Harper and Row, 1970.
- Landis, Paul H. Making the Most of Marriage. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1975.

- Landis, Judson, and Mary Landis. Building a Successful Marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Landis, Paul H. and Mary G. Building a Successful Marriage. 5th ed. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Landis, Judson T. "Religiousness: Family Relationships and Family Values in Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish Families." Marriage and Family Living, XX (4) (November, 1960), 341-347.
- Lantz, Herman and Eloise Snyder. Marriage. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1969.
- Lederer, William J. and Don D. Jackson. The Mirages of Marriage. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1968.
- LeMasters, E. E. "Holy Deadlock: A Study of Unsuccessful Marriages." The Midwest Sociologist, IX (July, 1959), 81-91.
- Levinger, George. "Task and Social Behavior in Marriage." Sociometry, XXVII (April, 1964), 433-448.
- Levinger, George. "Sources of Marital Dissatisfaction Among Applicants for Divorce." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, XXXVI (5) (October, 1966), 803-807.
- Locke, Harvey J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage. New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1951, 238-244.
- Luckey, Eleanore Brown. "Marital Satisfaction and Personality Correlates of Spouse." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXVI (May, 1964), 217-220.
- Maltz, Maxwell. Psycho-Cybernetics: The New Way to a Successful Life. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Mathews, Vincent D. and Clement S. Mihanovich. "New Orientations on Marital Maladjustment." Marriage and Family Living, XXV (August, 1963), 300-305.
- McCary, James Leslie. Freedom and Growth in Marriage. Santa Barbara, California: Hamilton Publishing Co., 1975.
- McCary, James Leslie. Human Sexuality. 2nd ed. New York: D. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1973.
- McGuire, M. S. and G. D. White. The Measurement of Social Status. Research Paper in Human Development, No. 3 (revised). Austin: University of Texas, 1955.
- Nevran, Leslie. "Communication and Adjustment in Marriage." Family Process, VI (1967), 173-184.

- Palmer, Sally E. "Reasons for Marriage Breakdown: A Case Study in Southwestern Ontario (Canada)." Journal of Comparative Family Studies, II (2) (Fall, 1971), 251-266.
- Peterson, Allan J. (ed.). The Marriage Affair. Wheaton, Ill.: Tydale House, 1971.
- Peterson, James A. Education for Marriage. 2nd ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1964.
- Picford, John H., Edra I. Signori, and Henry Rempel. "Similar or Related Personality Traits as a Factor in Marital Happiness." Journal of Marriage and The Family, XXVIII (May, 1966), 190-191.
- Reiss, Ira. "Toward A Sociology of the Heterosexual Love Relationship." Marriage and Family Living, XX (May, 1960), 139-145.
- Renne, Karen S. "Correlates of Dissatisfaction in Marriage." Journal of Marriage and Family, XXXII (February, 1970), 54-67.
- Rogers, Carl R. On Becoming a Person. New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1961.
- Satir, Virginia. Conjoint Family Therapy: A Guide to Theory and Technique. Palo Alto, California: Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1964.
- Schachlel, Ernest G. "On Alienated Concepts of Identity." The American Journal of Psychoanalysis, XXI (1961), 120-127.
- Schulz, David A. and Stanley F. Rodgers. Marriage, The Family and Personal Fulfillment. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Schutz, William C. Joy: Expanding Human Awareness. New York: Grace Press, Inc., 1967.
- Smith, H. C. Sensitivity to People. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.
- Sporakowski, Michael J. "Marital Preparedness, Prediction and Adjustment." The Family Coordinator, XVII (1968), 155-161.
- 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, Darlene Hall, and James Walters. "Do Parental Values Influence Preparations for Marriage?" Family Perspective, VI (1973), 19-26.

- Strauss, Anselm. "Personality Needs and Marital Choice." Social Forces, XXV (March, 1947), 332-335.
- Terman, L. M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.
- Weis, Albert E. (ed.). Editor and Publisher, International Yearbook, 1973. New York: Editor and Publisher, 1973.
- Westley, William A., and Nathan B. Epstein. "Family Structure and Emotional Health: A Case Study Approach." Marriage and Family Living, XXII (Nov., 1960), 25-27.
- Whitehurst, Robert N. "Premarital Preference-Group Orientation and Marriage Adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family, XXX (August, 1968), 397-401.
- Williams, Joyce W. and Marjorie Smith. Middle Childhood: Behavior and Development. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Williamson, Robert C. Marriage and Family Relations. 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972.
- Winch, Robert F. The Modern Family. 3rd Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Wright, Milton. Getting Along With People. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.
- Udry, J. Richard. "Personality Match and Interpersonal Perceptions as Predictors of Marriage." Journal of Marriage and The Family, XXIX, No. 4 (Nov., 1967), 722-725.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. Statistical Abstract of the United States 1975 (95th ed.). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1975.

APPENDIX A

NEWSPAPERS USED IN THE SAMPLE SELECTION

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

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE USED IN THE RESEARCH

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS BY MARKING A LETTER
AROUND YOUR SELECTION.

Example:

Are you now engaged?

a. Yes
b. 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, transferable 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 name _____

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 hi./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

VITA

Mildred Louise McKinley

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Thesis: RELATIONSHIP OF PSYCHOLOGICAL COMFORTABLENESS TO SELECTED
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AMONG ENGAGED COUPLES

Major Field: Higher Education

Minor Field: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Anadarko, Oklahoma, February 19, 1929, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. K. McWethy. Married September 11, 1948 to Paul O. McKinley. Mother of two sons, Tracy and Brian.

Education: Graduated from ElReno High School in May, 1946. Attended Oklahoma A. & M. College (now Oklahoma State University) from 1946-1948; graduated from University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma with a Bachelor of Science in Home Economics, June, 1951. Completed requirements for the Master of Education in Secondary Education in August, 1955. Did post graduate work in guidance at East Central State College, Ada, Oklahoma and the University of Oklahoma. Completed requirements for the Doctor of Education, with emphasis in Family Relations and Child Development at Oklahoma State University, May, 1976.

Professional Experience: High School Vocational Home Economics teacher thirteen years; Assistant Professor, Cameron University, Lawton-Oklahoma, 1970-present.

Professional Organizations: National Council for Family Relations, American Home Economics Association, Oklahoma Home Economics Association, National Education Association, Oklahoma Education Association, Higher Education Alumni Council of Oklahoma, Omicron Nu, Delta Kappa Gamma.