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INTRODUCTION

The past three decades have witnessed a number of major changes in the traditional concept of the college student. A striking illustration of these changes can be seen in the vast increase in the proportion of married students on college and university campuses.

Two or three decades ago there was widespread skepticism, and cases of outright opposition relative to the student's ability to successfully handle education-plus-marriage and advisability of allowing students to attempt it. Many administrators were convinced an appreciable proportion of married students, particularly undergraduate students, would constitute a disrupting influence. In some schools the skepticism evolved into discrimination; married students were not permitted to participate in school-sponsored athletic events, live in dormitories, fraternity or sorority houses, or to hold offices in campus extracurricular organizations.

Today, much of this earlier resistance to campus marriages has disappeared. Many present-day administrators not only hold the opinion that married students have the ability to successfully handle education-plus-marriage, but in many cases married students are viewed as contributing to campus stability.

Today, over 6,000,000 students are enrolled in college. Approximately 25 percent of this number are married and living with their spouses. Included in this percentage is 6 percent of the female and 26 percent of the male student population. This percentage does not include students who are married but whose spouses are absent, such as in the military service. In 1963, of those students attending full time (12 or more hours during the
average school week), 12 percent were married (15 percent of the males and 6 percent of the females). In the same year, of those students enrolled part-time (taking fewer than 12 hours during the average school week), almost 55 percent were married including 59 percent of the male and 47 percent of the female student population (12, p. 457).

Frequently, the assumption is made that campus marriage is merely young marriage that happens to occur in a college milieu. It is further assumed that college marriages could lead to expectations which may be appropriate for marriage outside the college or university environment, but are not appropriate for college marriages. These assumptions are questionable in two ways: (1) It is true that many campus marriages are young marriages. However, there is also wide variation in the age of married college students; (2) There is also the possibility that college marriage is a different type of marriage than what is conceived as the traditional marriage, as it entails factors relatively unknown to marriages outside this atmosphere. This presents a special need for research which will lead to the development of insights into this particular population of married couples.

Several authors, including Petersen (149), Kirkendall (95), and Bowman (12), state the major problem areas confronting married college students include: (1) personal growth within the marriage relationship; (2) family planning; (3) coping with stress factors found in combining marriage and college life; and (4) overall marital adjustment.

Christensen and Philbrick (36) reported 50 to 75 percent of all children born to college couples were unplanned, thus requiring adjustments in marriage and often in schooling. Davis (49), as a result of studying 2,842 graduate students in 25 educational institutions, reported the proportion
of fathers working full time was three times that of non-fathers. LeMasters (109) reported a strong relationship between the presence of unplanned children and maladjustment in marriage among urban couples. For some married students the circumstances may warrant beginning their family. However, if the phenomenon of the birth of unplanned children in college marriages is frequent enough and stressful enough, it requires more detailed study. Studies concerning the frequency of the unplanned child in college marriages were conducted before the wide distribution and use of improved contraceptives, such as the "pill" and the "coil" (IUD). Therefore, there exists today the possibility of a lesser degree of unplanned pregnancies among married college students and therefore the possibility of improvement in the area of family planning.

However, the birth of the first child, planned or unplanned, has been viewed as a crisis in the married lives of parents (109). Approximately 60 percent of all married students are parents. Therefore, the influence of parenthood on marital adjustment among married college students warrants further investigation.

Simultaneous financing of marriage and college is a major stress for most married students. Landis (107) states finances is the most prevalent problem in college marriages. Finances could confront the couple with a need for prolonged dependency on parents, indebtedness, and a reversal of the traditional male and female roles. These stress factors come at a time when the couple is striving to gain independence and identify with role patterns of husband and wife. Stress related to maintaining adequate financial support could facilitate adjustment or be a disruptive factor, depending on how it is handled. Whereas, twenty-five years ago parental subsidy
of a married college student was negligible, today there is growing attitude of the appropriateness of parental support (150, 39). However, both parents and students report conflict in their attitudes regarding this cultural change (150). Research is needed that will indicate the manner and extent to which the modification of these attitudes may be taking place.

There have been a number of studies concerned with campus marriages. However, there are several reasons for continuing research in this area. Many of these earlier studies failed to adequately control for relevant variables which differentiated subgroups within the married student population, i.e., graduate and undergraduate students, employed and nonemployed wives, couples in which both spouses were students, and in which only one spouse was a student. Also, these earlier studies vary greatly in their sampling procedures.

A second major reason for continued research in this area is the fact that past research dealing with married college students was conducted in the latter 1940's and 1950's. The married student population of these two decades was predominantly a veteran's group (World War II and Korean War), older, and government financed. Today, the married college student population is generally viewed as a younger group and dependent on parents, spouses, loan funds, scholarships, and employment for financial support. Therefore, much of the research findings reported in the 1940's and 1950's are possibly not applicable to the married college student of today.

The third major reason for research dealing with the married college student is that the majority of the former studies have been purely descriptive in purpose and strongly demographic in nature. Past research offers little insight into the problems of the marriage of this population. The
studies which have dealt with factors affecting the marital adjustment of married college students and/or spouses have not investigated the marital adjustment of the individual spouses. Rather, the former studies which investigated marital adjustment primarily investigated factors related to the combined degree of marital adjustment achieved by the couple. Thus, considering the vast number of married college students and the additional stress of securing a college education while also adjusting in marriage, it appears that factual information concerning marital adjustment of each spouse in this particular population is much needed.

A very important factor in marriage is the satisfaction which the spouses derive from their life together. Marital satisfaction takes on increased importance when factors such as additional stress is added to the marriage, or the controlling forces in society keeping marriages together are weakened. Such a weakening in social control is manifested at the present time in more permissive divorce laws and fewer negative sanctions in everyday life concerning divorce. Under these conditions marital satisfaction is even more important for the continuation of a marriage.

Marital satisfaction is assumed to be derived from marital adjustment (sometimes referred to as success, satisfaction, happiness). The conditions under which marital adjustment occurs have been studied in a number of investigations. However, very little empirical research has been conducted in this area with married college students.

Most of the investigations in the area of marital adjustment are so-called prediction studies, i.e., they deal with the problem of how well marital adjustment can be predicted from knowledge of various factors related to the marriage. These factors include those which occur before the
marriage takes place, at an earlier time in the marriage, or at the same
time the marital adjustment is observed. This study is also a prediction
study, dealing with marital adjustment and the variables believed related
to adjustment.

This study will examine factors which are related to marital adjust­
ment among married college students and/or spouses at Iowa State University.
More specifically, it will attempt to ascertain the relationship between
the characteristics and attitudes of married college students and/or spouses
at Iowa State University and the degree of marital adjustment which the
individual spouses have achieved. It is assumed there exists certain var­
ables in college marriages, in addition to variables which exist in any
marriage, which contribute to marital adjustment. This study seeks to
accomplish the following objectives:

1. To gain insight into the characteristics of the married col­
lege students and/or spouses at Iowa State University.

2. To determine the differential effect, if any, between selected
variables and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the
individual spouses.

3. To determine the influence of the wife being a student and/or
employed on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the
individual spouses.

The scope of this study will be confined to an examination of the
characteristics of the married college students and their spouses at Iowa
State University. These students were enrolled at Iowa State University
during the school year 1967-1968. In addition, they were enrolled during
the Summer Session, 1968, and/or were pre-registered for Fall Quarter, 1968.
There is no attempt in this dissertation to generalize the findings of this study to married students of other campuses. However, this is not meant to imply that future researchers dealing with similar samples cannot utilize the findings of this study.

To accomplish the foregoing objectives, the following will be presented: (1) The theoretical framework used in this dissertation whereby certain theoretical concepts are discussed; (2) The derivation of specific empirical hypotheses to be tested; (3) Operational measures used to test the empirical hypotheses; (4) Data secured from the sample will be presented with a partial analysis of the findings; (5) Discussion of the findings; and (6) A brief summary of this dissertation and suggestions for further research.
A review of literature is necessary and appropriate when conducting research. The principle purposes for such a review of literature are:

1. To investigate prior theoretical and empirical work conducted in the major area of interest.

2. To facilitate the delineation and formulation of the problem area(s) in the major area of interest.

3. To gain insight for possible methods and procedures which can be pursued in: (a) The explication of theoretical concepts; (b) The development of operational definitions; (c) Delineation of the population; (d) Techniques for eliciting data from the respondents; (e) Techniques for statistical analysis; (f) Drawing of the sample; and (g) The general execution of the study.

The above contributions of the review of literature are related to several portions of this dissertation. Reference is made throughout this study to literature cited as relevant to this study. This literature is integrated into the body of this dissertation where it appears most logical and appropriate. It is assumed that the use of a review of literature in this manner will be more meaningful and useful to the reader. Therefore, no specific review of literature is presented as a separate portion of this dissertation, but applicable reference material is integrated into the body of the study.
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Merton (133) strongly recommends that theory and research be interrelated. Each is necessary to the development of the other. He stresses that theory, stated in general statements of relationships, guides and directs empirical research, thus extending the usefulness of research findings. Research findings that are derived from a set of theoretical propositions tend to be more useful because they may suggest consequences in areas of behavior other than that in which the original research was conducted. Such research findings allow for the cumulation of both theoretical and empirical knowledge. Also, the use of a theoretical framework in empirical research provides grounds for general prediction.

The primary objective of this chapter is to develop a theoretical framework for the present study within which concepts can be defined and logical hypotheses developed. By theoretical framework is meant a general level discussion and specification of concepts that will constitute the focus of data gathering and analysis. This framework will be based upon past empirical research, generalizations, and conceptual models. The rationale to be developed will be treated as a hypothetical construct to be tested. The hypotheses will be tested by using data obtained from the Married Student Study. In addition, an attempt will also be made to generate a logically interrelated set of expected relationships between the conceptualized variables.

The variables included in this theoretical framework are:

1. Marital adjustment
2. Role
3. Satisfaction
4. Communication

5. Situational characteristics

The variables, including role, satisfaction, communication and situational characteristics, will be considered as independent variables in this dissertation and the variable marital adjustment will be considered the dependent variable. It is assumed that differences in one or more of the independent variables will be reflected in empirical differences in the dependent variable.

Differences in the independent variables will be at the conceptual level, i.e., conceptual categories for different levels or stages of these variables, and at the empirical level, i.e., empirical categories for different levels or degrees of the independent variables. The major dependent variable, marital adjustment, is also presented at the conceptual level in addition to being empirically demonstrated at the operational level by the score received by the individual respondents.

This research is not intended to be a complete or a totally comprehensive investigation of marital adjustment. However, the development of general level and conceptual level hypotheses involve the examination, evaluation, and consideration of certain perspectives, concepts, research hypotheses and assumptions of various academic disciplines. Implicit in this dissertation is the assumption that no one discipline provides all of the concepts and theoretical generalizations that adequately account for the complexities of marital adjustment.

The overall developmental sequence of this chapter will be to first examine a general frame of reference for: (1) social system; (2) marriage; and (3) interaction. Within the boundaries of this frame of reference, the
identity and development of the aforementioned independent variables that are expected to be related to differential marital adjustment of the individual spouses will be presented. The development of general hypotheses will be followed by the derivation of specific hypotheses. All of the hypotheses to be tested in this dissertation will be derived in this chapter.

Social System

It is possible to view the entire social environment of an individual as that person's social system. It is also possible to use the smaller units which involve human behavior or action from a social system's framework. From this it is assumed an individual is a member of many different social systems and his behavior or action may be influenced, in part, by each of these social systems. According to Gross:

. . . Human behavior is in part a function of the action and reactions other members of the multiple social systems in which the individual lives and behaves . . . . .

(65, p. 32)

Parsons and Shils described a social system as:

A social system is a system of action which has the following characteristics: (1) It involves a process of interaction between two or more actors; the interaction process is a focus of the observer's attention; (2) The situation toward which the actors are oriented include other actors. The other actors (alter) are objects of cathexis. Alter's actions are taken cognitively into account as data. Alter's various orientations may be either goals to be pursued or means of the accomplishment of goals. Alter's orientations may thus be objects for evaluative judgment; (3) There is (in a social system) interdependent and, in part, concerted action in which the concert is a function of collective goal orientation or common values, and of a consensus of normative and cognitive expectations. (145, p. 55)
Parsons and Shils, in *Toward a General Theory of Action*, continued in their description of a social system:

... a system of the actions of individuals, the principle units of which are roles and constellations of roles. It is a system of differentiated action, organized into a system of differentiated roles. (145, p. 197)

In his book, *The Social System*, Parsons states

... a social system consists in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the "optimization of gratification" and whose relation of their situations, including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols. (146, p. 24)

Parsons does not include in his definition of a social system cases of interaction where the individual is engaged in reciprocal influence with himself. Neither does he include interaction in which the actors, while influencing one another are unaware of each other's presence, or when individuals are not interacting in terms of culturally structured and shared expectations.

Loomis and Loomis, in their work dealing with the PAS Model, describe a social system as:

The social system is composed of the patterned interaction of members. It is constituted of the interaction of a plurality of individual actors whose relations to each other are mutually oriented through the definition and mediating of a pattern of structured and shared symbols and expectations. (120, p. 4)

In view of these various, but very similar definitions of the concept social system, it is concluded there is a reciprocal relation between the individual and his social system. Not only does the individual "give" to the social system, but he also "receives" from the social system. In this
dissertation, the major focus will be on what the individual gives as well as what the individual feels he has received from the social system, in this case, marriage.

This material on the structure and function of social system(s) has been presented previous to the introduction of basic complexes which are assumed to exist in the social system. For the purposes of this study the development of theoretical generalizations applicable to college marriage is dependent on the social system framework. It is realized several social systems influence the behavior of individuals. It is further realized that the social system, marriage, is a "sub-system" of the larger social system, family. However, only the selected social system, marriage, and selected variables will be examined in this dissertation.

Marriage

According to Malinowski (128), there is an institution in every society which is intuitively identified as the family. In every society this institution is in some way involved in placing the "newcomers" into appropriate jural relations with members already functioning in the society. In this study, the least common denominator of family organization, marriage, will be the primary focus, thus emphasizing the importance of this dyad relationship.

Marriage refers to an institutionalized mating arrangement between males and females, whereas family refers to marriage plus progeny (38). When "family" is referred to in this dissertation, it indicates the nuclear family which is composed of husband, wife, and their immediate children. Marriage is viewed as a precondition of family organization and the family as a product of marital interaction.
In this study, the primary focus will be on two married people, specifically married college students and their spouses. A married couple is defined as a man and a woman who have filled certain legal requirements, having gone through a wedding ceremony or are otherwise accepted as married by law. For the purposes of this study a marriage is assumed to be continuing as long as the couple occupy the same household. Marriage does not so much refer to the pair of persons involved by the term marriage, but rather to their mutually dependent acts within the framework of marriage, thus constituting interaction.

The field of applicability of the theoretical framework in this study is restricted in the following way. It applies only to marriages with the following characteristics: (1) At least one of the two spouses is currently enrolled as a student at Iowa State University; (2) The spouses live in a common household separate from the extended family; and (3) The spouses manage this home jointly.

This freedom does not imply that spouses are completely free to form their interaction in any way they wish. Rather, the laws, mores, and sanctions in the forms of rewards and punishments provide limitations in their interaction. However, there are a great number of decisions which couples make for themselves, such as who is the breadwinner, who is going to dominate in the interaction. The overall influence of parents, in-laws, and the greater family on the marital life of a couple is generally viewed as being minor. It is assumed this description fairly well fits the modern marriage of the United States and western culture. Therefore, it is applicable to the marriages of college students at Iowa State University.

Thus, within the framework of marriage is a process of interaction.
The basic events in such a process, the units in a theory of interaction, are actions or behavior of individuals. An act is considered as any behavior which can be distinguished as a unit, i.e., a kiss or a sentence.

The acts of individuals stand to each other in the relation of interaction. That is, the act of individual B depends upon the preceding act or acts of individual A and vice versa. These chains of interaction involving a greater or smaller number of individuals are the basic subject matter of sociological theory. However, in order to study these interaction chains, it is necessary to classify them in order to find a way of keeping a number of specific interactions together as one object of study.

This can be accomplished by defining a class of phenomena, the production of which this dissertation is interested. It is then necessary to decide, more or less arbitrarily, that some interactions are of importance in the production of these phenomena. Such a set of interactions, for the purposes of this study, is within the framework of a social system. The social system is the class of phenomena used as the starting point for pertinent research. The study of a system consists in determining to what extent the result is produced by the interaction of the system and how this production takes place.

It is believed, by the author of this dissertation, the term "social system" is a more basic term than "social group". Not only is it viewed as a more commonly used term in today's sociological terminology, but it also places heavier emphasis on "system" rather than on "group". The dynamic interrelationships of behavior appear clearer when the elements of the study objects are acts rather than individuals. In this investigation the major concern is such a dynamic relationship.
Interaction

The concept of interaction defines the process which constitutes the very core of social life and human behavior. Social actions of individuals are directed toward other human beings and consist of an interplay between the action of the Self (Ego) and the expected or actual reaction of one of many other(s) (Alters) (45) (Figure 1).

The simplest unit of sociological analysis is not the individual, but rather, at least a pair of individuals who mutually affect each others' behavior. Loomis and Loomis defined interaction as:

Interaction, the core datum of sociology has been defined as an event by which one party tangibly influences the overt actions or state of mind of the other. (120, p. 2)

The basis of the process of interaction is the individual act, or the original act on the part of individual A, which prompts a reaction from individual B, and vice versa. Beal and Bohlen describe the "unit act" as the lowest operational form of human behavior. In their description of the unit act, it is a process of: (1) The individual receiving the stimulus; (2) Interpretation of the stimulus; and (3) The response to the stimulus. These aspects of the unit act are described as:

Before man responds to any stimulus toward which he has not developed a habituated pattern of behavior, he weighs alternative goal choices in terms of the kinds of outcomes he prefers and selects a means for attaining the choices he makes.

Whenever man receives a stimulus, he looks into his past experience and asks himself what similar stimuli he has received, what similar problems he has faced . . . next, he asks himself how he responded or acted in relation to these similar stimuli when he met them in the past. This would apply to both ends and means. He then recalls his evaluations of his actions; was he satisfied, or unsatisfied, with the outcomes of his actions. (5, p. 293)
Figure 1. Diagram showing interplay between the action of the Self (Ego) and the reaction of Other (Alter)
Two assumptions derived from the previous discussion dealing with interaction are: (1) An actor's behavior in a particular situation is the result of a complex interaction of the elements discussed in the previous section; and (2) It is taken as axiomatic that the shapes of these elements take depend on what the actor brings to the situation and on what emerges during the interaction process. Thus the expectations that actor associates with a particular status will depend upon his previous and present experience.

Determinants of the act

Factors which determine the manner in which an individual acts in a situation are: (1) Characteristics of the individual, for example, his action tendencies, needs, drives, knowledge, attitudes, inhibitions, and tensions; and (2) Characteristics of the situation which act as stimuli for the individual. Included in these determinant factors are the earlier experiences of the individual. The present character of the individual is shaped by the social pressure in the form of sanctions on the individual. These sanctions and the individual's earlier experiences have shaped his character within the limits set by his hereditary constitution.

It has been posited that man possesses and uses the ability to project himself into the future. Stimuli received by an individual at any particular time is evaluated in light of past experiences and consequences of alternative reactive behaviors are considered. By this process man is allowed to evaluate his past stimuli, his past behavior, and determine whether he was rewarded in a manner considered appropriate by him for his actions.

Man has some desired state of affairs for his future life which motivates his behavior. With these goals in mind he can select from available
alternatives the goals and means believed to be appropriate for their attainment. The courses of action which are perceived by the individual as ways of attaining these goals are means. In view of the determinants of the act the processes by which these determinant elements are utilized will be discussed.

Definition of the self

Upon entering a situation an individual defines the situation on the basis of his perception of significant elements. On this basis the actor will choose from his various identities the one he considers most appropriate.

In some cases the choice of identity is easy as the situation calls for an identity which the actor has in his repertoire and there is only one identity in the repertoire which seems to fit. However, at times, the actor may not have an identity in the self which fits the demands of the situation or he has any number of identities which might be considered appropriate. He then chooses an identity based on previously learned connections between particular situations and particular identities and cues he receives from the present situation.

In the case of an actor not having an appropriate identity he could choose from his repertoire without realizing this identity would be appropriate. If he acts in accordance with this inappropriate identity, the result could be failure to reach goals, lost opportunity, and a feeling of "what went wrong?". The case of having too many identities available for use in a particular situation has been viewed by role theorists as role-conflict. This form of conflict is created by two situations. The first of these is when actor and other stand in multiple relationships to each other, and the situation contains no formal basis for choosing one identity
over the other. An example of this type of role-conflict would be when people find themselves having to interact with people who are subordinates as well as friends. The second type of role-conflict could occur when an actor finds himself in interaction with multiple others and various relationships call forth identities which are incompatible with one another. This conflict could be typified by the plight of the man who has to decide between his "employee" identity, and his "family-man" identity.

Other things being equal, it is assumed an actor would have a tendency to solve identity conflict in favor of the identity which is more prominent, or higher on his hierarchy. However, other things are seldom equal, and therefore prominence is not always going to be the crucial element. Thus, he may reject a particular identity because he accepts others' definitions rather than his own.

The individual, from life experiences, has acquired through the process of role-taking a variety of perspectives from which to view and evaluate his own behavior. Therefore, he can act with reference to self as well as with reference to others. In short, socialization makes objectivity possible in the behavior of the individual.

Another solution to role-conflict would be to withdraw from the situation and escape the conflict situation. An individual could also attempt to define oneself with both identities. A third way in which the individual could attempt to avoid a decision between identities would be to compartmentalize, i.e., separate the others who are causing the conflict. In this way, actor may utilize the two identities at different times and therefore, at least partially, avoid conflict between them.

Choosing the performing self Not only does the actor decide who he
is in a particular situation, he also decides who he would like to appear to be. The choice of the performing self could be based on general principles, such as: "It's always best to be honest", or "Can I get away with it?".

It is assumed it would be easier and safer for the individual to present a self which is consistent with his own self-image. There is also something to gain from doing so—support for one's self image. A false self is more likely to be presented when actor is interacting with a stranger, when circumstances are conducive to posing, and when potential gain from posing is higher than presentation of the self which is consistent with the self-image. A false self would be presented in order that actor may receive a particular evaluation from other, thereby creating for himself a particular kind of self-image. For example, actor could exaggerate his exploits, so other would admire him, and thus permitting him to have higher self-esteem. However, the higher the self-identity is on the prominent hierarchy, it would seem the less likelihood of actor presenting a false self.

The presentation of the false self implies the actor's self may be based upon how other people define him. However, actor may attempt to influence the way he is defined by others. This illustrates one of the aspects of both autonomy and creativity involved in the self.

Defining the other Simultaneously with forming identities for the self the actor is undertaking a similar process for other. On the basis of definition of the situation actor assigns an identity to other. The identity chosen will be partially based upon the expectations that actor brings to the situation. The actor must also be sensitive to clues which a
particular other gives to his identity.

Merely to assign identities to other is incomplete. Knowing who other is will not tell the actor how other will behave. Therefore, actor will have to attempt to discover which self other is going to present to him. This process is comparable to the way in which actor assigns an identity. Actor has certain general expectations as to which selves are likely to be presented in particular situations by particular kinds of persons, and the actions of other gives actor clues as to the self which other is presenting. It is important to the actor that he "know" both other's true self and other's performing self. He must know what self the other will present if he is to predict other's behavior. In addition, he must know other's true self in order to be able to determine the truth or falsity of other's present self.

An additional definitional element enters when the actor develops a conception of how he appears to other. The actor can know how he appears to other only by taking other's role, and in order to do so, he must have insight into other's identity.

The definitions actor has of other are only tentative. They are working definitions which are necessary for actor and other to continue interaction. However, actor must always be sensitive to indications that definitions require change, and sufficiently flexible to make these changes if the interaction is to proceed.

Secondly, the importance of language in this process should be emphasized. Without language, it would be impossible to carry on the activities just described. The categories used in order to clarify the self and other are provided by the language we speak. Language is the means by which
there will be an exchange of information necessary for the development of
the definitions. It would be possible for some of this information to be
exchanged by signs, but without the ability to use verbal and non-verbal
language, the definition process would probably only be partially accom­
plished.

The performance Through the aforementioned defining process actor
and other have formed working definitions of each other and ideas concern­
ing the selves to be presented. From the expectations for behavior asso­
ciated with these identities actor gets his first clues for action. Actor
has an idea of how other should act because he has assigned an identity to
other and actor knows how such an identity should be expressed. Similarly,
by assigning to himself an identity and a performed self, actor obtains
guides for action. Also, by taking the role of the other, actor has gained
an idea of the identity that other has assigned to him, thus providing him
with a basis for anticipating what kind of behavior other expects of him.
It should be emphasized these definitions and expectations which actor
develops at the beginning are usually rather tentative and are subject to
modification in any particular encounter.

These definitions and expectations are the basis of a performance.
The focus now concentrates on how these definitions and expectations are
combined with one another.

In many instances, there is reasonable congruence among the various
elements in interaction. The mutual definitions of actor and other are
congruent and appropriate for the situation. The expectations the partici­
pants associate with the assigned identities are similar, and the self and
performed-self are the same. When this is the case, interaction can flow rather smoothly, the actor can "act naturally" and interaction can proceed. This situation is most likely to occur when the participants have had a long period of acquaintance, when they have been in similar situations and when they are of similar background. Congruence permits efficient organized behavior. As the individual moves through a variety of inter-personal situations, the congruence of definition and the behavioral expectations these situations imply is fundamental to the continuity and organization of behavior.

The opposite of congruence would be incongruence. Incongruence occurs in a variety of forms. Incongruence may appear in conflicts, lack of coordination between self-concepts and the expectations of other, conflicts among aspects of self called into play in the same situation, conflicts in expectations derived from significant others within the same organized group, conflicts in expectations derived from significant others who themselves are in the audience but do not relate to one another, and the temporal succession of expectations which are not articulated. Not all forms of incongruence will have the same disorganizing effect on the individual, but the general result of incongruence is some amount of stress. The amount of stress depends upon the elements which are in conflict and the choice which is made. However, interpersonal conflict, failure to achieve goals, forfeiture of self-respect, pangs of conscience, and cognitive dissonance could be some of the results.

How does this strain affect interaction? Generally the behavior of other provides cues on the basis of which further performance in terms of an identity is possible. If these cues are not provided, then such per-
formance is no longer possible, and the identity, and interaction, will fade.

In order to attempt to maintain some facsimile of interaction the actor could attempt to reduce the incongruency, either through new perceptions or through rationalizations. However, regardless of means used to reduce incongruency, the actor would have to admit he was wrong the first time. The actor could adopt an inadequate definition in order to keep peace, but in doing so could possibly defeat the ultimate goals of the original interaction. Also, actor could act in a way which was designed to lead other into reinterpretation of the situation so that other's change brings about the desired congruence. These methods may bring about increased congruency, but costs will be involved. These costs would possibly include: expenditure of time, energy; loss of social rewards, acceptance and approval of others, help from others, prestige, respect and power; and loss of self-reward (self-respect).

In concluding this discussion of the components and processes involved in interaction it should be noted that even though the discussion of interaction is quite lengthy, it actually takes very little time to accomplish what has been described. This is especially true in the present case, as it was necessary to describe, one after the other, events which occur simultaneously, and to describe in words processes which go on with almost no reflection. The activity of an instant may take two pages to describe.

The conceptual framework used in this dissertation, depicting the major concepts of social system, family, marriage, and interaction is presented in Figure 2. Within the framework of the general social system the sub-social systems family and marriage and the subsequent process of inter-
Figure 2. A conceptual framework depicting the major concepts social system, marriage, and interaction in relation to the concepts roles, communication, satisfaction and situational characteristics, and resultant marital adjustment.
action between the spouses takes place. In this study, the emphasis will be on the least common denominator of family organization, marriage, and the process of interaction of the spouses within the framework of marriage. The resulting human behavior of the process of interaction within marriage is the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

For the purposes of this dissertation the major elements which comprise the interaction processes, and in turn determine the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, is presented in the interaction model. The four components of interaction, roles, satisfaction, communication, and personal characteristics are defined as the independent variables in this study.

The aforementioned major concepts were chosen as independent variables for this study because of their relationships to the process of interaction. It is through the process of interaction that role-learning and role-expectations take place. Satisfaction evolves from the interaction of the spouses regarding specified factors in their marriage and factors related to their marriage. Communication could be described as direct interaction of the spouses. Personal characteristics, even though not directly viewed as interaction is assumed to influence the process of interaction.

In the interaction model (Figure 2) roles, satisfaction, communication, and personal characteristics are presented as interrelated. Although not investigated in this study roles, communication, and satisfaction are assumed to be interrelated. In addition, personal characteristics could affect these independent variables, as well as the dependent variable, marital adjustment. However, for the purposes of this dissertation it is
assumed there is a direct relationship between each of the independent variables, roles, satisfaction, communication, and personal characteristics and the dependent variable, marital adjustment.

There will be no attempt in this dissertation to investigate intervening variables or multiple relationships between variables. In this study one-way relationships between the four major independent variables, roles, satisfaction, communication, and personal characteristics and the dependent variable, marital adjustment, is investigated.

Each of the major independent variables, role, satisfaction, communication, and personal characteristics will be discussed in detail in later sections of this chapter. However, it is necessary to discuss the dependent variable, marital adjustment, before discussing the major independent variables, in order that the derived hypotheses relating these independent variables to the dependent variable may be stated.

In the subsequent development of this chapter, attention will be directed toward generalizations concerning factors related to marital adjustment. These independent variables are assumed to influence the marital adjustment achieved by married college students and their spouses. Before moving to the discussion of the independent variables, it is necessary to discuss the definition and scope of the dependent variable, marital adjustment.

In most situations involving human relationships, elements of conflict are present. Marriage is no different from other relationships in this respect. Recognition of areas of disagreement in marriage is universal.

Before marriage, people in love could possibly over-emphasize their similarities rather than their differences. It is easy for a couple to
idealize each other and to impute attitudes that may not exist. Each one may oversell himself and since both are in a somewhat euphoric state, they may fail to learn much about their points of difference during the courtship period. As the couple is launched upon life as a married couple, personality traits and value systems will become more apparent. Gradually the two will probably recognize that they are not in such close agreement on everything as they had thought during the engagement period.

Whenever two or more people attempt to live peaceably and pleasantly together, adjustments must be made. People living in college dormitories, people of the same sex sharing an apartment or sharing any type of housing requires cooperation, self-discipline, and a willingness to share and to compromise. In marriage people could interpret these differences more seriously and go head-on into controversial issues as the spouses cannot go their separate ways and avoid sore points so easily as can roommates.

It is assumed that in all marriages differences of opinion and potential conflict situations will arise in one or more areas requiring agreement or cooperation. The quality of a couple's overall relationship will be determined by their ways of meeting these situations. In the past, domestic discord was regarded as a private affair between the two involved persons. The recognition of marital adjustment as a subject of public concern is relatively recent.

According to Burgess and Cottrell (20) the emergence in Western Society of marital adjustment as a social concern can be traced to the individualistic movement ushered in by the Renaissance and the Reformation. The transition from the conception of marriage as a sacrament to marriage as a contract was essentially a change from subordinating the person to the
Institution of marriage to making his interests paramount. In the United States the increased divorce rate has called public attention to the problem of adjustment in marriage.

Bernard (6) states adjustment is inevitable. The endogamous process of mate selection guarantees a certain degree in similarity in marriage partners with respect to class background, religion, and education. These similarities reduce the necessity for marital adjustment in these areas. However, if partners are too much alike in their aims and goals, for example, if both want to be decision-makers, competition may result. In this case the conditions under which marital adjustment must be made often demand a choice among competing alternatives.

Differences between spouses exist on a continuum ranging from those which are essential to the functioning of the marriage, those which are not essential but are pleasant, those which are not actually disintegrative but are unpleasant, through those which are positively disintegrative. Some differences are essential for the division of functions which is basic to the operation of organisms or organizations. This differential and specialization also underlies the marriage situation. For example, if neither spouse is willing to assume the responsibility for making decisions, difficulties may arise and one or the other, or both, must learn to perform this function if the marriage union is to function effectively. However, if both partners wish to make all the decisions, again some sort of adjustment must be made. If both spouses are either overly dependent or independent, they may have difficulty. Therefore, it may be assumed that differences in personality and in performance of family functions is required for the effective functioning of marriage. The absence of differences be-
As stated before, there are both unpleasant and pleasant differences in marriages. For example, one spouse could have an interest in art and the other in music. This difference may be very interesting and pleasant to the couple but is not necessarily integrative in nature or essential for the successful functioning of the marriage. Other differences, however, may be unpleasant but are not positively divisive. A couple could live together even though they disliked one another's tastes in clothes or food or entertainment. So long as neither spouse attempts to change the other or force their own tastes on the other, such differences have merely nuisance value and do not demand adjustments of the spouses.

However, some differences are not only unintegrative and unpleasant but are actually divisive. Differences in goals and values or objectives are often of this nature. This is primarily true because differences such as these demand a choice among or between alternatives, so that if one is chosen, the others are rejected; therefore if one mate wins, the other loses. Even within the union, apart from the outside world, the specific actions of marriage impose choices. A couple cannot have sex relations with each other and not have them at the same time; they cannot rear their child both as Catholic and Protestant; they cannot spend the same money for slipcovers and a power mower; they cannot go to a party and to a movie together at the same time. Such are some of the differences which call for adjustments.

The major areas in which differences are likely to be divisive in a marriage, and therefore call for adjustments or dissolution of the marriage, have been classified by several researchers. Landis (102) classified these areas as: religion, social life, mutual friends, in-laws,
money, and sex relations. Kirkpatrick (96) in his "dilemmas" included:
(1) family freedom versus order and efficiency; (2) free expression of age, sex and individual potentialities versus specific and stable goal expectations; (3) personal self-expression versus child-rearing; (4) work achievement versus the love reproduction function; (5) family loyalty versus community loyalty; and (6) extensive casual association versus restricted intensive association. Coode (62) found the following areas of complaint: drinking; desertion; relatives; the triangle of drinking, gambling, and "helling around"; nonsupport; management of money; lack of affection for home life; value differences with respect of style of life, education, manners, entertainment, the arts, and religion; authority; and idiosyncratic characteristics. Farber (54) discussed four "predicaments" of marriage: (1) social-emotion versus instrumental values and norms; (2) short-run versus long-run considerations; (3) family versus community commitments; and (4) emphasis on parents versus emphasis on children's needs and desires. Blood and Wolfe (11) reported the following areas of stress in the marriages they studied: money, children, recreation, personality, in-laws, roles, religion, politics and sex. Herndon and Nash (74) reported physicians found sex, fear of pregnancy, money, affection (too much or too little), inability to discuss problems, in-laws, failure to express appreciation, and inability to conceive, as the major problems among their patients. These areas of adjustment are viewed as recurring issues in the marriage situation. However, anything may become an issue demanding adjustment.

There are several concepts which are used in relation to adjustment. The following discussion will attempt to stress the similarities and differ-
ences between the concepts adaptation, accommodation, compromise, maladjustment, hostility, and adjustment.

Adjustment and adaptation The concept of adjustment is sometimes contrasted with the concept adaptation. Although both refer to functional changes in the organism, adaptation implies a body change, genetic, or acquired. This change might be a change selected into the heredity of the species, or it might be a change selected in the individual organism in response to certain stimuli such as tanning of the skin in response to sunlight. Individual marital adaptation may occur, as when a spouse's gastrointestinal system adapts to the dietary habits of the other. Physical adaptations are not a major concern in this dissertation.

There are also psychological adaptations. Negative psychological adaptation results when a sensory stimulus no longer evokes a conscious response. An analogous "psychological adaptation" may be said to occur in a marital relationship when the bride is no longer excited or thrilled or even surprised to be called "Mrs. Smith". In fact, she doesn't even notice it. This type of "psychological adaptation" is common in the marital relationships; the spouses becomes so used to one another they are scarcely aware of one another's presence--rather it is only when one or the other is absent that either becomes conscious of the relationship. Again such "adaptations" are not a major concern.

Adjustment and accommodation Accommodation is used primarily, by sociologists, to describe the processes by which groups achieve and maintain some sort of consensus--even if it is to "agree to disagree". An accommodation may vary along a continuum from a highly cooperative and even friendly relationship to a hostile explotive one (6).
In the process of accommodation a couple accepts the fact of their differences and accommodates themselves to the situation in one of several ways. They may not be able to reach a compromise that is entirely satisfactory to them both, but usually their accommodation involves little or no outwardly expressed aggression or antagonism. They resolve their differences on certain matters by striking an equilibrium in which each tolerates the behavior of the other with little or no protest. Both may recognize that they have not reached a satisfactory agreement, but their state of accommodation will be such that their differences place relatively little strain upon their marriage. Differences in viewpoint and reactions to undesirable characteristics may be "tabled" in the interests of shared goals. The undesirable conditions will continue to exist but will not be allowed to hinder cooperation toward mutually desired ends. This form of accommodation is seen among couples who differ seriously on such points as religion and social activities, but who present a united front for the benefit of the children.

Based on the previous discussion, the amount of accommodation required is a function of the amount of differences between the spouses and of the intensity of feeling concerning these differences. For example, a decision concerning religious training of the children would require more accommodation if the wife were a devout Catholic and the husband an equally devout Baptist than if they were both Protestants with low religiosity. The accommodation that an individual makes in an interaction sequence can be thought of as his adjustment. In other words, marital adjustment is that behavior which serves to reduce differences between marital partners with respect to a particular marital situation, or interaction sequence.
Adjustment and hostility  A third concept related to adjustment in marriage is a state of hostility. Constant quarreling and bickering go on over the points on which the two spouses differ, or tension is produced by antagonisms that are sometimes expressed in words or made evident by behavior. If the couple cannot cope in any satisfactory way with their differences, the result could be a relationship that is either static or inflexible, but characterized by hostility, or a relationship that moves toward a breakup of the marriage.

An example of hostility would be a couple who differs in recreational interests. The husband does not like to dance, but he is an enthusiastic golfer. The wife continues to try to force her husband to take her to dances. When he refuses, she retaliates by hiding his golf clubs, going home to mother, or going to dances without him. Or she may appear to have given up her interest in dancing but continue to hold resentful feelings. This resentment may find expression in refusing to participate in other activities that the husband enjoys, or refusal to cooperate in sexual intercourse. The husband may retaliate by spending more and more time on the golf course. In this way a couple may settle into a permanent state of antagonism and conflict.

Adjustment and compromise  Compromise is referred to as a method of adjustment. Some couples are able to develop a relationship in which both compromise to a certain extent and find a middle-ground of agreement satisfactory to both. Few couples, if any, are in perfect agreement from the beginning in all areas of living. Through compromise, they may reach an adjustment after a period of time that gives them a feeling of confidence and security in their marriage. In the most satisfactory adjustments,
neither one feels that he has had to make too great a sacrifice in the compromising.

Adjustment and maladjustment Marital adjustment may be thought of as a continuum ranging from complete adjustment to complete maladjustment. Maladjustment applies only to the end result of change. One does not ordinarily speak of maladjustive processes, although one might speak of processes leading to maladjustment. A marriage is described as maladjusted when it fails to satisfy the spouses to the point of separation or divorce.

Definition of marital adjustment

"Adjustment" may be used several ways. In a dynamic sense, the term refers to the process of making functional changes in a relationship. "They are adjusting to the situation." That is, they are making the functional changes called for by the situation. The term also refers to the more or less stable end results of such changes--"They have arrived at an adjustment."

In order to be meaningful marital adjustment must be discussed in view of the modern concept of marriage. Marriage, in our society, is increasingly viewed as becoming a more intimate and personal affair with less and less traditional control. Marriage is increasingly viewed as the culmination of a romance rather than a socially sanctioned institution. Marriage tends now to be considered as a continuation of a companionship instituted and tested in the period of courtship and engagement. According to Burgess and Cottrell (20) a well-adjusted marriage is a marriage in which the attitudes and acts of each partner produce an environment which is favorable to the functioning of the personality of each, particularly in the sphere of primary relationships.
The accommodation that each individual makes in the marital situation can be described as an adjustment. In other words, marital adjustment is that behavior of each spouse which serves to reduce differences between marital partners with respect to various marital situations or interaction sequence. A good adjustment could be described as when the number of conflicting characteristics of expectations is relatively low. The adjustment becomes better as the number of conflicts decreases. Adjustment is defined as the process of adaptation of both the husband and wife so as to avoid or resolve conflicts sufficiently so that mates feel satisfied with the marriage and with each other, thus developing common interests and activities, and feelings that their marriage is fulfilling their expectations.

As stated in the introduction, this study will investigate factors related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses. The rationale for investigating the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in this study is based on past research dealing with marital adjustment. Burgess and Cottrell (20) stated the marital adjustment of husband and wife should be combined to constitute the marital adjustment for the couple. Terman also advocated this combination; however, he was less emphatic. Locke, as a result of studying divorced and married couples, concluded the degree of marital adjustment of husband and wife of happily married couples were in agreement to the degree they could be combined. However, this was not true for the unhappy and divorced couples. Locke (115) stated the degree of correspondence between adjustment scores of spouses probably measured to some extent the degree of agreement between the spouses rather than the validity of the test.

Terman (171) stated it is unreasonable to expect spouses to be equally
satisfied with one another and with their marriage. Score divergence, according to Terman, probably indicates the attitude of husbands and wives are not reciprocal.

In view of the aforementioned research and the assumption that spouses could have different expectation-levels regarding their marriage, which could result in differential satisfaction-levels, the degree of marital adjustment achieved by each spouse will be investigated.

Each major concept, and related sub-concepts which are the independent variables in this study, will be investigated as to the hypothesized effect on the marital adjustment of each spouse. The independent variables which apply to each spouse will be investigated as to the hypothesized effect on that spouse's marital adjustment and as to the hypothesized effect on the marital adjustment of their spouse. For example, the age of the husband at the time of marriage will be correlated with the degree of marital adjustment achieved by him in the couple's marriage and to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by his wife in their marriage. At the same time, the wife's age at marriage will be correlated with the degree of marital adjustment achieved by her in their marriage, and to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by her husband in their marriage.

Past work in the area of marital adjustment

As was stated in the introduction, studies dealing with marital adjustment have primarily been prediction studies. Only major studies in the area of marital adjustment will be reviewed in this section of this dissertation. There will be no attempt to present all the findings of these studies, rather only a brief description of each study. Findings of these studies which are relevant to this dissertation will be presented when the
various related concepts are discussed.

Burgess and Cottrell (20) conducted the first large quantitative investigation which dealt with the concept of marital adjustment, publishing the results in 1939. Seven thousand questionnaires were distributed by various means to both married and divorced couples, of which 526 questionnaires were completed and returned. The questionnaire contained items about the premarital background of the husband and wife, as well as post-marital items on attitudes and experiences in marriage. The criterion of success in the marriage used in this study was the Index of Marital Adjustment. Burgess and Cottrell assumed marital adjustment depended on: (1) Common interests and activities; (2) Demonstrations of affection and confidence; (3) Number of complaints; and (4) Expression of well-being.

The premarital information was correlated with the marital adjustment score and used as a basis for discussing the effect of individual backgrounds on marital success. From this process the five areas of premarital background of husband and wife which were most predictive of marital adjustment was determined. These five basic areas included:

1. Impress of cultural background (family background, including religion, siblings, etc.)
2. Psychogenic characteristics (ways individuals react to others as determined by relationship with family members during childhood)
3. Social type (social roles, age, education, religious affiliation)
4. Economic role (occupation, income)
5. Response patterns (age difference, length of acquaintance)
The emphasis in this study was not so much the findings but rather the development of an instrument by which marital adjustment could be measured. However, generalizations concerning the findings of this study can be summarized as affection, temperament, compatibility, and social adaptability were found to be the primary factors related to marital adjustment. The physiological and economic factors were of less importance and appeared to be largely determined by the other factors.

Lewis W. Terman (171), in the middle 1930's, borrowed extensively from the Burgess and Cottrell schedule for items used in measuring marital adjustment. However, instead of focusing on background factors, Terman focused on personality correlates of marital happiness. The data for Terman's study were collected from 792 couples by self-administered questionnaires. These couples were contacted through various institutes, associations, and conferences. This sample of couples supposedly represented the middle and upper-middle classes of urban and semi-urban California.

Terman's questionnaire was one of the most lengthy used in investigating the concept of marital adjustment, consisting of almost 300 items. He divided his Index of Marital Happiness into nine categories: (1) common interests; (2) extent of agreement or disagreement concerning ten areas of marital interaction; (3) manner of handling disagreements; (4) frequency of regret of marriage; (5) guess as to whether one would marry the same person again; (6) contemplation of divorce or separation; (7) subjective rating of degree of marital happiness; (8) length of unhappiness; and (9) two complaint lists--57 possible complaints husbands could have concerning their wives and 53 possible complaints women could have about their husbands.

Terman and Oden (172) conducted a longitudinal study of gifted men and
women to further test the predictability of marital adjustment and see if later divorce was predictable from previous happiness and aptitude scores. In 1940, 317 gifted men and their wives and 250 gifted women and their husbands filled out the marriage test, including aptitude and happiness ratings. The marital happiness index was based on Terman's earlier index with additional categories in leisure time spent with spouse and satisfaction with spouse.

A follow-up study with this same sample was conducted in 1946 (172). There were 41 of the gifted men and 45 of the gifted women of the original sample who were divorced by the time of the follow-up study. When mean scores of the 1940 tests for the broken marriages were compared with those for the unbroken marriages, husband and wives whose marriages were intact had significantly higher scores on both marital happiness and marital aptitude than did the persons whose marriages had been broken.

H. J. Locke (115) conducted a study concerning the concept marital adjustment, publishing the results in 1951. This study was based on a comparison of a divorced group and a group identified as happily married. There was a total of 201 married couples and 123 additional divorced individuals interviewed. Divorce and happiness in marriage were selected as criteria of marital maladjustment and adjustment respectively. Significant differences were viewed as more likely to be revealed when these extremes of the continuum of adjustment and maladjustment were compared.

Locke divided his marital adjustment questionnaire into the same basic categories as Burgess and Cottrell. In addition to background information he also secured information regarding traits of directional ability, adaptability, affectionateness, sociability, and conventionality. A final group
of items dealt with marital interaction in the companionship family—
intimacy of communication, equality between husband and wife, shared versus
individual enjoyment of activities. These latter items were contingency
items, included to show the effect of postmarital interaction.

In Sweden, George Karlsson (89) conducted a companion study to Locke's.
In this study 90 happily married, 39 unhappy couples, 51 randomly picked
couples, and 25 legally separated couples were interviewed. The categories
Karlsson used for prediction and the items used in his Index to Marital
Satisfaction were very similar to those used by Locke.

Burgess and Wallin (22) conducted a study dealing with marital adjust­
ment in the early 1950's. The sample for this study consisted of 666
couples who were part of their previously studied 1,000 engaged couples.
Burgess and Wallin used several criteria for marital success. After class­
ifying the indices used by Burgess and Cottrell, Terman, Locke, and
Karlsson, they developed multiple criteria for marital success. Burgess
and Wallin's measure included an index for nine different components which
they thought would be more meaningful for evaluating types of success in
the marriage. These indices included: (1) performance; (2) happiness of
the marriage; (3) general satisfaction with the marriage; (4) satisfactions
and dissatisfactions with various aspects of the marriage and spouse; (5)
degree of agreement about family matters; (6) love for mate and perception
of reciprocation; (7) sexual satisfaction; (8) companionship; and (9) com­
patibility of personality and temperament.

Common to all the past research discussed has been the dividing of
marital adjustment into categories or areas. Marital interaction takes
place in an infinite number of categories, each category being unique in
some respect. However, there may be clusters of categories toward which individuals tend to develop patterned types of adjustment. By isolating the various categories the adjustment an individual made to a sample of situations from one of these categories could be determined, making it possible to predict the individual's adjustment to other situations in the category. These categories will be referred to as adjustment areas. An adjustment area includes those interaction sequences toward which the adjustments of the individual are essentially similar, and which differ from adjustments made in other areas. This is not meant to say adjustments made within an area are the same in all respects, but only that they are sufficiently similar in nature so that it is useful to consider them together. For example, a particular person may make a very good adjustment with his spouse about economic and financial matters in their marriage, about methods of rearing children, and about religion, but make a somewhat poorer adjustment about recreational matters or in-laws, and a very poor adjustment about sex relations.

For the purpose of this dissertation marital adjustment is viewed as an abstract concept and cannot be measured directly. However, through the measurement of the adjustment categories which determine the overall marital adjustment of the spouses, marital adjustment can indirectly be measured.

In this study, the degree of marital adjustment achieved by each spouse in the marriage relationship will be measured by A Test to Measure Adjustment in Marriage by Burgess, Locke, and Thomas (25). This test is an adaptation of (1) the original Burgess and Cottrell's Index of Marital Adjustment which was developed in 1936; (2) Terman's Index of Marital Happiness; (3) Locke's 1951 study of divorced and married couples; and (4) The
Short Marital Adjustment Test developed by Locke and Wallace in 1959. Items which Burgess, Locke, and Thomas included in this test were significant predictors of marital adjustment in the original studies. Items selected had the highest level of discrimination in the original studies, did not duplicate other included items, and covered the major areas of marital adjustment and prediction as judged by the authors.

Burgess, Locke, and Thomas considered the following criteria or areas in their multiple index of marital adjustment: permanence, happiness, consensus, companionship, satisfaction integration, and sex. Each of these criteria introduces a different meaning of the term "success". There are high intercorrelations between the items within the adjustment areas (.68 to .91) but relatively low correlations between the different areas. The operationalization of marital adjustment and the sub-concepts will be discussed in the next chapter.

For the purpose of this research, marital adjustment is defined as the process of adaptation of husband and wife, so as to resolve conflicts sufficiently so that the individual mate feels satisfied with the marriage and each other. Marital adjustment will be assumed to exist on a continuum from high (happy marriages) to low (divorced).

As previously stated, marital adjustment is the dependent variable in this study. There are also four major independent variables which will be investigated in relation to marital adjustment in this study. These independent variables will be conceptualized in the subsequent sections of this chapter. The independent variables are:

1. Role
2. Satisfaction
3. Communication

4. Personal characteristics

It is assumed that empirical differences in one or more of the independent variables will be reflected in empirical differences in the dependent variable.

Role

For the purpose of this dissertation the various roles performed by each spouse is assumed to be derived from and influenced by the interpersonal behavior (interaction) within the marriage framework. In this section of this chapter the conceptualization of role will be presented. The concept will then be related to marital adjustment, past research will be reviewed, and relevant hypotheses will be presented. This analysis is based on role-prescriptions for interpersonal behavior which are associated with particular, socially recognized categories of persons. These categories are referred to as statuses or positions.

Linton defined status as a "collection of rights and duties", and role as "the dynamic aspect of status...when the individual puts the rights and duties which constitute the status into effect, he is performing a role." (114, pp. 113-114)

Cottrell described role as:

...an internally consistent series of conditioned responses by one member of a social situation which represents the stimulus pattern for a similarly internally consistent series of conditioned responses of the other(s) in that situation. Dealing with human behavior in terms of roles, therefore requires that any item of behavior must always be placed in some specified self-other concept. (46, p. 617)
For the purpose of this dissertation, role will be defined as the totality of those acts in an interaction system performed by one individual in a particular situation. The self-other concept is furnished by the interaction framework or system. In conceptualizing role, several sub-concepts, or processes leading to a particular role will be discussed.

Role-taking

Role-taking or the ability to imagine oneself in the place of another is sometimes referred to as empathy or identification. However, for the purpose of this dissertation it will be referred to as role-taking. Stryker describes role-taking as the "anticipation of the responses of some particular other...or multiple others" (165, p. 138), while Heiss describes it as:

. . . basically it involves guessing; actor guessing the attitudes of the other. It is, however, informed guessing rather than blind guess. Essentially what the person does is base his guesses upon information gathered in the past and in the present situation. If his information and his ability to generalize are adequate, he will accurately take the role of the other. If either ingredient is deficient, his accuracy will be reduced. (73, p. 6)

The individual (actor) gets necessary information needed for role-taking by direct instruction, by observing interaction as a participant, or as a bystander (other). By this means he gains knowledge concerning how specific others react to specific actors under specific circumstances. Each experience an actor has gives him information which will help him take the roles of the other in the present and in the future. For example, the student in a student-teacher relationship has the opportunity to gain information which would be useful in taking the role of a student, a teacher, or this particular teacher.
The breadth of actor's role-taking ability reflects his social experience; and his ability to take a particular role is largely determined by the experience with it as actor, other, or observer. Another factor which might determine one's role-taking ability would be the information available regarding the role, the actor's memory, the recency of relevant experience, and the extent to which actor "paid attention" during the interaction. The degree to which actor "paid attention" could depend on the importance of the interaction to the actor.

Frequently, however, actor finds himself in a situation which differs from previously experienced situations. In these circumstances actor not only has to draw upon his prior experiences, but he also must be able to discern between this experience and past experience and to make necessary adjustments. For example, a new wife cannot take the role of her husband if she assumes her husband is the same as her father. However, her experiences with her father will aid her in her role-taking if she understands the differences between the role of husband and that of father.

Skill at perceiving differences between situations and the ability to make the necessary adjustments could be developed through the process of trial and error during interaction. When confronting a new situation, actor must develop an implicit hypothesis concerning the differences and similarities between the present situation and past situations. On this basis he takes the role of the other and judges the correctness of his hypothesis on the actual reaction of the other. Through this process actor will learn important differences, unimportant differences, and that particular characteristics have different effects in different circumstances.
Role-expectations

The previous discussion has been expressed in terms of actor responding to objects in the external world—primarily people. Typically, a person also responds to other persons by naming, defining, and classifying himself. Self has been defined in various ways, and each definition calls attention to a slightly different aspect of the same activity. Mead (130) defined the self as that which is an object to itself, or an organism has a self to the degree he views his activities from the standpoint of others. Cooley (43) describing the self as developing in the intimate face-to-face relationships of primary groups, defined it as a social product of the processes summed up in the "looking glass self".

For the purposes of this dissertation self will be defined as a person's view of himself. "We come to know what we are through other's responses to us," (167, p. 116). Actor can learn from the responses of others, as he understands the language and can interpret the verbal and nonverbal symbols through which other communicates his reactions.

In cases where others disagree in their opinion of actor, self will reflect the predominant attitudes which have been presented to him. The certainty with which he holds a particular self-image reflects the degree to which this image has predominated over the other images.

The responses of other are effective only insofar as they are perceived by actor, and perception is often both partial and selective. Actor registers only part of other's responses and these are not necessarily a representative sample. Also, not all reactions which are perceived are correctly interpreted. Part of the misinterpretation could stem from the lack of consensus concerning the meanings of signs and symbols, even in a
single language community. Also, there is the possibility of depressive processes being in operation, resulting in people giving themselves the benefit of the doubt or actually fooling themselves as to the meaning of other's behavior. Also, reaction perceived varies in magnitude and effect. In some cases the effect is hardly noticeable, while in other cases a reaction is given much weight.

The different degrees of effect could be attributed to the source of definition of the self. Certain people called "significant others" are more likely to be heard and to be listened to. This concept of "significant others" represents the recognition that in a fragmented and differentiated world not all persons with whom one interacts have identical or even compatible perspectives. Consequently, the individual must give weight or priority to the perspectives of certain others. To speak then of "significant others" is to say that given others occupy higher rank on a continuum of importance.

Miller (134b) describes those persons more likely to be chosen as significant others as: (1) Powerful persons over less powerful persons; (2) Those that are defined as competent; (3) Persons loved by actor, as by definition satisfaction is dependent upon rewards that only a love object can provide; and (4) Persons with whom actor is in interaction. Miller continues to state the significance of another would vary depending upon the issue involved. People "listen" to different people about different things.

The nature of a reaction would also be relevant. For example, a mild rebuke can easily be unperceived, misunderstood, and/or discounted. However, this would not be true of a full-scale "dressing-down". Similarly,
the more clear a reaction, the more visible and less ambiguous it is, the greater would be the effect of this reaction.

Festinger's (56) cognitive dissonance theory states when actor obtains information which is inconsistent with his current beliefs, he finds himself in a conflict situation. These conflicts can be resolved by "denying" the new information or changing his beliefs. All things being equal, there would be a tendency for actor to reject information which is unfavorable to self and to change the self concept to accommodate information which is favorable. It would also seem likely the strengths of these effects would depend on the degree of importance that the actor gives to the particular dimension.

Perceived definitions become less influential as time goes by. General observation would suggest there is a "forgetting" process at work in the definition of the self. On the other hand, primacy may also affect the weighting process. First reactions in a particular matter may be given more weight at the beginning, thus moderating the effect of forgetting some reactions.

In addition to actor's self-image which is derived from other's reactions, actor also has internalized standards. People's self-image reflects, in part, the degree to which their behavior coincides with these standards. This is not meant to imply that the existence of internalized standards makes the self any less a social product, as these standards also have a social origin.

Implicit in this discussion is the idea that the self is an evaluative self—it consists of a person's opinion of himself, for example, "a good guy", "a bad guy", or "a Don Juan". In addition to this evaluation of the
Self, there is a cognitive self (165). The cognitive self is a set of identities or positional labels that actor uses to describe himself in his place in the world, for example, a male, an American, or a college professor. This cognitive self is not a random collection of identities. Rather, identities are organized into a hierarchy of prominence. The prominence of an identity is dependent on the frequency with which actor perceives others using it to define him, weighted by the values that actor gives to these perceptions, such as source of definition or reward.

How is all this information referred to in the previous discussion conveyed? Part of this process is very obvious; other says things about actor, actor hears them and understands them. However, in order to interpret other's responses actor must be able to participate in role-taking, so he can understand the meaning of other's words and actions. In addition, role theorists suggest actor gets information that is not directly related by: (1) Actor "reads" and interprets the subtle reactions of other; and (2) Further role-taking takes place in which actor asks himself, "If I were a person like him and I saw somebody do what I just did, what would I think of that person?" (73, p. 12)

In summary, social role could refer to the expectation that a social group has an individual member of the group consequential to his particular place in this group. Newcomb defines this concept as:

The ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a certain position constitute the 'role' (or social role) associated with that position. (138, p. 42)

Role expectations represent the "ought to do" aspects of the role position, and the role behavior is expressed by what the individual does in living these expectations.
Jacobson extended the definition of role to the marital situation as:

Since role may be defined as a culturally ascribed pattern of behavior, including duties, expected or required of persons behaving in specific social situations, i.e., the behavior expected of husband and wife in marriage situations. (88, p. 146).

Therefore, marital satisfaction could be described in terms of the relation between what the spouses want from marriage and what they receive from it. The determinants of whether a spouse is satisfied with a role or not is included under the term: role expectation. These expectations may be of two kinds: (1) Conscious so that the desired role-characteristics can be reported; and (2) Unconscious so that the properties of the role which will bring about satisfaction cannot be reported by the spouse.

There are two basic roles in marriage, and each spouse has his expectation about each of these roles. Therefore, there are four possible differences between role and role-expectation which could be used as the basic data for determining adjustment achieved or required in a marriage; husband from his role and wife's role, and wife from her role and husband's role. The degree of adjustment achieved by a couple in the marital situation could be defined as the discrepancies between expectations and reality.

Marital-role expectations are derived from several major sources and each source tends to present different conceptions of husband and wife. The child's first concepts of husband-wife roles are derived from his parents, though it appears the girl gets hers from the mother far more than the boy does from the father (127). A new couple brings to marriage expectations derived from different parental homes which are not necessarily similar. The second source of role-expectations is mass media and the culture generally. These role-expectations are filtered through the subcul-
tures of sex; therefore males come to marriage with different interpretations of marriage than females. Studies of high school students (51) and college students (12) consistently show more conceptions of male dominance and more traditional views of the wife role among the males than among the females. Yet in the courtship process those couples whose role conceptions coincide most closely are the ones who marry (97), so that husbands and wives usually define marital roles in a fairly similar way (6).

A third source of marital role-expectations which may account for some of the similar concepts of husband and wives is the interaction between husband and wife. This process is not yet explored by research. However, while initial interaction between two people is governed by cultural role expectations, subsequent interaction between two people changes their expectations of each other. As two people become emotionally involved, each tends to respond to the other in terms of how he thinks the other sees him (role-expectations). This process usually goes on without conscious recognition by the persons involved. In this way, a husband may see that his wife expects him to be more forceful and dominant in the family decision making and respond to this expectation by first behaving in a more dominant manner, and finally by incorporating a conception of his husband role into the self-concept which is closer to his wife's conception of his role. A wife may see that her husband expects her to be more active and aggressive, and respond to this perception by behaving more in accordance with it. She then redefines her self-concept in terms of how her husband sees her. The couple may actually never have been aware of the discrepancy in their original conceptions, and the conflict in role expectations is not "resolved" by "give and take", or any rational adjustment considerations of
the couple; rather, it is done by a process of responding to the other's role expectations.

According to Ingersol (87) conceptions of marital roles should not be conceived as determined by some certain early experience, but as originating in early experience and then developing and changing through interaction. From this it is included that it is not some pre-existing relationship between two people which determines the course of their marriage, but rather the responses of each in their interaction with each other. The resolution of role conflict, through accurate response to expectations of the mate is observed more frequently in well-adjusted than unadjusted couples, has been reported by several authors (14, 144).

Role-learning

For many positions, the roles are clearly defined, while for other positions there is no such clear-cut information. However, when roles are indicated, this is merely to set limits and give suggestions and is not meant to cover all eventualities or situations.

The process of role-learning closely resembles the process leading to the development of the self. The major difference is that in learning the self one is learning a particular set of definitions of oneself, where in role-learning the individual is learning the behavior considered appropriate for the particular position he holds or will hold. It is difficult to separate the two processes as they occur simultaneously. Both involve communication and role-taking is the major means by which information is conveyed. Other not only defines and evaluates actor, thereby contributing to the development of the self-concept of actor, but at the same time other conveys a set of expectations which are associated with actor's position.
Anticipatory socialization partially prepares one for a role, making it possible for the individual to enter many statuses with relatively clear ideas of what he is expected to do. Anticipatory socialization occurs through direct observation of people holding statuses the individual might hold in the future. For example, a mother says to her daughter: "Now watch me carefully, someday you are going to be a mother and you will have to . . ."

Role-taking also plays an important part in role-learning. When actor interacts with people who occupy one of his future statuses he, as in all interaction, puts himself in other's place so he may predict other's probable reaction. In doing this actor learns how a person occupying this particular status thinks and acts.

The process of anticipatory socialization is less than complete. By their very nature there are certain aspects of all social statuses which any given individual is unlikely to see unless he is actually in that position. This degree of incompleteness will vary depending upon the nature of the role.

Merton (133) speaks of role-sets, or the various roles which one person plays in the various positions they hold. For example, a father may also play the role of a dentist, a Sunday School teacher, a Boy Scout leader, etc. Karlsson (89) speaks of part-roles, which can be distinguished from each other by various criteria, and actually could be defined as shared roles. For example, a marriage in this society involves two persons, and consequently has two major roles: husband and wife. These roles of husband and wife are subdivided into part-roles: the producing of children, taking care of the household, and earning money.
 Role theory in family sociology

Under the influence of Cooley, Ernest Burgess at the University of Chicago brought forth the idea of studying the family as a "living form". Burgess proposed the family be studied as a "unit of interacting personalities" and developed a typology of families, using a classification of families in terms of the patterns of personal relationships tying husband and wife, parents and children together. This study of the patterns of personal relationships in family life led directly to the conception of the family as a unit of interacting persons:

By the unit of interacting personalities is meant a living, changing, growing thing. I was about to call it a superpersonality. At any rate the actual unit of family life has its existence not in any legal conception, nor in any formal contract, but in the interaction of its members. For the family does not depend for its survival on the harmonious relations of its members, nor does it necessarily disintegrate as a result of conflicts between its members. The family lives as long as interaction is taking place and only dies when it ceases. (23, p. 5)

Burgess continued in the framework of family interaction to explain that by this process of interaction the family develops a conception of itself. It becomes a unit with ties to the community and the larger society. Interaction as a principle of social life applies not only to internal family relationships, but to the relations of the family and its environment.

Burgess pointed out every person is more or less aware of his own role in a family and a sense of the roles of others in the family as well. He contended roles were the social reality of the personality; but they were not absolutes. They are, rather, relative to the social situation.

The first full scale treatment of the family from the point of inter-
acting roles was that of Willard Waller in the late 1930's. Waller (178) proposed studying the family as a "unity of interacting personalities". To Waller, interaction, a set of processes by virtue of which society exists, takes place in the mind. Such interaction has certain special characteristics: (1) Great changes take place in interacting elements in the process of interaction, particularly as a function of the experiences of crises; (2) The cause of much of the behavior of a human being is within the human being himself; (3) Society, in any ultimate sense, exists in the mind and in imagination; and (4) Elements which interact, interpenetrate, becoming part of one another.

Waller viewed the family as a more or less closed system of social interaction, and while family events often must be explained through extra-family variables, they can frequently be explained by reference to other family events. Waller described his approach to the family as follows:

The conception of the family as a unit of personalities acting upon one another furnishes the correct approach to the study of the relation of the family and society... In order to understand the relation of the family to society, we must describe concrete processes of interaction within the family group and relate them to larger social processes which are taking place in the greater society. This discussion has suffered in the past from a too static view and from a tendency to relate the abstract conception of the family to an abstractly conceived society.....These are valuable interpretations, but their value would be greatly enhanced if it were possible to trace concretely the interaction processes involved. (178, p. 25).

Reuben Hill has added substantially to the analysis of the family from the viewpoint of roles and interactional processes. Hill's most creative contribution was a distinctively theoretical orientation to family research--the developmental approach. In his developmental approach he com-
bined the emphasis of interacting personalities of family members with the life cycle conceptions of the family. His primary work concentrates on the crises which occur at different points in the family-life cycle. This primary reason for these crises is that of roles:

But parents are trained in roles which are pertinent only through this period, they are not trained for roles which permit creating intensity of relationships with children. More, both parents have difficult problems of role transitions at a point when children are experiencing such problems as well. (75, p. 149)

Leonard S. Cottrell consistently used the idea of roles in studying the family. In the early 1930's he proposed marriage be viewed as a process of interaction of roles, conceived as an organization of habits and attitudes appropriate to a given proposition in a system of social relationships. He stressed the need of recognizing the importance, in the marriage relationship, of reciprocal expectations of behavior noting that such expectations are an integral part of the concept of role. Cottrell proposed that unique role patterns are chief determinants of the success or failure in marriages of persons from similar cultural backgrounds. He set forth a set of propositions for the study of marriage adjustment:

First, marriage adjustment may be regarded as a process in which marriage partners attempt to re-enact certain relational systems, or situations which obtained in their own earlier family groups. Or, in other words, marriage partners tend to play the habitual roles they evolved in their childhood and adolescence.

Second, the kind of roles that marriage partners bring to the marriage will determine the nature of their marriage relationship and the degree of adjustment they will achieve.

Third, that maladjusted marriages may be regarded as results of the failure of marriage situation to provide the system of relationships called for by the roles which the marriage partners bring to the marriage. (47, p. 109)
Much of the current work in this area derives from the impetus provided by Cottrell, and the direction this work has taken reflects Cottrell's insistence on the necessity of finding adequate means of operationalizing roles in the marital situation.

Roles and marital adjustment

The meaning of the work in the field of role-theory is not easy to assess. The research, in general, uses adjustment in the sense of happiness or satisfaction with a relationship. Whether the theory postulates adjustment in this sense or as a consequence of accurate role-taking is not at all certain or clear. Further, the past researchers, in their operational procedures, if not in their modes of conceptualizing variables, frequently treat role-taking as an attribute of the person rather than as a characteristic of the relationship. In short, adequate measurement of role-taking would seem to require close specification of the interactive context in which role-taking occurs, and the treatment of role as a reciprocal rather than a one-way process. According to Farber (54), the various types and levels of role-taking must be distinguished if this area of research is to make progress.

This discussion turns now to past research conducted in the context of the family as interacting personalities. There will be no attempt to discuss all the research which has been conducted in this area; rather, this dissertation will only deal with research which concentrated on the dyad relationship of husband and wife. Nor will there be any attempt to review the specific findings of these studies; rather it is simply an attempt to document major foci.

The first major study of marital adjustment from the standpoint of
interaction of roles in the family context was conducted by Burgess and Cottrell (20) in their attempt to predict success or failure in marriage. A significant segment of family literature follows out leads provided by their framework, though the bulk of these are oriented to specific findings rather than to the underlying conceptual scheme which provided the framework for the original study. The Burgess and Wallin (21) study of the variables predictive of success in engagement and marriage, a work which in many ways represents an attempt to deal with problems arising in the Burgess and Cottrell research, was also approached from the interactional viewpoint.

A study which actually succeeds in treating the family as an interacting unit in its methodology is Lu's (122) research into the impact of home discipline and reaction to authority on marital roles. He found that dominant roles in marriages were more frequently assumed by persons who reacted negatively to discipline imposed by their parents, especially their mothers, and that equalitarian roles were more frequently taken by persons who had close affectional attachments to their mothers. Lu also found that equalitarian spouse relations were associated with good marital adjustment, and that dominance of either husband and wife in the marriage relationship was associated with poor marital adjustment.

Buerkle, Anderson, and Badgley (14), in their study of marital adjustment, rejected the hypothesis that altruism relates to marital adjustment. These authors found that adjusted couples used the following techniques of resolving conflict: (1) Accurate role-taking concerning partner's plans; (2) Being or appearing to be sympathetic with partner's plans; and (3) Remaining ignorant of partner's plans. Komarovsky (99) conducted research which investigated communication within the marriage dealing with the norms
of privacy and self-disclosure as actual behavior, the existence of significant others apart from spouse who may act as confidantes for the person, and the impact of these factors on marital stability. Kirkpatrick and Hobart (97) related dyadic empathic responses to the various stages of pair intimacy from favorite date to marriage, finding no consistent trend in degree of empathy by stage, but finding that members of married pairs were more empathic with respect to one another than were favorite dates. A replication of this study by Hobart (79) produced similar results. Based on the preceding discussion of the development of role theory in the area of the family and of the more recent studies, the following summary statements can be made:

1. Role theory has not stimulated a great deal of research in the family, but in recent years there have been a number of studies oriented toward role theory.

2. The research that does exist indicates the basic validity of the role theory.

3. The theory, however, requires some modification—largely in the form of introduction of social structural variables.

In relation to the third point, Cottrell stated in 1950:

A major problem in the social psychologists is to conceptualize "situations" in a way which serves the purpose of analysis, and which does not reduce to the science-defeating banality of saying that every situation is particular and so different. Nor do we need to dissolve the real word, including social structure external to the person, in an all-embracing definition of the situation. (48, p. 711)

Much of the research in this area deals with internal family relationships. It is the goal of this dissertation to view marriage in a relatively
closed social system. However, viewing marriage in a relatively closed social system is a methodologically necessary device or an ideal type. It is not accepting it as reality, but rather to facilitate investigation of the interplay between family roles and extra-family roles.

Changing roles in the family

The American family, in the last few generations, has undergone profound change. Studies which have been concerned with marital roles evidence such change. According to Parsons and Bales (147), this new emerging family presents a particularly favorable opportunity for the social scientist as this family is more highly differentiated and specialized, thus easier to study.

The changes of the family have been discussed by several authors. Cavan (29) speaks of the effects of mobility, urbanism, and industrialization on the family. Mobility has facilitated an increase in types and intensity of communication. With the limited mobility of the past, there was little opportunity for the family to come into contact with new, or different, ideas or values. The status quo of family life was not greatly disturbed or rapidly changed because when alternative modes of behavior are not known, the role patterns of the family remain unchanged.

With the advent of modern means of communication and transportation, new behavioral patterns were not only made possible, but such divergent modes of behavior were more readily passed from person to person and family to family. In general, it could be said these changes have contributed to "A marked decline in familism and an equivalent increase in individualism." (24, p. 495) The interests, ideas, and behavior of the individual persons within the family became more divergent; thus the roles of the individual
members are not as interdependent as they once were.

The change from rural to urban living has also had a great impact on the American family. This change has contributed more than any other factor to the change in, and the "loss" of many of the functions of the family. The functions of yesterday's family helped make it a more nearly self-contained unit than it is today. Parsons and Bales (147) stressed the "loss" of these functions does not mean there had been a "loss" in the importance of the family.

The economic function is perhaps the best example of this change in self-sufficiency, but recreational, educational, and social activities which once took place within the family unit have moved to outside the family. Along with these "losses" and changes in functions, have been accompanying changes in husband and wife roles.

Parsons (147) stated that whereas the family farm was operated by the entire family, an urban job is held by the individual and does not involve other members of the family in a comparable sense. Thus the shift from rural to urban living not only brought with it "losses" of certain functions, but changes in the roles of husbands and wives. At one time the roles of each were interlocking and very much dependent upon one another. However, in the present day urban family, certain roles of each partner is to a larger degree individualistic and independent of each other. This condition is especially true of economic roles, as in the case where the husband and wife both work outside the home and have their separate incomes and jobs (107).

Accompanying the change from rural to urban and the increased mobility of recent years, has been the transition to an industrialized society, with
all its technological implications. By the nature of the new jobs which resulted from the change, as well as the tremendous increase in the number of jobs, this transition served further to increase the opportunities for wives to work outside the home. The fact that wives could work outside the home and provide at least partial support for the family, afforded an equalizing influence for the relative positions of husbands and wives. Consequently, the conception of their respective roles were altered in accordance with this change. In addition, it can be said that industrialization also helped to produce an increase in individualism and a decrease in familism (107).

Other changes relevant to the family and the roles of its members are the increased amount of leisure time which has been made possible by industrialization, the clear distinction which is now made between sexual activities and reproduction, and the general advances in the educational level throughout American society. Moreover, the events just discussed should not be thought of as independent forces, as there have been a great number of interdependent factors which have been influential in the changing conceptions of marital roles.

More specifically stated, there has been a change from the traditional conception of husband and wife roles to the modern more equalitarian attitudes. The family of our immediate past developed roles for the husband and wife that not only had clarity, but supplemented each other. The husband, with well-defined duties, was the acknowledged head of the family. He was to provide for the family and was final authority on matters of discipline and in decisions affecting the family. The wife was a junior partner, who contributed her opinions but accepted the decision of the husband,
and who attended to the details of the household and the training of the children. Her time was filled with the necessities of family life. These roles were largely predetermined, taught to the children by parents who had learned them from their parents, and therefore accepted by the children as final. The community also upheld the roles, giving disapproval to those who deviated. The stability of coordinated patterned roles gave to the family the attribute of dependability was a part of social structure.

In recent decades, the trend has been away from fixed roles for the husband and wife, particularly for the wife (30). Landis describes the new form of marriage as:

... assumes equality of husband and wife. It assumes their mutual sharing of responsibility as well as their mutual enjoyment of each other in a physical and psychological sense. Such freedom and unity of personality was not conceived of in the old patriarchial family where the obligations of wife to husband were stressed rather than their mutual satisfaction to each other. (107, p. 584)

As in the case of many social changes and especially those of magnitude, the transition of family patterns has not been without many problems. When concepts of marriage are in a process of transformation, and different marriage forms prevail in different social groups, couples find they have conflicting expectations of husband-wife roles.

Role-conflict starts before people enter marriage. Komarovsky (99) studied 153 senior college women and found over forty percent of the women in this sample admitted difficulties in personal relations with men because of conflicting sex roles. In Lovejoy's (121) study of 179 Washington University students (109 males and 70 females) the subjects felt sex roles in the family of today were not as well defined as they were in their families.
of orientation. Lovejoy also found significant differences in male and female respondents regarding role expectations. Both sexes felt decisions should be joint to a greater extent than was practiced in their families of orientation. Females displayed this attitude more than males, where more males than females expected their wives to play the traditional roles, therefore suggesting a possible source of future marital role-conflict. Data suggested that women are moving toward the men's role, at least toward sharing it, while at the same time men are moving toward the woman's role.

In view of married couples, studies confirm role-expectations which are in conflict are a source of trouble. Ort (144) interviewed college couples in their mid-twenties and found that the more areas of role-conflict between husband and wife, the lower was the marital happiness for the couple. Hurvitz (84) interviewed middle-class couples and found the greater the discrepancy in the importance assigned to certain roles by the two spouses, the lower were their marital adjustment scores. Jacobson (88) found that divorced couples exhibited a greater disparity in their attitudes toward the role of husband and wife in marriage than do married couples. However, Hobart and Klausner's (79) findings contradicted these results when they compared the marital role expectation disagreements (as registered on a marital-expectations test) of husbands and wives with their marital adjustment scores, and found no relationship existed between these differences in role conceptions and their marital adjustment.

Mangus (129) found role conflict between spouses had a "negative impact" on mental health. He concluded that "the disintegrative nature of the marriage" could have been predicted from carefully conducted role conflict analysis.
Parsons and Bales in discussing the increased divorce rate in the United States stated:

... it is not an index that the nuclear family and marriage relationships are rapidly disintegrating and losing their importance. The truth is rather that, on the one hand, the two roles have been changing their character; on the other, their specific importance, particularly that of marriage, has actually been increasing. These aspects of the process of change impose additional strain on family and marriage systems. We suggest that the high rates of divorce are primarily indices to this additional strain. (147, p. 16)

Hacker (68) found the problems of contemporary role-expectation arise from: (1) Traditional difficulties of the breadwinner; (2) Conflict arising from inadequate fulfillment of role expectations; and (3) Accommodation to the new freedom and responsibilities of women. Hacker concluded his research with:

Man is now expected to incorporate womanly virtues (charm, tact, warmth), but still achieve economic success, all the while avoiding displays of emotionalism. Man as husband must excel his wife in "external creativity". As a father, man legally bears the chief responsibility for the guardianship of the children, but often in practice plays a subordinate role. Father is no longer the chief mediator between the outside world and his family. Men are considered as paying the price for the past lack of reciprocity between the sexes and the solution may well be a "collaborative" effort of men and women in evolving new masculine and feminine identities which will integrate the sexes in the emotional division of labor so that the roles men and women play will not be rationalized or seen as external constraint but eagerly embraced as their own. (68, p. 233)

Jacobson's (88) study, in which the relationship between divorced couples and married couples role conceptions were investigated, gives evidence of the importance of the problem arising from conflicting, or confused role expectations. In his study of 100 divorced and 100 married couples, he tested the hypothesis that divorced couples exhibit a greater disparity
in their attitudes toward the roles of husband and wife in marriage than do married couples. Statistically significant differences were found between discrepancies in marital role conceptions of married and divorced couples. The married couples showed more agreement in their attitudes toward the roles of husband and wife than did the divorced couples.

Role expectations, however, need not be studied only from the negative aspect of conflicting or confused conceptions, as was exemplified by the studies previously discussed. Another approach is to search for correlates of marital role expectations. In Blood's (11) study in Detroit, using a Jacobson scale, it was found that in cases where the women work there is a more equalitarian conception of both husband and wife roles.

Yi-Chang (123) in a study of 589 married couples attempted to determine the association between conflict with parents in the family of orientation and marital roles. By using a sixteen item scale to measure dominance, equalitarian, and submissive roles in marriage, she found that the husband-more-dominant role was significantly and positively related to:
(a) husband's conflict relationship with his father; (b) husband's conflict relationship with his mother; and (c) wife's absence of conflict with, but attachment to her mother. The equalitarian role was found to be positively related to: (a) husband's absence of conflict with his father; (b) husband's absence of conflict with, but attachment to his mother; and (c) the wife's absence of conflict with, but attachment to her mother. The wife-more-dominant role was positively associated with her conflict relationship with her mother. This study also revealed that the wife's affectional relationship to her father was not associated with either dominant, equalitarian, or submissive roles in the marital relationship.
Lu (122) investigated the relationship between discipline in the parental home and marriage roles. The major conclusion indicated that it is the reaction to the discipline and not the discipline itself that is important. More specifically, it was found that with a majority of couples in the "wife-more-dominant" group the wife disliked her home discipline but her husband "didn't mind" his discipline. Likewise, it was found that in a majority of cases in the "husband-more-dominant" groups the husband disliked his home discipline but his wife "didn't mind" her discipline.

Some authors, however, have not seen a convergence of roles. Included in these is Parsons (147) who concluded there was a serious trend toward occupational equality, but no trend toward homogenization of the sex roles:

... The differentiation between the roles of parents becomes more rather than less significant for the socialization process under modern American conditions... In subtle ways the same is true of the roles of spouses vis-a-vis each other... The content of the conceptions of masculinity and femininity has undoubtedly changed. But it seems clear that the accent of their differentiation has not lessened... The tendency in certain respects is probably increasing (for women) to specialize in the expression direction. (147, pp. 24-26)

Gerald Leslie describes the present day roles of husbands and wives:

Husbands are supposed to be the not-too-autocratic heads of their families. They are supposed to develop competence in their occupational, social and sexual roles, economically supporting their wives and children and being firmly but considerately aware of their needs. Husbands should modify their roles somewhat in accordance with the changing roles being demanded of their wives. Women are expected to be primarily mothers and homemakers, and to cater to the needs of men. They should be far more circumspect in their personal behavior avoiding sexual immorality and avoiding too direct competition with men. At the same time, there is widespread sentiment (and legislation) in favor of increasing equality for women. They should be permitted and encouraged to develop their potentialities as people. (110, p. 260).
In conclusion, it would seem there has been a compromise of roles within marriage. Certain sex roles have been differentiated (such as male career versus female homemaker), while other role differences have been minimized (such as decision-making, shared recreation, companionship, and similar interests).

Generally, even today, the husband's major role in the family is that of earning income and giving status to the family. The wife's major role is of an integrative nature; more than her spouse she is expected to know and anticipate the husband's thoughts and feelings, provide a pleasant atmosphere at home, satisfy his desires and care for his children. Thus, the wife provides the emotional support for the family while the husband plays a "linkage role" between his family and the occupational systems (147, pp. 13-15). The roles the husband plays involve his being oriented outside the family more than the wife and spending less time with the children than she does. Although the wife may play some instrumental roles, she is more likely than her husband to be oriented toward the family, be concerned about relationships among the family members, and be involved in caring for the children. While she cannot participate directly in the world of the husband, she can offer him emotional support.

In the cases of married college students, however, these roles are often reversed, with the wife being the major breadwinner while the husband is either employed part-time, or not at all. Also, both spouses could be oriented outside the home with responsibilities entailed in their student and work statuses. Both could have equal responsibilities for duties which are usually associated with the wife's household duties. Because of the possible reversal of instrumental and expressive roles, dissatisfaction
from both spouses could evolve; the wife could view her husband as not fulfilling the traditional male role as breadwinner, or the husband could be very dissatisfied with not being able to be in the role of the major breadwinner.

It is the purpose of this dissertation to investigate various aspects related to the roles entailed in college marriages which could affect marital adjustment, with emphasis on the wife's roles. From the foregoing discussion the following general hypothesis will be stated:

G. H. 1: The various roles played by the husband and wife of married college couples is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**The employed wife**

The traditional picture of the American wife's role is almost purely domestic. She marries early, then spends the remainder of her life caring for her husband and children. This picture has little relevance to the contemporary American wife. Today over 30 percent of all married women are in the labor force (134a).

In the traditional concept when all a woman's functions could be fulfilled in essentially the same physical place, her home, the integration of emotional and instrumental elements was not a matter of concern. However, when women went outside the home for instrumental functions, the integration of the instrumental and the expressive roles became problematic. During a less complex age, it was taken for granted that women were productively employed and this employment was a positive contribution to the well-being of

---

1 Hereafter, general hypothesis is referred to as G. H.
her children and her relationship with her husband. Only when the employ-
ment came to be outside the home did the question arise: Does it interfere
with what is taken for granted as her primary responsibility—the emotional
health of her children and the level of adjustment of her marital relation-
ship? It is this latter factor with which we are concerned in this disser-
tation.

The first careful studies of the effect of the wife's employment con-
cluded there was no difference in the marital adjustment of working and
non-working wives, but what really mattered was the husband's attitude
toward his wife's employment (115). Nye (142) in a later study was not
able to confirm the importance of the husband's attitude as a crucial var-
iable.

Practically all recent studies show a relationship between the wife's
full-time employment and marital conflict, but the relationship is not
clear. Blood and Wolfe (11), in their Detroit Study, found employed wives
did not differ significantly from the non-employed wives in their evalua-
tion of their marriages. However, they observed a slight trend toward
higher marital satisfaction among employed wives of low-income husbands and
non-employed wives of high-income husbands. Nye (142) suggested present
data to be sufficient to support the contention that employment of mothers
increases conflict in the marital relationship. However, the higher the
socio-economic status of the family, the less significant the net adverse
effect on the marriage (141). Since this contradicts the findings of Blood
and Wolfe that the adverse effect of employment of the wife is greatest in
the high-income group, and since neither set of results is statistically
significant with respect to the difference effect in different status
levels, it is often concluded that it is not known whether marital adjustment is affected differently by the wife's employment in families of varying socio-economic status.

In spite of conflict, however, the income which the wife brings home can be assumed to put the family into a high socio-economic bracket, which has a positive effect on the marital adjustment (141). The two effects seem to balance each other out, so the net effect of the wife's employment on marital adjustment could be negligible.

Women who are not employed at all have been shown to play a less companionate role with their husbands than those wives employed full time (182). According to Nye and Hoffman (141), family recreational roles are apparently not affected to any degree by the wife's assumption of the role of provider. Blood (9) reported the amount of interaction an employed wife had with her family was greater than her unemployed counterpart. He reported "dual-income couples expect more interaction and joint activity in their leisure time (9, p. 313)". However, some of the more time consuming uses of leisure together are curtailed.

In the case of married college students, and the assumed limited income of the couples, the importance of the wife being in the labor force could be great. It is assumed her income is needed, and in cases necessary for her husband and/or herself to continue their education. In cases where the wife is not a student and is the only employed member of the marriage, it could relieve the pressure of the husband having to fulfill the role of both student and provider for his family. In view of the inconclusive evidence of the effect of the employed wife on marital adjustment, which is indicated in past research, and the increased importance of the wife being
in the labor force among married college students, the following sub-
hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 1: The wife-only employed is positively related
to the degree of marital adjustment achieved
by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 2: Both spouses employed is positively related
to the degree of marital adjustment achieved
by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Wife's occupation and role

In previous studies, occupation has been conceptualized as various
forms or kinds of employment ranging along a continuum from very high pres-
tige (very desirable) to employment of very low prestige (not desirable).
For example, the North-Hatt scale has been developed and used as an opera-
tional measure for determining a continuum for occupational prestige and
desirability. However, the North-Hatt Scale is primarily for male occupa-
tions. For the purposes of this dissertation a scale for the occupations
held by the wives in this sample was developed (Appendix A). The develop-
ment of this scale is discussed in the chapter on Methods and Procedures.

The higher ranking occupations of the wives in this study are viewed
as being more desirable, of having higher salaries, and as being more
satisfying to the individual. It is also assumed since higher ranking
occupations are those which require special training, the women who are in
these occupations are getting to use occupational training they had, thus
contributing to their satisfaction. If a person is more satisfied in their
occupation, at which they spend several hours a day, this satisfaction
could be reflected in their other life activities, including their marital

1Hereafter, sub-hypothesis will be referred to as S. H.
relationship. In view of the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 3: The higher rank of the wife's occupation is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**Husband's satisfaction with wife's employment**

As stated in a previous section, Locke (115) concluded there was no difference in the marital adjustment of working and non-working wives, but what really mattered was the husband's attitude toward his wife's employment. However, Nye (142) was not able to confirm the importance of the husband's attitude as a crucial variable.

Axelson's (2) study of attitudes of husbands toward working wives showed the husbands of non-working wives tend to believe that a mother should not work at an outside job as long as pre-school age children were at home. However, the husbands did not hold this same attitude in regard to mothers of school-age children.

As stated before, the importance of the wife being in the labor force in college marriages could be crucial for the continuance of education by either or both of the spouses. However, the husbands could find themselves in emotional conflict over their wife being employed and/or being the major breadwinner of the family. The husband could feel he should be the sole or the major breadwinner for the family, especially if children are present. This possible emotional conflict could be expressed through dissatisfaction expressed by the husband regarding his wife's employment. In view of the above discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 4: The degree of satisfaction expressed by the husband regarding his wife in the labor force
is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Number of hours wife works

It is assumed the majority of employed wives would have, in addition to her employment, the responsibility for the major portion of the household duties for the couple. In spite of the increased emphasis on the changes in roles of both men and women, research does not support the idea that the amount of work men do around the home has increased in any great amount. Therefore, if a woman is in the labor force, she not only has the responsibility of her job, but also of her home.

As the wife's hours employed outside the home increases, the time which she has left to take care of household responsibilities and to share activities with her husband could decrease. Therefore, it is assumed it would affect the overall marital relationship. She could be increasingly tired because of her double responsibility of employee and housewife, and there could be friction between wife and husband regarding the possible neglected state of the household or the lack of time she has to be with her husband. In view of the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 5: The number of hours per week the wife is employed is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Wife's income in proportion to total family income

As income of the husband increases, the percent of wives in the labor force decreases. Ruth Cavan (31) reported about one-third of the wives whose husband had an income of less than $5,000 worked; if the husband's
income was between $5,000 and $10,000, one-quarter of the wives worked; and of husband's whose incomes were over $10,000 only 15 percent of the wives worked. Cavan concluded: "A finer classification at the top of the scale would probably show no wives worked at the highest income groups (31, p. 555)." According to Cavan, when considering both the age of children and husband's income, the highest percentage of working wives is in the group with children between ages 6 and 17 and whose husband earned less than $1,000 per year as 58 percent of these wives are reported as working. The lowest percentage of working wives fell into the group having children under the age of 6 with income from the husband of $10,000 or more.

Blood and Wolfe (11) and Heer (72) reported when wives are employed, they gain power in decision-making and may even become dominant over their husbands. Since a higher percentage of low-income husbands' wives work than wives in other classes, it is assumed there is a loss of power for the lower-income husbands. The increased power of the wife in the lower-income husband groups has been attributed to the necessity of the wife's income for the family's livelihood. As stated before, for married college couples it is assumed it is necessary for the wife to be in the labor force for continuation of education for one or both spouses. However, it would also be assumed as the proportion of family income which the wife's income constitutes increases, it could increase the threat to the traditional concept of the male as "head of the family". In view of the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 6: A greater proportion of wife's income of total family income is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
Student enrollment and role

Past research dealing with the married college student has primarily focused on the husband as the student and the wife as breadwinner or in the role of housewife and mother, or did not consider the wife at all. However, approximately one-fourth of the wives in this study were students.

With both wife and husband enrolled as student, it could increase or decrease the marital adjustment achieved in the marriage. It could mean more pressure on the marriage. The spouses' schedules involving times of arising and retiring, times of greatest busyness and preoccupation, and leisure time may coincide so infrequently that they seldom talk to each other at any length without a feeling of pressure. According to Bowman (12), in cases where both are students their communication suffers. Bowman stresses the danger of competition between the spouses if they are both students.

However, if both spouses were enrolled in school, they could hold the attitude they were sharing in the process of getting an education. There could be less likelihood of the wife feeling she is putting the husband through school while possibly sacrificing her own education. Even though there would be increased pressure, the couple would be sharing the same type of life. In view of the above discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 7: Both spouses being enrolled in school is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

However, in cases where only one spouse is enrolled, it is the husband who is more often enrolled while the wife either works or assumes the role
of housewife. The value is still held, in our society, that the man is or will be the major breadwinner of the family. Therefore, if a choice has to be made between the spouses regarding which one gets to go to school, it is more often the husband who goes. In view of this preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 8: The husband-only enrolled in school is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Wife's major

Related to the role as a student is the major of each student. Major is defined as that area of concentration of course work which a student takes. Different majors are viewed as having various degrees of prestige among both students and faculty. For the purposes of this dissertation a continuum scale was developed and used as an operational measure for determining a continuum of prestige for the majors of female respondents.

This scale was developed very much like the scale for female occupations (Appendix A). The scores assigned to various majors were tabulated to form a scale of prestige for the majors of the wives in this study who were students. There was a total of 17 majors, ranging in order from Child Development as having the lowest prestige to Bacteriology which was classified as having the most prestige.

However, in view of the prestige scale of majors for the women enrolled in school in this study, it is readily noticeable that those majors which were ranked as having the lower prestige are also those which could be described as "home-related". Also, those majors higher on the continuum are those which could entail more time spent in laboratory session, there-
fore more time away from home. With increased time spent away from home, there could be increased friction between the spouses over neglected home responsibilities, or the husband having to take a larger part in taking care of the home. Also, those majors which are low on the prestige scale but are "home-related" could contribute to the development of domestic related skills such as cooking, sewing, caring for children and management. In view of the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 9: The prestige of the wife's major is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Grade point of the wife

In addition to the pressures exerted on the student from household responsibilities and possible child care and employment, there are also the pressures of academic work. The pressures of academic work could be described as both atypical and irregular. There are times when the husband may resent the time the wife has to study--he may want to do something with her, or he may feel she should be taking care of her household responsibilities, rather than studying. When final examinations and similar special pressures enter the picture, the husband may fail to understand the wife's increased preoccupation, tension, irritability, and fatigue and interpret this behavior as an indication of a lack of interest in him. This increased tension is viewed as being increased if the wife's grade point is lower, and could affect the marital adjustment of the couple. If the wife's grade point is consistently high, there would not be the pressure of "pass or fail" and therefore a possibility of less tension in the marriage, resulting in better marital adjustment. In view of the preceding discussion the
following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 10: The wife's higher grade point is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Wife's student classification

Student classification is defined as the level of education the student-wives of this study were pursuing their educational pursuits. Students are classified as undergraduates, special students, and graduate students at Iowa State University. There are various levels within each of these major categories.

It has already been stated there is an expected positive relationship between the wife's enrollment as a student, if the husband is enrolled as a student, and marital adjustment. The student classification of the wife could also affect the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the couple in their marriage.

It is assumed that if a woman was pursuing graduate school, there would be increased pressure from her major professor and graduate committee. Therefore, graduate school could put more strain on her marriage than if she were an undergraduate student. Also, the female graduate student is generally viewed as being a more aggressive and independent woman and more committed to her education than the general image of the undergraduate woman. In view of the previous discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 11: Higher student classification of the wife is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
**Course load**

Academic course load is defined as the number of quarter credits a student is taking in any particular quarter. At Iowa State University, a full course load is defined as twelve or more credits per quarter, while a part-time load is defined as eleven or fewer credits per quarter. However, few graduate students take over twelve credits per quarter, particularly those who have assistantships. Those graduate students who are employed full time at the university are only allowed to average five credits per quarter.

The number of credits a woman takes per quarter is viewed as possibly affecting her marriage. The more credits one takes per quarter, the more time one must spend in class, the library, and in laboratories. If a wife were taking a heavier load, she would, therefore, have less time to take care of household responsibilities and less time to be with her husband. In addition, a heavier course load could create more tension within the person, and this tension could transfer to her marriage. In view of the previous discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 12: The average number of quarter credits constituting the course load of the wife is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**Husband and wife's attitude regarding wife's education**

There are wives who have as great a determination to complete their education as their husbands. Yet, some husbands fail to understand this. If the husband also depreciates the importance of a woman's education, thinking of it as something casual or not important which she can readily give up without regret at the slightest whim, the stage is set for his mis-
understanding the effect of academic pressures upon her. Women, even though enrolled in school, could hold the attitude that her going to school is unnecessary and friviolous.

However, if the wife completing her education is important to the husband, it stands to reason he will attempt to organize activities so this is possible and will be more understanding of the pressures exerted on his wife. If the wife views it as important for her to finish her education, regardless of what degree she was working on, this could be reflected in her marriage. The wife's desire to complete her education could be evidenced in better organization of activities regarding her household responsibilities and time with her husband so that she would have time to study. It could also contribute to the wife's understanding of her husband's experiences as he goes through school. In view of the previous discussion the following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 13: The degree to which the student-wife wants to complete her education is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 14: The degree to which the husband of the student-wife wants his wife to complete her education is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Parental help and role

Another sub-concept of role is that of parental help, either loans or gifts. In view of the perceived change of attitudes concerning parental help to their married children, it is the purpose of this dissertation to investigate the effects of parental financial help on the marital adjustment achieved by the couple in their marriage. Also the effects of different
According to Bowman (12), many a conflict in campus marriage arises from some situation positively or negatively associated with parental subsidy. No amount of theorizing by the couples that they should be independent of their parents increases their income or decreases their expenses. According to Landis:

In 1947, it cost an average of $148 per month for college couples to live. Most of these couples were living in college housing projects. In 1952, the average cost had advanced to $222 per month. By 1958, the cost was between $280 and $300, depending on whether couples had a child and whether they lived in college housing. In 1968, the cost of living had continued to increase. (107)

People often reason that since parents support their children in college while the children are single, they should continue this support if the children marry while in school. Both parents and students are uncertain about what is the wisest policy. If they can afford it, parents would more than likely continue the financial backing so their children may finish their education (107). But it is recognized certain problems may arise if they continue to support their married children, even though the children are still students. Few parents can view their children as independent married adults as long as they are contributing a major part of the children's support. The situations could be more complicated because money contributed is for the use of the child-in-law as well as their own children. In-law friction could easily arise. Landis (107) found in the 1967 study of 3,189 college students in 18 schools, more than 80 percent of both men and women said they thought the girl who married as a student should continue in school, but only a third of the men and a fourth of the women
thought the parents ought to continue to support a married daughter. However, half the men and a third of the women thought their parents would continue support through school if they married.

A review of research in the area of parental financial support for their married children points to the conclusion that such aid is becoming more general in all social classes in our society, whether or not children are students. A study cited by Bowman that examined and compared parental assistance among blue-collar workers and white-collar workers, found that parental help is most extensive during the first few years of the children's marriage (12). White-collar families give more help for a longer period of time, probably not only because they have financial resources, but also because of their children's longer educational requirements and later readiness to earning income. The help given by middle-class parents is more often financial; the help given by working-class parents is more likely to take other forms, such as child care. In both classes of families, the wives' parents tend to give more help to young married couples than the husbands' parents do. Sussman and Burchinal concluded that changes may be occurring in the family system toward a weakening of the financial autonomy of the nuclear family unit. Evidence suggests some blurring of the distinct lines formerly drawn between "yours" and "ours" after the children marry.

Financial support contributed by parents is assumed to be of two categories, gifts and loans. If a couple were receiving monetary gifts from either or both sets of parents, there could possibly be increased in-law interference, and an increased feeling by the couple of dependency on the parents. However, if parents were loaning money to a couple, it would
possibly be more on a business transaction, therefore, a possibility of less interference from the in-laws. Also, due to the fact that the couple was going to reimburse the parents for this assistance, there could be less of a feeling of dependency on the parents by the couple. In view of the previous discussion the following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 15: Parental help through loans will be positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 16: Parental help through gifts will be negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Husband's or wife's parents helping

In view of which set of parents are helping, it has already been stated the wife's parents tend to help the young married couple more than the husband's parents (168). There is a possibility of differential effect of his parents, her parents, or both sets of parents helping the young married couple. If the wife's parents are helping while the husband's parents are not helping, this would bring in the danger of threatening the male ego by emphasizing the fact that he (the husband) is not able to support his wife. Also, if the wife's parents are helping, it would be taking the monetary support of the college couple away from the male side of the family and placing it on the wife's side of the family, which is in contradiction to the traditional values related to the family in our society. If his parents were helping, it could help eliminate the conflict over the financial support coming from the wife's side of the family rather than the husband's, but there is also the possibility of the wife then viewing her husband still as a "dependent boy" who cannot support his family, thus not
fulfilling the traditional male role in our society.

However, if both sets of parents are helping, neither spouse could feel that they were either being solely dependent on their in-laws, as in fact, they would be somewhat dependent on both sets of in-laws. There would also be the possibility if both sets of parents helped the couple, they would know that they had the parental support, emotional as well as monetary, and this attitude could have a positive effect on their marital adjustment. In view of the previous discussion, the following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 17: Both sets of parents helping the couple is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 18: Only the wife's parents helping the married couple is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 19: Only the husband's parents helping the couple is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Religiosity and role

The religious roles in which a couple participate, either as individuals or as couples, are viewed as affecting the degree of marital adjustment which they have achieved in their marriage. Religiosity is defined as the degree to which one professes a particular religion, is religious minded, and takes part in religious activities. Research shows that generally, in our culture, the presence of a religious faith is associated with more favorable chances of marital success.

Locke (115) compared divorced and happily married couples and found a
larger percentage of the happily married couples had a church wedding, were
church members, and were active in Sunday School and attended church, both
before and during marriage. He suggests that being a church member is not
only a mark of a conventional person, but also a sociable person, and both
characteristics are associated with good marital adjustment.

Terman (171) found those people whose religious training had been ex-
tremely strict or rigid tended to be similar to the group with no religious
training at all insofar as marital happiness was concerned, although they
still had a somewhat higher happiness rating than the no-religion group.
Peterson (150) classified religious backgrounds according to five types,
ranging from those that rigidly control the individual along puritannical
lines and are emotionally oriented, to the agnostic or nonreligious groups.
He found the lowest marital adjustment scores among those individuals who
had the very rigid type of religious background and the most high adjust-
ment scores among those who were in the middle group classified as reli-
giously liberal.

A study conducted at the Oklahoma City Family Clinic by Reddick (156)
reports similar findings. This clinic, utilizing lawyers, ministers,
teachers, businessmen and doctors, tried to effect reconciliations of couples
having marital difficulties who were referred to it by judges and school
teachers. The clinic, as of 1967, had dealt with 250 couples. Forty per-
cent of these couples were separated, 11 percent were divorced, 23 percent
had divorces pending. Nine out of 10 of these marriages were reconciled.
Only three of these 250 couples were attending church when they came to the
clinic; the experience of the counselors was that participating in church
activities was conducive to reconciliation. Reddick stated:
The family council has found that reconciliation becomes almost a certainty if they (the clinic) can persuade the couples to become active in church. (110, p. 43)

One of the most comprehensive studies in marital adjustment in England was conducted by Chesser (34), who reported in 1957 on data secured from 6,000 marriages. He found the highest percentage of happy marriages among Protestants (known in England as Non-Conformists), a smaller percentage in the Church of England, and the smallest number of happy marriages in the group that had no religion at all.

In Weeks' (181) analysis of the divorce rate of parents of 6,500 school children in Spokane, Washington, he found that 24 percent of the marriages of parents without religion ended in divorce in contrast to a failure rate of 17.4 percent for inter-faith marriage. The foregoing discussion indicates that religiousness may be an important factor in marital adjustment.

In view of this discussion the following sub-hypothesis is made:

S. H. 20: The degree of religiosity of the spouses is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Presence of children and role

There are a number of studies available which deal with the subject the effect of children on the marital adjustment of the couple. The results of these studies are presented in Table 1.

It can be assumed, however, the presence of children is an impact on the marital relationship of a couple. At the birth of the first child, the wife's role is tremendously complicated, as it demands far more time and energy from her than the husband, whose role generally remains relatively unchanged. The changes which occur in the marital relationship at the birth
Table 1. Past research investigating the relationship between presence of children in the family and marital adjustment of the married couple

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Davis - 1929 (49)</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lang - 1932 (108)</td>
<td>In early marriage, those without children the happiest, after five years of marriage, those with one or two children happier than those with none or more than two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard - 1934 (6)</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terman - 1938 (171)</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess-Cottrell - 1939 (20)</td>
<td>Couples with none or one child better adjusted than those with more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed - 1947 (157)</td>
<td>The greater the family size, the poorer the marital adjustment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton - 1948 (70)</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locke - 1951 (115)</td>
<td>No relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood and Wolfe - 1960 (11)</td>
<td>Women with three children happier than those with more or fewer children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of the first child are seriously disorganizing enough to be described as a real crisis in the lives of the young couple (109). In studying a sample of parents and their reactions to the birth of the first child, LeMasters summarizes the parents' responses:

The mothers reported the following feelings or experiences in adjusting to the first child: loss of sleep (especially during the early months); chronic "tiredness" or exhaustion; extensive confinement to the home and resulting curtailment of their social contacts, giving up the satisfactions and the income of outside employment; additional washing and ironing; guilt at not being a 'better' mother; the long hours and seven days (and nights) a week necessary in caring for an infant; decline in their housekeep-
ing standards; and worry over their appearance (increased weight after pregnancy, et cetera). The fathers echoed most of the above adjustments but also added a few of their own: decline in sexual response of wife; economic pressure resulting from the wife’s retirement plus additional expenditures necessary for child; interference with social life; worry about a second pregnancy in the near future; and general disenchantment with the parental role. (109, p. 354)

With the birth of the first child the amount of time the wife spends in domestic tasks increases and the amount of time she spends with her husband decreases. Even when there is time, it may be difficult for husband and wife to carry on an adult conversation with little children around. The intimate give-and-take of communication which helps to maintain the special feelings spouses have for each other may have to be limited to the time after the children are in bed, and by that time the young mother may be too tired to talk. Having their love-making interrupted by a crying infant is an experience few young couples would greet with enthusiasm. Husband and wife may come to think of themselves as parents first and husband and wife to one another only secondarily.

In the case of college marriages, the foregoing facts would be even more complicated by limited income, the strain of classes, studying, the mother very possibly being employed outside the home, and in many cases cramped or substandard housing. In view of the foregoing discussion, the following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 21: The presence of children in the home of a married college couple will be negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 22: The number of children a couple has is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses.
in their marriage.

Desire for children

In the Burgess and Cottrell (20) study, couples with good adjustment and no children generally desired children. Locke (115) also found a similar relationship between good marital adjustment and desire for children. The desire for children by a couple could possibly symbolize a desire to share, not only with each other, but also with a child. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 23: A greater desire for children is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Premarital pregnancy

Possibly no other area in the study of the family is so loaded with value judgments and conflicting interpretations than the effect of premarital intercourse upon subsequent adjustment. Results of research dealing only with the effect of premarital intercourse and marital adjustment could be summarized as there being no relationship. However, when there is a premarital pregnancy the negative effects have been found to be very significant. The report of the Institute for Sex Research (67) on pregnancy, birth, and abortion reported that approximately one-fifth of unmarried women who have intercourse become pregnant. Some ninety-four percent of these pregnancies, where the mother does not marry before the birth, terminate in induced abortion or spontaneous abortion, resulting in only 6 percent of these cases being carried to term. Sixteen percent of the women who become pregnant before marriage subsequently get married before the child is born. Approximately one-sixth of all brides in the United States are pregnant at the time of marriage (67).
Christensen (36) studied marriages in Utah and Indiana which occurred after the woman became pregnant and found the divorce rate was twice as high (18.54 percent) among those couples as among the couples where the woman was not pregnant at the time of marriage (6.27 percent). Geisman and LaSorte (59) and Rountree (159) found similar results in their studies dealing with the effect of premarital pregnancy on marital success.

In the cases of college couples a premarital pregnancy ending in marriage could not only bring forth a feeling of being "trapped" by both parties of the couples, but could also result in the wife, and possibly the husband having to quit school, or at least slow down the rate of the educational process, due to required employment for family finances. In view of the above discussion the following sub-hypothesis will be stated:

S. H. 24: The occurrence of premarital pregnancy is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Unplanned pregnancy after marriage

The time from marriage to first birth reported varies from study to study. Data from Indiana for three different decades collected Christensen (36) found 43 percent of first births occurred with the first year of marriage. Studies by Christensen regarding pre-marital pregnancy would suggest about half of these were conceived before marriage. About 33 percent occurred during the second year, totally three out of four births in the first two years of marriage. However, the interval between births appears to be lengthening in recent decades. A national sample of couples in the mid 1950's showed the average number of months between marriage and first birth to be twenty-seven months for Protestants and twenty-three
months for Catholics, with generally lengthening intervals for subsequent births (58). The most recent survey, including only women in large metropolitan areas, showed half of the first births in the first eighteen months and three-fourths within the first thirty months. Second births were generally further from the first births with the median interval being about twenty-seven months (183).

According to Westoff (183), parents apparently have decided preferences in the timing of children and different reactions to the intervals they achieve. When asked about their reactions to the timing of children, only 3 percent replied, "It didn't matter". One-fourth of the mothers thought that the first child should be born as soon as possible. In spite of this, however, most couples do not practice regular contraception until after the birth of the first child. Of those couples who had their births within eight months of marriage, a majority reported that it was "too soon", but for those with first births more than a year from marriage, only a few reported it was "too soon".

From one to four years seems to be the most acceptable interval for the first child. No matter how early the child came, the mother reported it interfered with their marital adjustment, increasingly so, if unplanned. The most frequent complaint was the strain on finances (173).

Christensen and Philbrick (40) in examining the question of family size as a factor in marital adjustment found that success in controlling births is a more crucial factor than the number of children. It was the coming of the unplanned children which were found to be responsible for most of the difficulty. However, Farber and Blackman (55) failed to find support for this position. Reed, in the Indianapolis Fertility Study (157),
found an increase in marital adjustment with increasing success in controlling fertility according to the desires of the couple.

An unplanned pregnancy in a marriage where one or both of the spouses were students could add additional strain to the marriage. Finances could be a serious factor, both in the cost of having a baby and taking care of it after it was born, as well as housing. One or both spouses might have to quit school to work or decrease their academic course load in order to work. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 25: The occurrence of unplanned pregnancy after marriage is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Parents' marriage and role

As was discussed previously, marital-role expectations are derived first from the husband-wife roles of individual's parents. Researchers who have investigated the background factors in the lives of people and related these factors to success in marriage have concluded that young people are usually conditioned early in life in ways that will make them good or bad risks in marriage. Although the studies were made in different parts of the country, they produced many of the same conclusions concerning the background factors that make for happiness in marriage. Terman found the following circumstances most predictive of marital happiness:

1. Superior happiness of parents
2. Childhood happiness
3. Lack of conflict with mother
4. Home discipline that was firm, not harsh
5. Strong attachment to mother
6. Strong attachment to father
7. Lack of conflict with father
8. Parental frankness about matters of sex
9. Infrequency and mildness of childhood punishment
10. Premarital attitude free from disgust or aversion toward sex (171, pp. 110, 111).

The most significant factors were those concerned with the happiness of the parents' marriage and the relationship of the child with his parents. People from homes where the parents had happy marriages, and from homes in which a satisfactory relationship existed between parents and their children, learn the traits of "marriageability" (171). People reared in homes in which the parents were unhappy and in which there was constant friction did not have this opportunity.

Landis (106) found that divorce tends to run in families. Reports from approximately 2000 students at the University of California concerning the marital records of their parents, grandparents, and aunts and uncles showed a significantly greater proportion of divorces in the families whose grandparents had divorced than in families whose grandparents had remained married.

From this research it can be concluded people are conditioned by their family background in ways that affect their marital adjustment. Based on the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 26: The degree of happiness of the parents' marriage is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Decision-making and role

The prevailing value in middle-class families in the United States is that husband and wife decide most things together (123). "Marriage is a fifty-fifty proposition" is a common slogan. This value is held by the married and those who plan to marry, although perhaps with greater strength
by the latter group. On the other hand, the value is more strongly held in some areas of decision than in others. Specifically, equalitarian norms seem to apply most strongly in child rearing, social participation, and recreation, and to a lesser degree in financial management and household tasks (173). Of the several investigations of family decision-making, equalitarian-democratic decisions have been prevalent in most segments of the population (11). It might be supposed that Catholic families would be more husband-dominated than other groups in the population, but Blood and Wolfe (11) did not find this to be true.

The kind of decision-making structure a marriage develops is closely related to the satisfaction the couple finds in the marriage. Good marital adjustment and satisfaction with the marriage are found most often in couples with democratic-equalitarian patterns of behavior, and least frequently with one spouse dominating the other (123). More particularly, a wife-dominant authority relationship is associated with the lowest satisfaction of all (11).

However, Blood and Wolfe (11) reported it was not the wife-dominance which created the unhappiness of the couples. Rather, it appears that the dominant wife "exercises power regretfully by default of her 'no good' or incapacitated husband" (11, p. 45). However, Jacobson (88) found that divorced females have very high female-equalitarian attitudes toward marital roles, while divorced males have very high male-dominant attitudes. In view of the cited research it can be concluded there is a relationship between the decision-making patterns of a couple and the degree of marital adjustment of a couple. The following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 27: The degree of equalitarian decision-making in
a couple's marriage is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 28: The degree of husband dominating in decision-making in a couple's marriage is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 29: The degree of wife dominance in decision-making in a couple's marriage is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Role-taking

This section of this chapter is concerned with one's accurate prediction of another's response, or what has been termed empathy or empathic ability, while others have interpreted it as role-taking. For the purposes of this dissertation it will be referred to as role-taking.

A study by Kirkpatrick and Hobart (97) involved 306 couples in various stages of intimacy from "favorite dates" to "married". The authors found that accuracy of role-taking increased with the degree of intimacy. This finding was reaffirmed in a later study by Hobart (78) involving 258 couples including those from "favorite date" through "married". Vernon and Stewart (175) came to the same conclusion in their study of 52 couples ranging from "just dating" to "being engaged". Thus, one can conclude from this research that role-taking accuracy is positively related to the stages of progressive association and intimacy.

A number of studies have been concerned with the relationship between accurate role-taking and marital happiness or adjustment. Dymond (52) in her study of 15 married couples found the two variables positively related. Buerkle and Badgley (15) found that two criterion groups, 36 families in
"trouble" and 186 couples "not in trouble", were clearly differentiated on role-taking accuracy. Hobart and Klausner (79) in their study of 59 married couples observed that: (1) The female's role-taking accuracy was more related to marital adjustment than the male's; (2) Role-taking was related to marital adjustment when the role-taking involved personality characteristics, but was not related when it concerned opinions about marital roles; and (3) Role-taking accuracy was negatively related to marital role disagreements. Locke, Sabagh, and Thomas (117), in their study of 126 couples, found no relationship between marital adjustment and accuracy of role-taking. It is difficult to resolve these conflicting findings for the following reasons: (1) The studies by Dymond, Hobart, and Klausner involve smaller samples and were perhaps more biased than the other studies; (2) The study by Buerkle and Badgley was unique in that it had an outside criterion of marital adjustment, while the other studies relied in marital adjustment scales; and (3) The study by Locke, Sabagh, and Thomas attempted to obtain a more random sample and thus their findings cannot be easily dismissed.

However, it would seem the more accurate one spouse could perceive the attitudes and feelings of the other spouse, the more that spouse would be able to adjust in order to make the marriage more enjoyable. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 30: The degree of accuracy in role-taking is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
Satisfaction is a key concept in the present study. It is recognized that satisfaction is more readily perceived than defined, thus making an explanation of the concept difficult. However, this does not preclude the possibility of its definition. The concept will first be discussed in general terms; following this a conceptual model will be evolved showing the relation between marital adjustment and satisfaction. In conclusion the general hypothesis will be stated.

Concept of satisfaction in general

Webster's New International Dictionary (p. 2220) defined satisfaction as "the relatively quiescent condition resulting from the fulfillment of a need or desire". Aiken (p. 40) refers to satisfaction as any activity which is "generally free from irreconcilable conflict, free from frustration, free from want in the merely privative sense...." It is assumed a person could be satisfied with one aspect of something while not satisfied with other aspects of the same thing. It is also assumed that satisfaction can exist on a continuum from very strong satisfaction to very weak satisfaction to very strong dissatisfaction.

Satisfaction and the social system

In order to make an individual perform the acts required by the social system it is necessary to establish a correspondence between the needs of the individual and the behaviors constituting the system. The individuals must be able to satisfy at least some needs through their activities within the system. Krech and Crutchfield state:

For most groups it can be safely generalized that group membership serves a function for the individual. Through
The motives of the participants in a social system needed to carry on the process may be classified into: (1) Satisfaction derived from the behavior of the system; (2) Satisfactions derived from the outside which would stop if the process stopped; and (3) Inertia, habitual behavior of the individual.

Krech and Crutchfield (101, p. 384) emphasize the differential satisfaction of needs. The needs of the most dominant members of a social system are more adequately satisfied than the needs of the less dominant members. Various distributions of dominant and non-dominant members and various kinds of dominance exist in social systems. However, greater satisfaction for the dominant members appears in all groups. As long as the less dominant members obtain sufficient satisfaction from the system to keep them from quitting or withdrawing from the system, they will not receive much more satisfaction. The more dominant person, however, has possibilities to arrange things so he or she gets much more satisfaction out of their activities.

Irrespective of how satisfactions are distributed among the members of a group, the satisfaction of each member must be great enough to provide him with the motivation to continue the interpersonal relationship within
the social system. The degree to which such satisfaction is provided determines the cohesiveness of the social system.

The changes that exert influence on the direction of increasing the satisfaction of the members of the system may be defined as forces toward cohesiveness or unity of the system. Relatively stable conditions which are accompanied by a fairly high degree of satisfaction with the roles among the members are also considered cohesive forces. According to Koos' study of *Families in Trouble* (100) the most important cohesive forces are believed to be:

1. The greater the number of members that accept the activities and the end-result of the social system as a positive value, the higher they rate this value, the stronger is the unity of the system.

2. The stronger the tendency of the individuals to rate the activity and the end-result of the social system as a higher value than values they achieve for themselves, the stronger is the unity of the system.

3. The more of the individual's needs that are met within a system, the more cohesive is the system.

4. The tighter the emotional attachments to the other members of the group and the looser they are to members of other groups, the more cohesive is the group.

The emotional attachments appear to play an important function in keeping a social system together. By disruptive factors is meant the reversal of the conditions that are called cohesive forces. Cohesive forces are defined as those conditions that are accompanied by at least a small amount
of satisfaction on the part of the members of the system. Of course, both cohesive and disruptive forces may come from within and from outside the system, and they may also be characteristics of the individuals or of the system.

If more cohesive forces are at work in a social system, the greater would be the possibility of it functioning better, thus withstanding pressures from the outside. If disruptive forces are at work, tensions are created in the system and it functions with difficulty and the probability that the functioning will cease or deteriorate is increased. If the disruptive forces are strong and lasting enough, actual deterioration of the functioning will occur. The system is said to be disorganized and eventually it may be dissolved. If there is a certain supply of internal cohesive forces in a system so that a disruptive pressure from the outside can appear without disturbing the functioning of the system too much, it is said that the morale of the group within the social system is good.

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to enter into the problem of the maintenance of social systems. Rather the preceding discussion was included in order to show theoretical importance of the satisfaction derived from the interactional process within a social system.

Satisfaction and marriage

Many different needs are satisfied in a marriage. Satisfaction is derived from different areas, and these satisfactions may be classified according to the areas from which they are derived. In this dissertation the main category of satisfaction derived from marriage, marital satisfaction, will be divided into Karlsson's (89) subdivisions with reference to the different areas affecting marital behavior. These categories do not
cover all the areas in which marital satisfaction is produced, but are believed to include the major areas. These areas may be delimited in the following manner:

1. Emotional satisfaction is derived from acts showing affection, love, good will, friendliness. It is also derived from acts indicating there is security in the receipt of emotional support.

2. The status satisfaction is derived from acts such as praising, rewarding, approving, complimenting, enthusiasm, admiration, and respect.

3. The sexual satisfaction in this dissertation denotes pleasure derived from the sex act between the married couple.

4. Economic satisfaction is derived from two sorts of activity: (a) production of work in or out of the home; and (b) consumption including actual consumption of goods and the activities directly connected with this consumption, for example, the eating of food, and the using of the house for leisure activities. With regard to both these categories of activities satisfaction may be derived in two ways: either from the activity itself (the interaction) or from the economic result of the activity (amount of economic value produced or consumed).

5. Child rearing as a source of satisfaction may also be regarded as consisting of two parts: (a) the interaction between parent and child; and (2) the end product of the interaction displayed when the child reaches adulthood.
However, this dissertation is only going to take into account the interaction aspect of this source of satisfaction, not the end product.

6. Recreational satisfactions are a result of the activities which spouses indulge in during their leisure time in and out of the home.

Marital satisfaction, however, for both spouses becomes important only when affection and sexual outlets are not sanctioned outside the marital relationship, such as the conjugal family. Hamilton (70), in his study of one hundred married men and one hundred married women, used the criterion of satisfaction to determine the success or failure of marriage. On the basis of answers to thirteen questions, Hamilton classified the degree of marital satisfaction of his two hundred cases into five large groups, graded from "A" to "E".

A. **Obviously successful marriages**: No significantly qualifying discontent or dissatisfaction with the marital situation on the part of either spouse.

B. **Fairly successful marriages**: More or less chronic elements of discontent or dissatisfaction which do not have, however, any apparently disruptive qualities, and which the spouse regards as overbalanced by the satisfactory features of the marriage.

C. **Marriages of doubtful success**: Persistent and irksome maladjustments upon which the spouse is focused in an effort to correct them, and which are associated with a higher degree of attachment between husband
D. **Intolerably bad marriages:** The spouses find the marriage to be overwhelmingly a source of discontent, dissatisfaction, and grievance, but have taken no steps toward terminating it.

E. Marriages which have terminated in separation or divorce or which have very low satisfaction scores.

From these findings, Hamilton concluded either husband or wife may be dissatisfied in a marriage where there is no conflict or incompatibility, or they may be highly satisfied in a union which has unsolved problems of adjustment. Conflicts present in a marriage do not necessarily mean that one or both members of a couple are dissatisfied. When conflicts are present, some of the factors making for dissatisfaction are present; however, other satisfying elements may be sufficiently powerful to serve as counteracting forces. Moreover, a couple may be satisfied, but one or both may be unhappy and incompatible. Similarly, a couple may be both harmonious and happy but not entirely satisfied. Satisfaction appears to Hamilton to be a resultant of the correspondence between the actual and the expected, or a comparison of the actual relationship with the alternative, if the present relationships were terminated. The status of being a married women may cause a wife to be satisfied with marriage, even though there are many conflicts in the marriage and she is unhappy. The inhibited and shy husband may prefer purgatory in marriage to the hell of the scandal of divorce and of the uncertainties of going from the frying pan into the fire of a second marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following general hypothesis is stated:
G. H. 2: The degree of satisfaction expressed by each spouse regarding various aspects of their marriage and surrounding factors will be related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

It is the purpose of this dissertation to investigate several areas of expressed satisfaction of the couples in regard to their marriage, and other relevant factors.

**Housing and satisfaction**

There were four categories of housing in this study: Pammel Court, Hawthorne Court, University Village, and non-university housing. Finances has been found in past research as the major strain in college marriages. It is, therefore, assumed that cost of housing, or values concerning finances, might very well affect where the couple lives.

As one views the various categories of married student housing at Iowa State University, it is observed that Pammel Court was built as "temporary housing" after World War II, but is still in use. The units are relatively small, the walls between the units are not very thick so sound-proofing is at a minimum, the units are definitely not attractive on the outside, many of the units are not attractive on the inside, and privacy appears to be at a premium because of the close proximity of neighbors. However, these units rent for only $32 - $38 per month. It could be possible for a couple to be very unhappy with their unit in Pammel itself, but the low cost of rent could override this dissatisfaction. Hawthorne Court costs more money ($80 per month), but does offer more privacy and there are children's playgrounds adjacent to the apartments. These apartments are also larger and more attractive. University Village, even though costing more, has the prestige of being the newest of the university housing.
The units in University Village are larger and bedrooms are upstairs, thus affording more privacy. As for non-university housing it could have been described as ranging from "slum-type" apartments to luxury apartments (University Towers).

However, regardless of where a couple lives, it can be assumed they want a place that could be described as "nice to come home to", and one in which they would feel comfortable to entertain friends. In addition, there would be the individual couple's needs regarding space for children, studying, hobbies, etc. The criteria for each couple concerning these factors would be individualistic. Likewise, one couple could be very satisfied to live in a particular apartment or unit, while another couple would not. Also, the degree to which a couple wants privacy from other couples, a life with or without close relationships with neighbors, could affect the satisfaction derived from the housing which they can afford or live in.

Barash (107) as cited by Landis, in a study of 74 married couples in which all the husbands were veterans immediately after World War II, found evidence of overcrowding and housing shortages in American colleges aggravated the couple's marital adjustment. However, Nygreen (143) at the University of Washington, in a study of 461 couples of which 86 percent of the men were veterans, concluded that lack of satisfaction with housing was not a major source of disturbance to married student couples.

Chambliss (32) conducted a study of 366 couples at the University of Georgia. The majority of 307 married male students and 59 married female reported complaints about housing conditions. It is this author's opinion that if a person is satisfied with where they are living, it will be re-
selected in other aspects of their life—in this case, their marriage. A college marriage would be a very opportune situation for each spouse to blame the other for the housing they were living in if they were not satisfied. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 31: The degree of satisfaction with housing expressed by the spouses is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Ames and satisfaction

Ames is not always viewed by students as the most "lively" place in the world to live. Whether this is true or not is not so important as the satisfaction one experiences with living in Ames, Iowa. Married college students very often view their stay as temporary, resulting in their not getting involved in community activities, and due to added extra responsibilities, they possibly do not become involved in campus activities. Therefore, other than work and school and activities arranged purely for married students, a married college couple could possibly have few outside activities in the community in which they live. Both wives and husbands could view the shopping facilities in Ames as limited, and could express discontent at having to "make-do" with what Ames offers or drive to another town for shopping.

If wives and husbands were dissatisfied with living in Ames, they could wish (overtly and covertly) that they could move, therefore affecting their marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 32: The degree of satisfaction with living in Ames expressed by each spouse is positively related
to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Evaluation of marriage and satisfaction

A person's satisfaction with their marriage is perceived as being expressed in their own evaluation of that marriage. This sub-concept was included in order to emphasize the relation of the individual's evaluation of their marriage to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the couple in their marriage.

Expressions of dissatisfaction with marriage are considered as one of the best indicators of marital maladjustment. Burgess and Cottrell (20) found one statement of a generalized attitude regarding a couple's marriage was a better index to marital unhappiness than specific complaints about one's mate and one's marriage. They concluded from this finding that the generalized attitude toward the marriage is of more basic significance than specific concrete disagreements or complaints. It is assumed a higher evaluation of one's marriage indicates higher satisfaction with that marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 33: The spouses' evaluation of their marriage is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

College marriage and satisfaction

Another manner which satisfaction with one's marriage might be expressed is the person's attitude regarding getting married again if they knew circumstances would be the same as their present circumstances. In this case, it would refer to the couple's or the individual's willingness to get married again if they knew the circumstances surrounding their col-
lege marriage would be as they presently are. Indirectly, this could be viewed as an indication of their satisfaction with one or both of them being enrolled in college while they are married. At the same time, the degree to which they would advise anyone else to get married under these circumstances could also be an indication of their satisfaction with their marriage.

Landis (102), in 1947, studied 544 couples at the University of Michigan; Christensen and Philbrick (40) studied 346 couples at Purdue University in 1950; and Eshleman and Hunt (53) studied 282 couples at the University of Michigan in 1960. All three research projects asked married students: "Knowing what you know now, would you marry before finishing college if you were unmarried?" In all the studies, three-fourths of the couples said they would marry while in college if they had it to do over again. The one-fourth who would not, or who were uncertain, felt there had been too many difficulties in earning a living, finding housing, and in doing satisfactory college work. Although these were the reasons given by those who would hesitate to try a college marriage if they had it to do over again, other factors revealed by the research suggest that the real reasons were much deeper. Many of the couples who doubted the wisdom of their college marriages felt dissatisfied with their marriages for other reasons. If they had waited to marry until after college, they might not have married the same person at all. The Christensen-Philbrick study showed a much lower happiness rating among those who would hesitate to marry while in college if they had to do it over again. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypotheses are stated:

S. H. 34: The degree to which the spouses hold the atti-
tude of college marriage helping one to do better work is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 35: The degree to which the spouses hold the attitude of getting married under the same circumstances is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 35: The degree to which the spouses hold the attitude of advising their child to get married under circumstances similar to theirs is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Satisfaction with present life

When an individual compares where he is with where he thinks he ought to be relative to standard of living, his definition of the latter will naturally affect his degree of acceptance of the former. The unmarried student probably thinks of his present standard of living as temporary, not entirely of his own making (although of his own choice because of his subordination of standard of living to academic achievement), the best that he and/or his parents can do under the circumstances and something that will change once he gets his degree. His standard of living is not radically different from that of many students about whom he knows. Living on a limited income is commonly accepted among students.

The married student, on the other hand, when comparing his present standard of living with that which he feels he ought to have, is sometimes less likely to fit himself into the general college atmosphere and more likely to compare what he has with the standard of living of married couples in his socio-economic class. He operates within a different framework. His present situation, then, may seem replete with limitations and depriv-
tions and is less likely to be accepted without stress and strain. For example, an unmarried girl who would get along well on a minimum standard financed by her parents and/or her own employment, may be discontent with the same standard when financed in part by a husband. Being married may give her a different aspiration level on the basis of which she appraises her present standard and finds it wanting. Similarly, a male student may get along well with minimum income while he is unmarried and dating, but shifts his basis for comparing where he is with where he thinks he ought to be when he marries. Once married, the husband may feel he is to provide a standard of living for a wife, and perhaps for children, in a way which reflects upon him as a man. These are broad generalizations, and are probably not applicable to all married students, but are regarded as important enough to affect the degree of marital adjustment which a couple has achieved in their marriage.

Much that is included in the experience of the campus couple is temporary. For example, they struggle for an education, knowing that when they have completed it they will start again, perhaps "at the bottom". Young couples like to establish homes, accumulate household goods, to improve or even buy their place of residence. The campus couples sometimes have substandard housing. They usually cannot afford to purchase many household items because they do not have the money and because they know that they will have to pay for moving them. They often take little interest in improving their place of residence because they know they will not live in it very long. Couples usually like to begin to build a circle of mutual friends. The campus couple knows that any friends they make will in all probability be left behind, or will leave them behind, when education
Sometimes married students sacrifice too much of the present for what they think of as the future (Mead). They may think too much of the life they hope to have after the education is finished and the husband, or both, can begin to work and to make their living. It is viewed in this dissertation that the degree to which a couple (or spouse) feels they are having to live for the future, rather than living for the present, will affect their marital adjustment. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 37: The degree to which an individual is satisfied with their present life is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**Satisfaction with "going out"**

The frequency which couples go out would vary from couple to couple. Some couples could be described as "home-bodies", while others could be described as "gad-abouters". Several authors (Burgess, Blood, Landis, and Locke) all report the desire of couples not to "go out" indicates happier marriages than if they desire to "go out". However, regardless of the frequency they desire to go out, some couples or individuals may desire to go out more or less often than they do. This degree of satisfaction a person expresses concerning the frequency they get to go out would not necessarily be an indication of frequency.

Most studies agree married students do not participate extensively in campus activities. Nygreen in the 1950 study at the University of Washington concluded:

Consistent with our expectations, married students tend not to participate widely in the campus social program.
Traditionally, the campus social structure is designed for single students. It is expected that married students would find this less satisfying than would single students. The data confirm this. (143, p. 154)

Other authors agree with this finding. Lantagne, as cited by Landis, found the married student participated in more adult types of social functions, rather than campus activities at the University of California. However, at Michigan State University it was reported undergraduate married men participated in student organizations about the same as unmarried undergraduate men (107). However, he did find the married undergraduate students participated less in outside campus activities than did the married men.

Chilman and Meyer (35) found significantly less time was spent in any form of recreational activities by married students than by unmarried students. In view of the findings of these studies, the conclusion is drawn that married college students do not take part in social activities, campus and off-campus, to the degree that unmarried students participate in these same activities.

If a spouse were dissatisfied with the frequency they get to "go out", feelings of being "trapped" into this life could develop. Therefore, these feelings could affect the marital adjustment of the couple. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 38: The degree of satisfaction expressed concerning frequency each spouse gets to go out is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Contraception and satisfaction

The vast majority of couples in Freedman's study (58) had used, were using, or planned to use contraceptives. Many of these couples had not
used contraception from the beginning of marriage, however. About half of all users did not begin until after the first pregnancy and some eighteen percent did not begin until after at least the second pregnancy. By the latter part of the child-bearing period, virtually all couples were either contraceptive users or were classified as subfecund.

It appears from Freedman's study that many couples begin marriage without having given serious consideration to the use of contraception. Some seventy percent of the couples who had at least one pregnancy before they used contraceptives reported that they wanted the pregnancies they had under these circumstances. Most of the others were "surprised" that the first pregnancy appeared so early. Some of the couples did not experience a pregnancy even though contraception was not practiced and subfecundity became evident.

As marriages progress, the use or non-use of contraception is related to fecundity status. The likelihood that contraception will be used increases with each succeeding pregnancy. When all the couples in Freedman's study were considered, eighty-one percent had used some form of contraception. When only the fecund couples were considered, eighty-nine percent had used some form of contraception.

According to Calderone (26), the acceptability of a contraceptive is concerned with the psychological reactions of the user to it—that is, willingness to use it and the absence of annoyance, frustration, or other unpleasant emotionalism connected with its use, as distinct from the effectiveness of the method. The condom is frequently preferred by lower-class and other females with anti-sex attitudes because it protects them from physical contact with the semen. The way it works is comprehensible to the
uneducated because of its visibility, and there can be no doubt as to when it is properly in place. Females may also prefer it because it does not require them to do anything. A few Catholic wives will allow their husbands to use condoms because then the wife is not "practicing" contraception. Men often object to the condom because of its interference with sensation during coitus. It cannot be put in place ahead of time and sex play must be interrupted to apply it.

The female's pill actual acceptability to various social groups is not known, but it is viewed as being widely acceptable. It is estimated over 6,000,000 women in the United States are taking the pill at this time. It requires no action at the time of intercourse, does not change behavior or sensation in any way for the majority of women, and does not require immediate action after intercourse. The pill's acceptability is limited by three factors. First, many women will not tolerate its side affects; secondly, it requires a careful woman who never misses a day in taking the pill, who never runs out of pills, and who can always remember whether or not she has taken one; and third, the pill's action is not visible or comprehensible to the user and must be taken largely on faith. This would limit its use among the uneducated.

The diaphragm, before the introduction of the pill, was the most widely used method of contraception by educated women. It does not affect the sensations of intercourse and can be put in place routinely beforehand so that it need not interrupt foreplay. On the other hand, it requires some knowledge of her own anatomy on the part of the woman and an accurate idea and how and where conceptions take place to give confidence in its use. It requires a trip to the doctor for fitting which is embarrassing to some
women. It requires a willingness to make a manual insertion in the vagina which is often offensive for women with negative attitudes toward their genitals. It requires accurate placement. For most middle-class women, these requirements are easily met. For others, its acceptability appears to be limited.

Withdrawal appears to be very limited in acceptability in this country. Its simplicity of use is counterbalanced by the fact that it requires termination of intercourse at precisely the most enjoyable instant for the male. It is said on the basis of clinical comments that the method results in psychological disturbance to the users and generally unsatisfactory coitus, but no systematic evidence is available to corroborate this.

The douche gets its acceptability largely from the obviousness of its action by "washing away" the sperm and from its ability to give some women freedom from a feeling of "uncleanness" resulting from sexual intercourse. On the other hand, it requires prompt removal of the partner and immediate action for effectiveness which is probably experienced as an interruption for some people, much in the same way as withdrawal.

The rhythm method of contraception has the acceptability of the pill in many ways (its action cannot be seen, it requires careful planning and record keeping). However, it has drawbacks of its own. In the case of the women with a very regular menstrual period, the rhythm method requires sexual abstinence for eight days in the middle of the period. For those with any irregularity of period, the necessary abstinence for the fertile period combined with the menstrual period (which most couples avoid) can easily amount to restriction of coitus during two weeks of the month. For those with low levels of sexual interest this may present no problem, but
for most couples it will be experienced as sexual deprivation.

The acceptability of a form of contraception for a spouse is assumed as definitely reflected in the degree of satisfaction which a period expresses regarding the method of contraception a couple uses and in turn affect the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 39: The degree of satisfaction expressed by the spouses concerning the form of contraception they are using is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Communication

Interaction implies—indeed, consists of—communication. Communication may be explicit or tacit. Explicit communication is usually verbal, although communication may also use other conventional symbols. It may be used to convey correct or incorrect information to clarify or to mislead, to enlighten or to deceive. Information is fundamental to all human adjustments, and explicit communication is basic to any form of adjustment which seeks to persuade or cajole or bargain.

Tacit communication, by way of body movements or "strategic moves" is particularly important in sexual adjustment as verbal communication in this area is impossible for many people (27). A vast amount of communication in the sex life of a couple is tacit, but tacit communication also exists in other parts of the marriage. The basic process of communication is the same in all cases. The basic process will be described and then the conditions for adequate development of communication will be briefly analyzed.

The purpose of communication is primarily one of transmission of sym-
bols. By the use of symbols items of information such as role-expectations, intentions, feelings, love and respect are communicated from one spouse to another. As the marital process goes on, information symbols are created within the spouses. At any time, some symbols will be more clearly relevant than others. Thus, the number of elements in the set of relevant information symbols is a measure of the information within the source. In this way, there are different amounts of information generated at different times.

The interpersonal communication system consists of the following:

1. An information source which produces information items.
2. A selector which determines whether the items will be transmitted or not.
3. A sender translator which translates the information items into symbols.
4. Transmitter, channel, and receiver. The transmitter consists of those parts of the body which produce words or any other kind of behavior revealing information items. The channel is the sound and light waves in the air. The receiver is the sense organs receiving these waves. For the purposes of this dissertation, the emphasis is on what happens before the symbols are transmitted and after they are received.
5. A receiver-translator which translates the symbols into information items.
The destination of the communication

There is no means of directly observing the concepts of information source, selector, translators, and destination. The preceding description deals with communication in one direction. However, it is assumed that communication goes in the other direction and the whole process is repeated.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the information source would be the individual spouse with his role-expectations, intentions, and feelings. These factors constitute the raw material for the communication. The focus of this study is if and how they are communicated. The other components of the communication process are operations performed on the information items derived from the source resulting in a reduction of the number of items coming through or a distortion of their meaning.

The selector is an operation performed by the communicator. The selector determines to which of two sets an information item belongs—those that should be communicated and those that should not. He then possibly transmits those items that should be communicated.

The sender-translator performs the operation of translating the message into signs which are conveyed to the other spouse as symbols of the message. This translation may be perfect and if so, no information is lost by the operation. It may also suffer from defects, therefore losing information. One defect is when translation does not occur at all either because the sending spouse is incapable of translating the information into symbols or because he is inhibited from performing the operation. The result in both cases is that the message involved is not adequately understood by the receiver.

Another defect may be that the symbols are deficient. The symbols may
have more or less of what is known as "semantic inadequacies", such as re-phasing because of tabus, generalizations. The semantic defects will result in the receiving of a message other than the intended.

The receiver-translator works in a way corresponding to the sender-translator, only it is performed by the receiver of the information. It prevents the reception of certain messages through inattention to those things the receiver does not want to hear or a form of cognitive dissonance. The receiver-translator may also change the meaning of some items according to his selective perception, based on belief, values and/or former experiences.

The added effects of all these operations are that some items never go through at all because of selection, incapacity and/or inhibition in the sender and selection in the attention of the receiver. Other information arrives in a changed form because of semantic distortions in sender and receiver.

The communication will have various degrees of adequacy under different conditions. The efficiency of the selector is dependent upon the judgment ability of the selecting person. He has to make a judgment of which items to communicate and which not to communicate. It does not seem too unreasonable to assume that his judgment will be better if he has higher intellectual capacity in general, a greater practical knowledge of how to deal with people, and is emotionally in balance (73).

When the information comes to the translators, there could be the incapacity to translate the information into symbols or to understand these symbols. This incapacity in verbal communication is thought to accompany the lack of intellectual capacity in general (167).
The inhibition for not communicating and selective inattention could be viewed as parallel mechanisms. Regarding some kinds of information there are social tabus against communicating or receiving these kinds of information. This inhibition could vary with the social background of the spouses. Special psychological inhibiting mechanisms should also be taken into account. These may be of a more permanent nature, that is neurotic anxiety, or of a more temporary nature, tensions between the spouses. Tensions may also belong to the more permanent set of mechanisms.

In regard to the selective inattention, it will increase with the extent to which the receiver is unprepared for the information he received. Thus, it may be decreased by a change in the communication process itself, introducing preparatory messages and sending each message repeatedly by different signals.

The final area to be discussed is that of semantic inaccurateness. It is particularly important in verbal communications. Some of the semantic shortcomings are due to generalizations, vague terms, unusual terms not defined, and rephrasing because of tabus. Semantic inaccurateness could be due to inadequate structure of the symbol system used for the communication, but also due to the lack of experience and mastery of the system. A decrease in the semantic disturbances might also be affected by sending more signals for each item of information or by rephrasing the information. On the whole, semantic disturbances could be of relatively small significance for marital communication due to the fact that much of marital communication is non-verbal, and semantic inadequacies are chiefly connected with verbal language.

Throughout this discussion of communication, one can readily see the
parallel between this exchange of verbal and non-verbal symbols and the processes involved in role-taking and role-learning in the process of interaction.

Communication and marital adjustment

Communication in marital interaction is assumed to be sufficiently important to be given a more expansive treatment. In marriage there are at least three different problems of communication. One is the communication role-expectations so that the spouses are informed about the degree and direction of the adjustment they are required to make. Communication of role-expectations is a necessary prerequisite for adjustment. If the communication is inadequate, the spouses do not know what to adjust to, in what direction, or how much to adjust.

Another problem is to communicate from one spouse to the other the feelings of love and tender emotions that each spouse has for the other. The third type of communication which facilitates marital adjustment is that of communication of intentions. In order to perform the process of marital interaction efficiently, it is necessary for spouses to be able to predict what the other one will do.

Communication of plans and contexts of single acts may also be necessary in those cases where the act is part of a larger role-segment which is acceptable to the other spouse, but where the act is dissatisfying to him when it appears out of context. This dissatisfaction may occur unnecessarily because of lack of communication.

With regard to communication of role-expectations, it is assumed that differences between role-expectations will occur in a marriage situation. Marital role-expectations of the spouses are so complex and so varied that
it is impossible to hope for complete correspondence between the spouses. Some expectations will be relatively easy to change and others relatively difficult to change. Communication of dissatisfactions in order to enable the other spouse to minimize these dissatisfactions is a prerequisite for all adjustment. However, communicating dissatisfactions which one spouse has already accepted as inevitable would create dissatisfactions in the other spouse without any compensating increase in satisfaction.

According to Peterson (149), being able to adapt to another person depends largely on understanding that person's needs and expectations. Unless role-expectations are communicated in engagement and marriage, neither person will learn how the other needs to adjust (89). The basic need for affection in marriage will not be met unless the marriage partners are able to communicate their sentiments of devotion and tenderness.

Karlsson stated:

In order to perform the marital operation efficiently it is necessary for the spouses to be able to predict what the other one will do next. Such prediction requires communication on intentions. (89, p. 33)

Karlsson (89) developed an index to measure the degree of communication between a couple. He investigated a number of items, such as talking about children, work or finances, appreciating the work of the mate, criticizing the mate, praising the mate, or playing with children. He then inquired as to the change in the behavior of each spouse which was expected by each spouse. The degree of communication was a composite of the degree to which each spouse understood the wishes of the other. The communication index showed a high correlation with marital adjustment. He concluded this indicated an association between communication and marital adjustment, and that the communication index could be used in predicting marital adjust-
Locke (115) also measured the relationship of communication to marital adjustment. He investigated items dealing with face-to-face communication, loss of unity through decline of communication, sympathetic understanding, frequency of kissing, talking things over together, and engaging in outside interests together. His index of items included that of affectional communication as well as verbal. His conclusions support that of Karlsson:

> Intimate, friendly, and prolonged communication between husband and wife tends to weld them together, whereas a decided decline in this type of communication tends to break up existing attachments. This conclusion was supported, in part, by items in the questionnaire, but was supported to a much greater extent by the case materials secured in the interviews. (115, p. 246)

Waller wrote that communication is a stabilizer of interaction for an engaged couple:

> Since there is so much to learn, so many differences to be accepted, understood, and accommodated, and since pluralistic ignorance (the uncertainty of each concerning the real attitudes of the other) has so completely characterized dating and courtship relations, communication becomes a major process of stabilization in engagement. (179, pp. 236-237)

Udry stated the relationship between the amount of communication between spouses and the marital adjustment of a couple is weak. However, he stated:

> It has been widely observed that in disturbed marriages there is frequently a decline in communication and communicative efforts between husband and wife. Yet, it is almost certainly a mistake to assume that it is the lack of communication which has disturbed the marriage. Rather, the knowledge of sociologists suggests it is the other way around: disturbances in the relationship are caused by adverse reaction to the content of husband-wife communication and inhibit further communication as a defense against further damage. (173, p. 279-280)
On the basis of the previous discussion, it is assumed there is a need for further research in the area of communication and marital adjustment. For the purposes of this dissertation the following general hypothesis is stated:

G. H. 3: The degree of communication between the couple is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Talking things over

Communication is a favorite nostrum for ailing human relationships. Business executives are sure their enterprises would be more successful if only there were better communication. Young couples about to be married are convinced their marriages will never break up "because we can talk to each other, because we can discuss our problems together" (173). The assumption behind these beliefs is that many, if not most, problems exist because people do not communicate and therefore do not understand each other. It has already been stated that research regarding communication in marriage does not agree as to the relation between communication and marital adjustment. Some researchers have shown weak evidence for there being a relationship between the amount of communication and marital adjustment (74). However, Locke, Sabagh, and Thomas (117) found there were very meaningful correlations between primary communication and marital adjustment.

However, infrequency of communication between a couple could indicate each spouse knows how the other feels about a particular subject. It could also indicate if there was once disagreement between them concerning a particular subject, the disagreement has been settled; therefore, there is no need to discuss these topics.
Also, infrequency of communication could result from "selective communication". There are some thoughts and desires and attitudes which could be considered destructive to the marital relationship when communicated. Landis (107), in his 1967 study of 581 couples, found two-thirds of the husbands and wives reported that they avoided any discussion of their differences as one method of coping with differences. Some couples learn early in marriage that there may be no solution to a specific difference and that discussion of it only brings unhappiness. About 10 percent of the couples in this study reported seldom or never resolving differences with their spouses through discussion.

In view of the fact that the married college students in the sample for this study had been married a relatively short time in comparison to couples in previous studies which investigated the relationship between communication and marital adjustment, it is assumed these couples could still be in the process of discovering their areas of no-discussion in addition to the process of still discovering each other's attitudes regarding certain subjects. Based on the previous discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 40: The degree to which couples talk things over together is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Consensus

Sociological theory states that communication and other forms of interaction among human beings creates the consensus that is the basis of social organization and making interaction possible and purposeful. Many studies, with other than marital groups, confirm the function of interaction in gen-
erating consensus. From this sociologists have assumed that marital inter­
action also generated the consensus which was the basis of family harmony
(39). However, research does not show this to be true, and several studies
even show that husband and wife do not generate consensus or agree with one
another more, or see life more similarly as they are married longer. Such
evidence is offered by Kelley (91). Comparing attitudes toward marriage of
couples at engagement and after twenty years of marriage, Kelley was unable
to report a statistically significant trend toward similarity:

There was a slight trend but not statistically signifi­
cant tendency toward greater husband-wife similarity in
these specific attitudes after twenty years of marriage,
far less than one might expect on the basis of two
decades of close interaction and shared experience.
(91, p. 685)

It should be noted that his quote refers particularly to attitudes about
marriage itself. When the full range of attitudes on which couples were
tested is taken into consideration, the couples had actually become less
similar over the years (91).

Pineo (152), reporting on the twenty-year follow-up of the Burgess-
Wallin couples, found a substantial loss of consensus over twenty years,
including loss of consensus on finances, recreation, religious matters,
demonstration of affection, friends, table manners, conventionality, phil­
osophy of life, ways of life, ways of dealing with in-laws, and intimate
relations. The results of the studies of Pineo and Kelley both include
data on the same couples at different times.

However, research does show that the consensus of a couple is related
to their satisfaction with their marriage. Terman (171) found the degree
of agreement between the spouses is substantially related to the husband's
happiness and even more closely related to the wife's happiness. Terman did not think, however, that it was the disagreement or agreement which caused the happiness or unhappiness, rather the disagreement was only an expression of their unhappiness, rather than the cause of it. Burgess and Wallin (21) also reported a relationship between consensus and marital satisfaction but not as strong as Terman's. Uhr (174) suggested that among Kelley's couples there was a tendency for the happy couples to become more alike in outlook and for the unhappily married to become less alike, but the difference was not statistically significant.

Based on the preceding discussion, it can be concluded that common attitudes and consensus on matters of concern contribute to marital happiness and that the loss of this consensus is associated with dissatisfaction in marriage. With this conclusion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 41: The degree of consensus between a couple regarding certain matters is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Personal Characteristics

The final general concept to be discussed is that of personal characteristics. The concept will first be discussed in general terms followed by the statement of the general hypothesis. Next, the specific personal characteristics to be included in the study will be described and the derived sub-hypotheses concerning the relationship between the specified personal characteristics and marital adjustment will be stated:

**Personal characteristics**

Personal characteristics, in this dissertation, are defined as those characteristics external to the marital interaction processes of the
spouses. There is no attempt in this dissertation to separate the independent variable, personal characteristics, from the other major independent variables of role, satisfaction, and communication. Rather, personal characteristics are assumed to be interrelated with these aforementioned independent variables. Personal characteristics are assumed to be inferential. For example, various personal characteristics such as age, social class, educational level, and income could greatly affect the various roles which the spouses perform. Likewise, the degree of satisfaction expressed by each spouse regarding various aspects of their life and marriage could be influenced by personal characteristics, such as social class background. Communication could also be affected by various personal characteristics, such as educational level.

However, for the purpose of the present study the direct relationship of specified personal characteristics to marital adjustment will be investigated. This approach is assumed to facilitate the investigation of factors related to marital adjustment. However, within this investigation it is assumed specified personal characteristics are not only related to marital adjustment, but are also related to role, communication, and satisfaction.

There have been numerous studies conducted which investigated various personal characteristics in relation to marital adjustment. Burgess and Cottrell (20), Bernard (8), Burchinal (17), and other authors found age at marriage related to success in marriage. All studies agree that early marriages are more prone to divorce. Burgess and Cottrell (20), King (93), Locke (115), and others found the length of acquaintance of a couple positively related to the degree of success their marriage achieved. Also, the longer engagements were found to be positively related to better marriages.
Goode (62), Kephart (92) and other researchers found a positive correlation between social class and marital adjustment. However, Bernard (8) and Terman (171) found no relationship. Kirkpatrick (96) and Roth and Peck (159) found higher social class related to success in marriage. Blood and Wolfe (11), in their Detroit study, reported that wives were most satisfied when both husband and wife had equal education. Goode (62) and Kephart (92) found a positive relationship between income of the couple and marital adjustment.

From the foregoing review of past studies, it seems logical to hypothesize that marital adjustment is associated with certain situational characteristics, thus leading to the statement of general hypothesis:

G. H. 4: Selected personal characteristics of the spouses are related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

As personal characteristics is an inclusive concept, this dissertation will not attempt to study all the possible ramifications and implications. The following sub-concepts are subsumed under the general concept of personal characteristics in this study: (1) Age when married, (2) Length of acquaintance before marriage, (3) Length of engagement, (4) Social class spouses came from, (5) Social class differential between spouses, (6) Educational level of each spouse, (7) Educational difference between spouses, (8) Income level of the couple and (9) Length of time the couple has been married.

Age when married

Chronological age is a personal characteristic of the individual. It is assumed increased age is related to emotional and social maturity. The
younger people are when they marry the greater would be the likelihood of marrying in rebellion against parental authority, or forced into marriage by pregnancy (17). Also, the older a couple is when they marry, the less likely it is they would encounter financial hardships (110). Nearly all students show that marriages before eighteen for women and before twenty-one for men have lower adjustment and higher instability. Those who marry later are not as likely to divorce if their marriages are unhappy as those who marry early (106). As to the relative age of the spouses and the marital outcome, studies are inconsistent, with a majority showing a similar age of spouses is positively related to marital adjustment.

The long-time historical trend in age at marriage in the United States appears to be generally downward. In 1890, for example, the median ages at marriage were 26.1 for men and 22.0 for women (60). By 1950, these average ages at marriage had dropped to 22.8 for men and 20.3 for women. However, this long-time downward trend is viewed as being at an end as there were no further decreases between 1950 and 1960. In fact, there was a slight upward swing in 1964, when the median age for men was 23.1 and that for women was 20.5 (111).

Homogamy operates in age at marriage as indicated by the relative ages of brides and grooms. On the average, brides are 2 and 1/4 years younger than their grooms and in 10 percent of all cases, brides and grooms are of the same age. In three-fourths of all cases, brides are younger than their grooms, and in one case out of seven, the bride is older than the groom.

A number of studies have demonstrated that age at marriage is related to the happiness or adjustment subsequently achieved. The early Burgess and Cottrell (20) study of the prediction of marital success found that the
highest adjustment scores were made by men and women who were from 28 to 30 years old at the time of marriage. Intermediate scores were made by those who married in their mid-twenties and the lowest scores were made by men who married earlier than age 22 and women who married before age 19. Terman's (172) study of California couples also found that men who married before age 22 and women who married under age 20 were less likely to achieve marital happiness. More recent studies by Landis (106) confirmed these findings but tended to set the critical ages somewhat lower. In Landis' study of 409 marriages, the critical age was 20 for both men and women; and his study of 544 marriages, the critical age was 20 for men and 18 for women.

The same general findings are obtained when divorce rates are related to age at marriage. Locke's comparison of divorced and happily married couples found that the divorced men and women had married younger than their happily married counterparts. A much larger proportion of the divorced men had married before age 21, and of the women, before age 18. A study by Landis (104) of the marriages of the parents of 3,000 college students, found that the divorce rate decreased steadily as the age at marriage increased. One of the most comprehensive studies was done by Monahan (135), who tabulated data on 52,722 youthful marriages and 8,040 divorces in Iowa. This study confirmed the findings that very youthful marriages are more likely to end in divorce and that they break up sooner than other marriages. Monahan de-emphasized the influence of age after the age of legal majority, however, and accounted for the unfavorable experience of many very young marriages to factors other than age.

The general logic underlying these findings, of course, is that age
is related to emotional and social maturity (18) and in turn to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 42: The age of each spouse at the time of marriage is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Length of engagement

For most couples, engagement is a decision to marry for the couple as primarily a period of planning and preparation. The "testing and screening" is assumed to be "latent" function of engagement perceived by scholars who study courtship and plays little part in the couple's thinking. Today, there is more emphasis on the series of rituals and other activities during the engagement period. These activities emphasize the broader commitments the couple is to acquire and de-emphasizes the intimate erotic pair relationship, and has resulted in longer engagements.

Some people can get thoroughly acquainted during a relatively short period of time, whereas others may be engaged for years without having settled many of the questions that should be answered during the engagement period. However, the majority of research which has investigated the relationship of length of engagement to marital adjustment found that longer engagements are among the main factors predictive of happiness in marriage. All studies indicate that short engagements are more likely to be followed by poor adjustment in marriage and that the lowest percentages of very happy marriages are among those couples who were not engaged at all (106).

In comparing the length of engagements of a matched sample of divorced and happily married couples in Indiana, Locke (115) found short engagements
(under one month for men and under six months for women) more prevalent among the divorced, and relatively long engagements (twelve or more months) more prevalent among the happily married.

Burgess and Cottrell (20) found that as the length of engagement increased the average adjustment score was higher. Terman's (172) study, likewise, showed that very short engagements were unfavorable and long engagements were favorable to marital adjustment. From the cited research it seems logical to assume there is a relationship between the length of engagement and marital happiness. In view of the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 43: The length of the couple's engagement is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Length of acquaintance

Possibly related to marital adjustment is the length of time which the couple knew each other before marriage. According to Landis (107), it might be expected that short acquaintances would be followed by long engagements; however, the opposite seems to be true. Those who are acquainted longer before engagement tend to have the longest engagements (62).

The general consensus of research dealing with length of acquaintance before marriage and marital success is that the longer a couple has known each other, the better are their chances for success in marriage. Karlsson (89) found long premarital acquaintance was associated with marital satisfaction, and short acquaintance was associated with marital dissatisfaction for both men and women.

The data of Burgess and Cottrell showed a consistent pattern of a posi-
tive relation between length of acquaintance and marital compatibility. Two or more years was most favorable for good adjustment in marriage. Terman, however, reported that the "most striking thing disclosed by our data is the almost negligible relationship between marital happiness and length of premarital acquaintance" (171, pp. 97-98). However, he concluded that the data did seem to indicate that a short period of acquaintance is somewhat unfavorable for husbands and wives, and that a period of three or more years is favorable.

Locke (115) found that the percent of happily married and divorced men for given lengths of acquaintance were about the same, whereas married and divorced women differed considerably. However, the difference between happily married and divorced men was not statistically significant.

The above research seems to indicate there is some relationship between length of acquaintance and happiness in marriage, even though in cases the data is inconclusive. Based on the preceding discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 44: The length of time the couple was acquainted before marriage is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Social class differences

Few studies are pointed directly to answer the question regarding the marital success of people marrying in their own social class in comparison to those marrying outside their own social class. A number of studies report that "similarity of family background" is important in marital success, but not many of the items in the family background indices are direct indicators of social class. Burgess and Cottrell (20) stated that the more similar the spouses are in family background, the better the marital adjust-
Similarity of family background can be taken as a very indirect measure of similarity of socio-economic status. A study by Roth and Peck (159) specifically sought the answer to the relationship between social class similarity and marital adjustment, working with the data from the Burgess and Cottrell sample. They found substantially more couples who are married within their own social class are well adjusted than those who married outside their class. This research also indicates that the more difference there is in the class level of the spouses, the more likely it is that there will be poor adjustment in the marriage.

However, in the Roth and Peck study the 845 subjects classified by the researchers, more than 80 percent were classified by the researchers as upper middle and lower middle class. However, the data indicating lower adjustment scores for cross-class marriages applied only to husbands and wives who were rated as different in social class at the time of marriage. For the smaller sample who gave sufficient information about their parents to permit class ratings to be made on them, there was no relationship between social class level of the parents and the marital adjustment of their children.

Leslie and Richardson (111) attempted to investigate status endogamy and marital adjustment by studying a group of students who married while they were in college. These researchers reasoned that, while status endogamy may operate in the larger society, it might not be so effective in a virtually all middle-class atmosphere, in this cases a college campus. They reasoned that if parents tend to pressure their offspring toward endogamous marriage, such pressure might be less effective when students marry while they are away at college and subject to the democratic norms
that are conspicuous on most campuses. They found only a slight tendency
toward homogamy among those students who married someone whom they had
known at home before attending college and none at all among couples who
met and married while on the campus. Leslie and Richardson concluded that
the campus situation, by encouraging the association of persons of diverse
backgrounds within the middle class atmosphere through its formal demo­
cratic norms, appears to favor heterogamous pairings. These direct group
pressures operating on the campus appear to be at least as influential as
homogamy-oriented norms internalized earlier in life.

Coombs (44), studying married couples at the University of Utah, sup­
ported the idea that campus norms may favor status heterogamy while com­
munity norms favor status endogamy. He found that the incidence of status
homogamy was much higher when both parties to the couple lived at home dur­
ing courtship than when neither lived at home.

In view of the indications of the cited research of the slight influ­
ence cross-class marriages have on marital success and the leveling influ­
ence of the campus, the conclusion could be drawn that social class differ­
ences between spouses do not have any effect on marital success. However,
it is frequently suggested that it makes a difference which spouse is from
the higher social status. Blood (9) and Roth and Peck (159) both stated
that when the wife is from a lower class status than her husband the mar­
riage will work out well, whereas when the husband is from the lower status
than the wife, the marriage is ill-fated. Even though there is little em­
pirical knowledge as to the effect of the relative status of husband and
wife on marital adjustment, there are good theoretical reasons for expecting
marriages where the wife is of higher social status to be less successful
than if the husband is of the higher status. Students of social class point out that in the American stratification system, all members of a nuclear family occupy the same status position which is assigned primarily by the occupational status of the father-husband. Likewise, the family's style of life is primarily determined by the husband's status. Therefore, if a middle-class woman married a lower-class man, the family can expect to be lower class and surrounded by a cultural environment which generates marital instability. On the other hand, if a lower-class woman marries a middle-class man, she can expect to have a family which is middle-class and which is surrounded with a cultural environment supporting marital stability.

Additional difficulties for the cross-class marriage in which the wife is of higher status might be theorized on the basis of the patriarchal traditions of the society, which to some extent equate masculinity with superiority. When a wife has status characteristics superior to her husband, it might be presumed to make her husband feel less masculine and make him resent her. At the same time, it might be presumed that the wife would resent the husband's inferiority interfering with her prestige in the community. Marriages in which the wife is of higher status might theoretically be considered prone to fall into wife-dominant influence patterns, which have been found to be associated with marital unhappiness. In view of this foregoing discussion, the following sub-hypotheses will be stated:

S. H. 45: The wife being from a higher social class than the husband is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

S. H. 46: The husband being from a higher social class than the wife is positively related to the
degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Social class of parents

From Hamilton's study of 1929 to Monahan's study in 1955, there were fourteen studies which dealt with divorce rate and social class. The general consensus of these various studies was "it is best not to be poor" (164, p. 124). However, Bernard (8) and Terman (171) did not find any relationship between the two variables.

Overall, however, it can be assumed that the lower the social class the less stable the marriage. This is primarily attributed to the fact that the social and economic organization of lower-class life does not support marital stability. Lower-class marriages nearly always show lower marital adjustment. However, this could be because testing measures are organized around middle-class ideals of a good marriage. However, according to Landis (107), the lower-class couples are less likely to use divorce as an escape from a bad marriage than are middle-class couples.

Although it was stated in a previous section that college life exerts a homogenization effect on the different social class on campuses, it still seems possible that married college students exhibit status or class differences that affect their patterns of family adjustment. The lower-class married student could be acting in conformity with his social class norms while the married student from middle-class or upper-class background is deviating from his social class norms. Early independence, including early marriage, is one of the norms of lower-class culture (80). On the other hand, middle and upper-class culture stress the postponement of independence and the acceptance of a deferred gratification pattern which includes
a ban on early marriage. The lower-class youth is often poorly prepared for participation in college social life, and late marriage is contrary to the values of his parental home. Marriage thus represents both conformity to the parental pattern and a possible means of avoiding the insecurity engendered by the middle-class nature of campus social life. Youth from a higher class background might be expected to continue to show more of an interest in college social life, thereby contributing additional strain to their already busy schedules.

However, even though the lower-class youth might be following the norms of his class, he is in an environment of primarily middle-class values. From these facts, combined with the less likelihood that lower-class parents can aid their children after marriage financially and the fact that lower-class parents are not as apt to set forth an example of the marriage values of a middle-class culture the following sub-hypothesis will be stated:

S. H. 47: The social class of the parents of each spouse is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Level of education at the time of marriage

The relationships between education and marital success are well documented and the results are relatively consistent; the more education one has, the lower his probability for divorce and the higher his probability of good adjustment. Several major studies found positive relationships between educational level and marital adjustment (171, 21, 20, 115). However, Bernard (8), Kirkpatrick (96), and Geisman and LeSorte (59) did not find this relationship. All studies dealing with divorce agree the more years
of schooling, the lower the divorce rate (115, 135a, 162, 172).

Udry stated "... on practically any measure of success one cares to choose, the better educated have the most satisfactory marriages" (173, p. 329). This conclusion applies to both sexes. The better educated women are the more satisfactory are their marriages. Better educated women are more satisfied with the love and affection in their marriages (20) and are more responsive and more satisfied sexually (171, 94).

However, it cannot be assumed that education alone would make persons more successful in marriage. People with more education are more likely to get married later in life, have fewer children, and are usually in the higher income brackets; all of which have been found to contribute to successful marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 48: The educational level of each spouse, at the time of marriage, is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Educational level differences

Results of studies regarding the effect of different educational levels of the spouses on marital success are not consistent. Blood and Wolfe (11) reported the wives in their Detroit study were most satisfied when both husband and wife had equal education. The more the marriage departed from equality of education, the less satisfied were the wives regardless if it was the wife or husband who had more education. Studies using narrower ranges of educational level do not show any significant relationship between differences in education and marital adjustment (171, 21). Burgess, Locke and Thomas (25) reported the more similar the husband and wife in
educational level, the better they both liked marriage (25). Divorce rates based on differences in education are not so easy to obtain. The only study this author was able to find was by Landis (104) and is based only on the parents of college students. The pattern for these more than six thousand marriages is inconsistent in direction, and cannot be interpreted as indicating that marriages where both spouses are similar in education are any less prone to divorce than marriages in which the couples are quite heterogeneous with respect to education.

The conclusion can be drawn that closeness in educational level is possibly predictive of higher success in marriage. However, this author could find no research which dealt with the differential effect of the husband or wife having the higher education. It is commonly accepted in our society for the husband to have more education than the wife. Educational achievement is a measure of social class and as presented in the previous section on social class differences, all members of a nuclear family occupy the same status position which is assigned primarily to the father-husband. Furthermore, if the wife is of higher educational status, it would contradict the patriarchal traditions of our society which does equate masculinity with superiority. When a wife has status characteristics superior to her husband, it might be assumed this would be disturbing to both husband and wife because of its contradiction to traditional masculinity-femininity differences. Thus, the wife with the higher education might be presumed to make her husband feel less masculine and make him resent her. At the same time, the wife could resent the husband's inferiority interfering with her prestige in the community. Marriages in which the wife is of higher educational level might theoretically be considered prone to fall into the wife-
dominant influence patterns which have been found to be associated with marital unhappiness. According to Blood and Wolfe (11), the mate with the highest educational level has more influence than he otherwise would have. The influence edge is especially noticeable when one mate is college educated and the other is not (9). In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 49: The wife having a higher educational level is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Income

To get a more realistic estimate of a family's income, it would be desirable to consider both its money income and real income (inflow of goods and services to a family). However, in the present study the concern is only with money income. It is assumed that the values people hold vary by different social groups. Income is one of the important factors used in the classifying of people into different social groups. As social class in relation to marital adjustment has been discussed in previous sections of this dissertation, it is assumed there would be a relationship between the marital adjustment of the spouses and their income. It is recognized that families may have different demands on their money income due to differential family needs. However, an adequate income could be defined as enough income to meet the economic needs of a marriage and/or family. It seems logical that adequate income in a family would contribute much to the security of both spouses. Locke (115) found there were more people among his divorced group in the lower income brackets than in his married sample. Also, the lower income person is more apt to remain married unhappily than
the higher income person, due to the cost of divorce (106). Nevertheless, it can generally be expected that married college couples with higher incomes are more likely to have money to spend on recreational activities, a nicer place to live, and savings, than would those couples with a lower income. On the basis of the foregoing discussion of the possibility of income and marital adjustment being associated, the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 50: The income of the couple is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

Length of time married

Studies which have dealt with the level of marital adjustment of married couples over periods of time have not found consistent results. Lang (108) found that marital happiness tended to decline with the number of years married. However, Lang's data were only for the first sixteen years of marriage. Bernard also reported a negative correlation between length of marriage and marital happiness, but considered the relationship non-linear, fluctuating over the years (8). Terman shows that his couples' happiness declined during the first several years, but was inconsistent after that (171).

All the preceding studies were done by studying a single group of couples who differed in the number of years married. It could be that the older couples did not contract as happy marriages as the younger ones, so that the couples married most recently scored highest in happiness. Only two prominent studies have interviewed couples more than once in their marriage. Burgess and Cottrell (20) first studied couples during engagement, next during the early years of marriage, and a third time after eighteen to
twenty years of marriage. They showed a consistent decline in marital adjustment from the early years to the later years of marriage. The greatest decline was noted in the following areas: companionship, demonstration of affection, common interest, consensus, belief in the permanence of the union, and marital adjustment scores. However, according to Burgess and Locke (24), there was no change reported in the marital happiness, sex adjustment, rating of one's personality traits, and idealization of the mate's personality. Burgess and Locke concluded from these data that the spouses gradually grow apart over the years ("disengagement") but have not necessarily changed their reactions and attitudes toward their marriage or their mate. Pineo (152) interprets the Burgess and Locke data to mean that "a process of gradually reducing marital satisfaction or euphoria typically characterizes the marriage studied", but that this loss of marital satisfaction is not accompanied by the equal loss of personal adjustment.

The Burgess-Wallin couples who divorced between the first and second testings did not have significantly different mean engagement adjustment scores from the couples who remained married. In fact, the divorcing men actually had higher engagement adjustment scores than the remainder of the sample (152).

Most of the studies quoted here lead to the conclusion that loss of satisfaction is generally an inescapable consequence of the passage of time in marriage. In view of the foregoing discussion the following sub-hypothesis is stated:

S. H. 51: The length of time the couple has been married is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
The general theoretical orientation, general hypothesis, and sub-hypothesis have now been derived and stated. The next task is to develop operational measures for the concepts used in the hypotheses. This will be the major concern for the next chapter.
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter will focus on the methodological aspects of this study. In order to make the discussion more meaningful, this chapter is divided into four sections. The first section will present a brief description of the empirical setting of the study. The second section will focus on data collection, field procedures, and a summary presentation of some selected characteristics of the sample. The third section will consist of a detailed description of the procedures used to operationalize the theoretical concepts developed in the previous chapter. The final section of this chapter will describe the statistical procedure used in the analysis of the data.

Empirical Setting of the Study

Iowa State University of Science and Technology is located in Ames, Iowa. In the fall of 1967 there was a total enrollment of approximately 17,000 students. Included in this total were 2,983 married students.

Married students at Iowa State University live in two basic categories of housing: university and non-university housing. University housing is defined as those complexes of apartments which are built by Iowa State University and are supervised by the Office of Married Student Housing. Non-university housing is defined as all other housing which married students lived in at the time of this study. For the purposes of this study non-university housing was limited to that which was located within the city limits of Ames, Iowa or trailer courts adjacent to the city limits.

Pammel Court, Hawthorne Court, and University Village are the three types of university housing available for married students and some staff
members at Iowa State University. In addition, the Office of Married Student Housing estimates approximately one-third of the married students live in houses, apartments, and mobile homes in non-university housing. The present study was conducted in the three categories of university housing and the non-university housing.

**Pammel Court**

Pammel Court is located north of Iowa State University. At the time this study was conducted in June 1968, there was a total of 664 units (apartments) which were occupied by married students. The units in Pammel Court include both one bedroom and two bedroom apartments. Pammel Court, the oldest of all university housing for married students was built of wood and metal construction, primarily for the influx of married veterans and their families after World War II. It was described as "temporary housing". Apartments are rented unfurnished (except for refrigerator and stove) for $32 - $38 per month. Utilities (including electricity and heat) cost an average of about $13 - $15 per apartment per month.

**Hawthorne Court**

Hawthorne Court is located east and adjacent to Pammel Court, and north of Iowa State University. At the time this study was conducted in June 1968, there was a total of 194 apartments occupied by married students and their families.

The 194 unit apartments in Hawthorne Court were all two bedroom units. Hawthorne Court is of wood construction and was built in the early 1960's. Apartments are rented unfurnished (except for stove and refrigerator) for $65 per month. The cost of utilities (including electricity and heat) cost approximately $15 per month per apartment.
University Village

The University Village is located north of Pammel Court and Hawthorne Court and Iowa State University. At the time this study was conducted in June 1968, there was a total of 300 apartments constructed. An additional 200 apartments were under construction and plans include further expansion.

Of the 300 apartments which were occupied at the time of this study, 265 were two bedroom Town-House type apartments, 24 were two bedroom apartments, and eight were one bedroom apartments. This portion of University Village is of brick construction and was built in 1966. Apartments were rented unfurnished (except for refrigerator and stove) for $85 per month. The cost of utilities (including electricity and heat) is approximately $18 per month per apartment.

Non-university housing

The non-university housing of married college students in Ames, Iowa is varied in its location and approximate cost. The major portion of couples in the sample for this study lived in apartments, both in complexes and private homes, and in mobile homes. Very few couples lived in single dwelling units. Non-university housing was located in all sections of Ames and in trailer courts which are located adjacent to city limits of Ames. It is this author's estimate that cost of the apartments which the married students lived in, which were classified as non-university housing, varied from $50 to $200 per month. There was also a wide variation in size and age of mobile homes which were located in the various trailer parks.

Data Collection and Field Procedures

Two of the most common methods used for data collection in survey
studies are the interviews and the questionnaire. For the present study, personal contact combined with a self-administered questionnaire was considered most appropriate in order to safeguard against non-returns and incomplete responses.

**Development of the interview instrument**

The interview schedules (Appendix B) for obtaining the desired information was specifically designed for this study. The main purposes of the cover letter were:

1. To further introduce the interviewer to the respondent.
2. To elicit the respondent's cooperation.
3. To gain the confidence of the respondents and to assure the respondents that the information obtained would be kept both anonymous and confidential.

There were three categories of information which were sought in the interview schedule (questionnaire). The first category of the schedule contained questions to elicit background information such as student status, length of time the couple had dated, length of time married, educational attainment, family size and composition, age of family members, family income, and employment status of husband and wife.

A second category of questions in the schedule were those which elicited information concerning the couple's satisfaction with college marriages, the importance of education, satisfaction with place of residence, satisfaction with employment, attitudes about children, degree of communication between spouses, decision-making patterns of the spouses, and contraceptive methods and practices.

A third part of the schedule included A Test to Measure Adjustment in
Marriage. This test was developed by Ernest E. Burgess, Harvey J. Locke, and Mary Margaret Thomas (25). It includes areas of companionship, consensus, affection, satisfaction with mate and marriage, and sexual behavior.

In the interview schedule this marital adjustment test starts with Question 75 and ends with Question 96.

With the exception of questions concerning length of time married, age, occupation, father's occupation, and major (if a student), all questions were forced choice questions in which the respondents were asked to indicate their answer. There were no categories of "Don't Know" in the answers. The majority of the forced choice questions were on at least a four point continuum, and in cases up to 10 or 13 points. However, in a few instances there were dichotomous responses for some of the questions. There were different forms of the questionnaire for husband and for the wife.

The population

Designing a research study to obtain data for determining factors related to marital adjustment among married college students was undertaken by the author of this dissertation and the Sociology Department of Iowa State University.

The married students of Iowa State University were selected as the population for this study for the following reasons:

1. There had never been a study conducted which dealt with the marital adjustment or other factors characteristic of married students and/or spouses at Iowa State University.

2. Iowa State University has one of the highest percentages of married students of any university in the United States.

The eligibility requirements for inclusion in the samples of this study:
1. The husband and/or wife were enrolled as students at Iowa State University during the Spring Quarter of 1968.

2. The husband and/or wife were enrolled as students at Iowa State University during the Summer Session of 1968 or the husband and/or wife planned to be enrolled as students in Iowa State University during Fall Quarter, 1968.

3. Couples in which both spouses were born in the United States.

4. Couples in which both spouses were presently living in the home.

5. Couples who had been married for at least one month.

The above requisites were considered mandatory in order to control for factors related to marital adjustment, in order for couples to have gained some idea as to their attitudes toward their marriage and to have developed some pattern in their role interaction.

Choosing the sample

The couples interviewed were chosen from the various housing categories previously discussed in this chapter. The number of couples interviewed from each housing category was determined by the total proportion of married students which lived in that particular category of housing. A total of 200 couples (400 respondents) were interviewed.

In the fall of 1967 there was a total of 2,983 married students enrolled at Iowa State University. As stated before, the Office of Married Student Housing estimated approximately one-third of all married students live in non-university housing. This would constitute a total of 1,989 married students living in university housing and 994 married students
Table 2. University housing--number of households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing category</th>
<th>Total units</th>
<th>Percent of total university housing</th>
<th>No. households in sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pammel Court</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Court</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Village</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

living in non-university housing.

Therefore, in determining the sample, two-thirds of it was from university housing while one-third of the total sample came from non-university housing. Based on a sample of 200 couples, this would constitute 66 households from non-university housing and 134 households from university housing. The number of households picked, by stratified random sample, within each housing category and in proportion to the total number of units in that category of university housing, is shown in Table 2.

**Sampling non-university housing**

In order to choose 66 random households of married students living in non-university housing, the following procedure was followed:

1. A single list, in alphabetical order, of all married students living in non-university housing was compiled from the Fall 1967 Student Directory of Iowa State University.

2. Consecutive numbers, starting with number 1, were assigned to each person's name.

3. By using a Table of Random Numbers 66 married students were chosen.
4. An additional 50 married students were chosen which could be used as substitutes in cases where students were no longer eligible for the sample. In cases where substitutes were used, these were chosen in the consecutive order in which they were chosen. This method of substitution applies to all categories of housing.

It should be stressed this was the only part of the sample where the names of the respondents were involved. Therefore, in cases where couples had simply changed households, the interviewer was able to locate them.

Sampling university housing

In order to choose a total of 76 units by random sample within Pammel Court a map of Pammel Court, which was obtained from the Office of Married Student Housing, was used and the following procedure was followed:

1. The already assigned numbers (by the Office of Married Student Housing) for each unit in Pammel Court were transferred, in order, from smallest to largest, to a single list.

2. The author of this dissertation then assigned parallel numbers to each unit, in consecutive order, starting with number 1 being assigned to the smallest unit number, a number 2 to the second to the smallest unit number, and so on, through "664".

3. Using a Table of Random Numbers a total of 76 random units from Pammel Court were chosen.

4. An additional 50 units were chosen which could be used as substitutes in cases where the student was not eligible.
In order to choose a total of 25 units by random sampling within Hawthorne Court, a map of Hawthorne Court secured from the Office of Married Student Housing was used. The sample was drawn in the same manner as explained for Pammel Court.

In order to choose a total of 35 units by random sampling within University Village, a map of University Village which was obtained from the Office of Married Student Housing was used. The sample was drawn by the same procedure as previously explained for Pammel Court.

The interviewing

The author of this dissertation did the contacting of all the households in this study. The time duration of the first contact with the respondents was approximately ten to fifteen minutes. At that time the purpose of the study was explained, and the respondents' cooperation was requested. The importance of the couple not discussing the questionnaire before or during filling it out was stressed. Approximately 24 hours later the author of this dissertation returned to the various households to pick up the questionnaires. Respondents reported it took from 30 to 70 minutes to complete the questionnaire. The refusal rate of those couples contacted was less than 1 percent. However, five households had to be substituted in the university housing categories due to foreign-born students or couples who had been married less than one month living in the selected units. In non-university housing twenty households had to be substituted as couples had completed their schooling and/or had moved away from Ames.

Characteristics of the sample

Table 3 presents selective characteristics of the entire sample of the
Table 3. Selected characteristics of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no. of persons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>$X = 2.87$</td>
<td>2 - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total yearly income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in dollars)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1 - 999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$X = $4500</td>
<td>$1 - 999--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 1,000 - 1,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 2,000 - 2,999</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 3,000 - 3,999</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 4,000 - 4,999</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 5,000 - 5,999</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 6,000 - 6,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 7,000 - 7,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 8,000 - 8,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ 9,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 or more</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of wives:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$X = 22.8$</td>
<td>18 - 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age of husbands:
(in years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>19 - 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational attainment of wives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school completed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>00 - 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school completed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-college training beyond high school</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year or less college</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years college</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years college</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected characteristics</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07 Master's degree candidate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Master's degree completed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Doctorate candidate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Doctorate completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Postdoctorate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Educational attainment of husbands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00 Less than high school completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01 High school completed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>01 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Non-college training beyond high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 One year or less college</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 Two years college</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Three years college</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 College completed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07 Master's degree candidate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08 Master's degree completed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 Doctorate candidate</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Doctorate completed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Postdoctorate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Married College Student Study.

Operationalization of Concepts

Spouses are assumed to vary in the degree of marital adjustment which they have achieved in their marriage. The primary purpose of this dissertation is to investigate the relationships of various factors which is be-
lieved to be related to these different degrees of marital adjustment of
the individual spouses. In this section the theoretical hypotheses which
were stated in the preceding chapter will be operationalized and empirical
indices will be presented.

Four general hypotheses are generated from the rationale presented in
the preceding chapter. These hypotheses are:

1. The respective roles of husband and wife is related to the
degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual
spouses in their marriage.

2. Satisfaction is related to the degree of marital adjust­
ment achieved by the individual spouses in their mar­
riage.

3. Communication is related to the degree of marital adjust­
ment achieved by the individual spouses in their mar­
riage.

4. Personal characteristics of the spouses is related to the
degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual
spouses in their marriage.

The research problem presented in this section is that of moving the
concepts to more definite levels of terms in order for empirical investiga­
tions. Zetterberg (185) states a systematically interrelated set of propo­
sitions based on informative value should be used. Carnap (28) defines the
process of moving general concepts to more specific definite terms for em­
pirical investigation explication. Northrup (139) has called the relation­
ship between two different levels of a single concept an epistemic correla­
tion.
According to Goode and Hatt (63), the function of the operational definition is to more precisely define a theoretical concept by describing the operations which observe, measure, and record a given phenomena. The operational definitions make the concepts more explicit to other researchers.

In the remainder of this section a detailed description will be given of the procedures used in construction and operationalization of the theoretical concepts and the various epistemic correlations will be stated. In addition, certain personal characteristics related to marital adjustment will be operationalized by different indices.

In the general hypotheses there were five general concepts. These concepts are role, satisfaction, communication, personal characteristics, and marital adjustment. The various levels of communication, satisfaction, role, and personal characteristics may vary independently for different individuals. This variation in role, satisfaction, and communication may produce a variation in marital adjustment. For each of these independent variables the sub-concepts which are related to the general concepts are stated and operationalized.

The operational procedure used in the remainder of this dissertation will be as follows:

1. The major concepts and sub-concepts assumed related to each major concept will be stated.
2. The question from the research schedule (questionnaire) related to the sub-concepts will be stated.
3. The coding used to generate an empirical score for each question will be stated.

The variable common to all hypotheses is the dependent variable,
marital adjustment. Marital adjustment will be the first variable operationally defined and for which empirical measures will be presented.

**Marital adjustment**

For the purpose of measuring the degree of marital adjustment achieved by each respondent in this study, *A Test to Measure Adjustment in Marriage* by Burgess, Locke, and Thomas was used. In formulating this test the authors included the adjustment areas: permanence of the union, happiness of the husband and wife, satisfaction with the marriage, sexual adjustment, integration, consensus, and companionship.

These adjustment areas are viewed as interrelated, while at the same time in each area of adjustment there is a separate variable which differentiates each adjustment area from the other adjustment areas. Each adjustment area is important in determining the success of a marriage union. For this reason the authors viewed it as desirable to combine these areas into a single instrument. This would have the advantage of a representation of the entire marriage, rather than the selection of only one criterion which may not be significant in certain cases.

This test is an adaptation of the original Burgess-Wallin test of marital adjustment. However, the original Burgess-Wallin test consisted of approximately 246 items. This short test has been constructed and is viewed as reliable and valid as the longer and more complex adjustment indexes (118).

In this dissertation the individual is conceptualized as having achieved a level of marital adjustment in the process of interaction within the social system of marriage as previously discussed. Based on this premise various questions were used to determine the marital adjustment score
for each individual. The questions are grouped according to the different areas of marital adjustment. The rationale for inclusion of each question is primarily taken from Burgess, Locke, and Thomas.

Assigning of weighted scores The differential weights assigned to each question in the test were originally determined in Locke's study of married and divorced couples (112). In Locke's study scores were assigned on the basis of the degree of differences between the percents of the happily married respondent and divorced respondent giving the various answers to each question. For example, one of the questions was: "Do husband and wife engage in outside activities together?" There were four possible answers. These answers, the percent of happily married and divorced men for each answer, and the assigned weights for Locke's study were as follows (117, p. 46):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Percent of the married</th>
<th>Percent of the divorced</th>
<th>Weight assigned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very few</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Locke stated the following regarding the assigning of weights to each of the questions:

The weight to each answer or category of a question was assigned by the method of graphical determination of weights, or an abac, constructed by J. P. Guilford. The actual statistical procedure employed by him in the construction of the table of weights is complicated, but a general understanding of how the weights were assigned is possible without a thorough knowledge of the method of calculating the weights. (117, p. 46)

In reference to the above illustration, a considerably larger percent
of married than divorced men reported they engaged in "all" outside interests with their wives, practically the same percents replied "some" of them, and a larger percent of divorced than married said "very few" and "none" of them. A weight of 4 was given each category of a question which did not differentiate between the married and divorced; that is, about the same percent of each group gave the same answer. Hence, "some" in the illustration presented was given a weight of 4. If a given answer to a question was reported by a significantly larger percent of married than divorced, it received a higher weight than 4. The higher weights were 5, 6, 7, or 8 depending on the degree of difference between the percents of happily married and divorced. In the preceding example "all" received 5 points. If a given answer was made by a significantly smaller percent of married than divorced, then a number smaller than 4 (3, 2, 1, or 0) was given that category or answer; "very few" and "none" in the preceding example received 2 points.

Computing scores Following the tradition of the construction of marital adjustment indices the total marital adjustment score was calculated by adding the weighted responses to the different items composing the index. As previously discussed, this was done on an empirical basis and the weight of each possible score is presented with the question. To get a total score for each item add the two numbers horizontally, which is the coded score for each answer. For example, a person circling 22 for a question would add 2 + 2 for the score of that particular question. A score for each question is obtained and then all scores are added together. From this total 44 is subtracted. This is due to the fact there were two points added to the weight of each answer of the 22 questions in order to secure more combinations of digits. Separate scores were computed for husband and
In view of the preceding discussion, the Epistemic Correlation used to relate marital adjustment to each of the related concepts involved in marital adjustment is:

E. C. 1: The marital adjustment score is a measure of marital adjustment.

In this section of this chapter the questions of the marital adjustment test are presented, numbered as they appeared in the Married Student Study questionnaires. The assigned weighted scores for each response are also presented.

Companionship Factor Questions:

75. When disagreements arise they generally result in:
   a. Husband giving in .................. 50
   b. Wife giving in .................. 31
   c. Neither giving in .................. 22
   d. Agreement by mutual give and take ......... 53

76. Do you and your mate agree on right, good, and proper behavior?
   a. Always agree .................. 61
   b. Almost always agree .................. 51
   c. Occasionally disagree .................. 40
   d. Frequently disagree .................. 40
   e. Almost always disagree .................. 13
   f. Always disagree .................. 22

77. Do husband and wife engage in outside activities together?
   a. All of them .................. 34
   b. Some of them .................. 24
   c. Few of them .................. 13
   d. None of them .................. 40

\(^1\) Hereafter Epistemic Correlation will be referred to as E. C.
78. In leisure time, which do you and your mate prefer?

   a. Both husband and wife to stay at home .......... 44
   b. Both to be on the go. .......................... 51
   c. One to be on the go and the other to stay
      at home ..................................... 31

   Underlying the inclusion of the procedure of settling disagreements is the assumption that mutual give and take is a procedure associated with higher marital adjustment. However, this is not in itself evident. It is based on the assumption that the spouses will wish a democratic procedure. This may be a plausible assumption in our society, but in other societies this would not necessarily be true.

   Common outside interests are indicative of adjustment to the extent they express a similarity of values in the two spouses. Also, more engagement in common interests indicate more time spent together by the spouses and on the assumption that spending time together is an index of satisfaction, this is further reason to include this item in the adjustment index.

   Burgess and Cottrell (20) included the question concerning leisure time and activities on the assumption that it is an index of common interests which increases the satisfaction. Burgess and Cottrell (11) found, as did Locke (115), that if both spouses prefer to be "on the go" it is more unfavorable in relation to adjustment than if both prefer to stay at home. However, if common interests was the important factor, these two cases would get the same score. Therefore, this item must indicate something besides common interest. The preference to stay home, rather than being on the go, may indicate more satisfaction with each other as mates and more satisfaction with their marriage as they do not require outside "entertainment", but rather are satisfied with each other's company.
Table 4: Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When disagreements arise, they generally result in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband giving in</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife giving in</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither giving in</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutual give and take</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on right, good, and proper behavior?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husband Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do husband and wife engage in outside activities together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of them</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of them</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few of them</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of them</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husbands Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In leisure time, which do you and your mate prefer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both husband and wife stay at home</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both to be on the go</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to be on the go and the other to stay at home</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The previous tables indicate the frequency of responses for the Married Student Study for each of the possible answers for the Companionship Factor Questions, by sex.

Consensus or Agreement Questions:

79. Do you and your mate agree on aims, goals, and things believed important in life?
   a. Always agree. ........................................... 26
   b. Almost always agree ..................................... 15
   c. Occasionally disagree ................................... 40
   d. Frequently disagree ..................................... 22
   e. Almost always disagree .................................. 31
   f. Always disagree ......................................... 13

80. Do you and your mate agree on friends?
   a. Always agree. ........................................... 25
   b. Almost always agree ..................................... 70
   c. Occasionally disagree ................................... 40
   d. Frequently disagree ..................................... 13
   e. Almost always disagree .................................. 31
   f. Always disagree ......................................... 40

81. Do you and your mate agree on ways of dealing with in-laws?
   a. Always agree. ........................................... 43
   b. Almost always agree ..................................... 52
   c. Occasionally disagree ................................... 23
   d. Frequently disagree ..................................... 33
   e. Almost always disagree .................................. 32
   f. Always disagree ......................................... 50

82. Do you and your mate agree on handling family finances?
   a. Always agree. ........................................... 25
   b. Almost always agree ..................................... 52
   c. Occasionally disagree ................................... 23
   d. Frequently disagree ..................................... 23
   e. Almost always disagree .................................. 32
   f. Always disagree ......................................... 40

83. Do you and your mate agree on amount of time spent together?
   a. Always agree. ........................................... 16
   b. Almost always agree ..................................... 60
   c. Occasionally disagree ................................... 41
   d. Frequently disagree ..................................... 40
Table 8. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 79

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on aims, goals, and things believed important in life?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sociological theory states that communication and other forms of interaction among human beings create the consensus that is the basis of social organization, thus making interaction harmonious and purposeful. Numerous studies, with other than married groups, confirm this function of interaction increasing consensus. Even though research in the area of married couples does not show a clear increase in consensus during their married life, there is evidence to suggest that in marriages where couples rate their marriages as happy, there is a tendency to be more agreement between the spouses. Therefore, it is viewed as important enough by Locke, Wallace, and Thomas to include this series of questions in this test of Marital Adjustment.

Table 8 and the following tables indicate the frequency of responses for the Married Student Study, by sex, for each of the possible answers for the Consensus of Agreement Questions.
Table 9. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 80

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husbands Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on friends?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 81

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husbands Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on ways of dealing with in-laws?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 82

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on handling family finances?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Frequency of response, by sex, to Question 83

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate agree on the amount of time spent together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affectional Intimacy Questions:

84. How often do you kiss your mate?
   a. Everyday. 25
   b. Now and then. 23
   c. Almost never. 50

85. How frequently do you and your mate get on each other's nerves around the house?
   a. Never 52
   b. Almost never 60
   c. Occasionally 50
   d. Frequently 23
   e. Almost always 32
   f. Always 41

86. Do you and your mate agree on demonstration of affection?
   a. Always agree 16
   b. Almost always agree 33
   c. Occasionally disagree 41
   d. Frequently disagree 14
   e. Almost always disagree 23
   f. Always disagree 32

87. Check any of the following items which you think have caused serious difficulties in your marriage:

Difficulties over money.
Lack of mutual friends.
Constant bickering.
Interference of in-laws.
Lack of mutual affection.
Unsatisfying sex relations.
Selfishness and lack of cooperation.
Adultery.
Mate paid attention to another person.
Drunkenness or alcoholism.
Other reasons.
Nothing.

   a. Nothing checked. 44
   b. One checked. 80
   c. Two checked. 61
   d. Three checked. 24
   e. Four or five checked. 23
   f. Six or more checked. 22

Kissing is a demonstration of affection, and it is assumed that the
spouses will want a maximum of demonstration of affection. However, there are many ways of expressing affection, and a couple who hardly ever kiss may actually be more affectionate than many couples who kiss every day. However, Locke (115), Terman (171), and Karlsson (89) all found frequency of kissing the mate to be associated with better marital adjustment.

It is assumed that if the presence of the spouse in the home results in getting on each others nerves, they will be less adjusted and less satisfied than if they do not. The maladjustment will be greater in proportion to the frequency with which these irritations occur.

The rationale for Question 86, concerning agreement of affection, is the same as the basis for the previous questions on agreement. It is assumed that mutual agreement on demonstration of affection will contribute to the satisfaction of the spouses.

Question 87 is essentially a list of complaints, serious complaints about things which are believed to cause serious marital difficulties. The assumption is that a person who checks more complaints will be less satisfied with their marriage than a person who checks only a few complaints. However, this question has no way of delineating past and present complaints, nor the true extent of these complaints.

The following tables indicate the frequency of responses for the Married Student Study, by sex, for each of the possible responses for the Affectional Intimacy Questions.

**Satisfaction with the Marriage and Mate Questions:**

88. Have you ever wished you had not married?

- a. Frequently. ........................................... 31
- b. Occasionally. ....................................... 22
- c. Rarely. ............................................... 34
- d. Never ............................................... 26
Table 13. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 84

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often do you kiss your mate?</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and then</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 85

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently do you and your mate get on each other's nerves around the house?</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Demonstration of Affection</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always disagree</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 87

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties over money</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mutual friends</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant bickering</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference of in-laws</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfying sex relations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selfishness and lack of cooperation</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adultery</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mate paid attention to another person</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drunkenness or alcoholism</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reasons</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
89. Do you and your mate generally talk things over together?
   a. Never. .................................................. 31
   b. Now and then .......................................... 40
   c. Almost always ........................................ 33
   d. Always .................................................. 16

90. How happy would you rate your marriage?
   a. Very happy. .............................................. 17
   b. Happy ..................................................... 43
   c. Average .................................................. 40
   d. Unhappy ................................................ 22
   e. Very unhappy .......................................... 13

91. If you had your life to live over again, would you?
   a. Marry the same person. ............................... 27
   b. Marry a different person ............................. 12
   c. Not marry at all ...................................... 21

92. What is the total number of times you left your mate or your mate left you because of conflict?
   a. No times. ............................................... 54
   b. One time. .............................................. 13
   c. Two or more times ................................. 22

The assumption is if a person has wished he had not married many times, he will be less satisfied than a person who has done so a few times or never. The wish not to have married is assumed to be an expression of dissatisfaction.

"Talking things over" is a form of interaction which could foster a feeling of satisfaction from each of the spouses as they would feel they had a "part" of what is happening. There is not much research which shows "talking things over together" fosters success in marriage. However, it has been widely observed that in disturbed marriages, there is frequently a decline in "talking things over". Therefore, it is assumed more frequency of "talking things over" will indicate a higher degree of marital adjustment.
Table 17. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever wished you had not married?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Asking respondents to self-rate the happiness of their marriage has the faults of a "generosity tendency". However, it is assumed their own evaluation of their marriage will reflect their satisfaction with their marriage. If a person answers he or she would marry the same person, it is assumed he would be more satisfied with his present marriage than if he stated he would like to marry a different person, or not marry at all. In answering such a question he is passing a judgment on the present marriage with regard to the satisfaction he is deriving from this marriage.

The number of times the spouses have left each other is assumed to be an indication of the satisfaction with the marriage. People differ in their tendency to leave. Some may leave after a slight disagreement, while others only when a divorce is practically unavoidable. However, in the total population such differences are assumed to cancel out.

Table 17 and the following tables indicate the frequency of responses, by sex, for each of the possible responses for the Satisfaction with the Mate and Marriage Questions for the Married Student Study.
Table 18. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husbands Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you and your mate generally talk things over together?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now and then</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Husbands Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How happy would you rate your marriage?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very happy</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhappy</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unhappy</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 91

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had your life to live over again, would you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marry the same person</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marry a different person</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not marry at all</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the total number of times you left your mate or your mate left you because of conflict?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No times</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One time</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more times</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sexual Behavior Questions:

93. What are your feelings on sex relations with your mate?
   a. Very enjoyable .................................. 43
   b. Enjoyable ....................................... 52
   c. Tolerable ....................................... 13
   d. A little enjoyable ................................ 22
   e. Not at all enjoyable .............................. 31

94. Do you and your mate agree on sex relations?
   a. Always agree .................................... 43
   b. Almost always agree .............................. 33
   c. Occasionally disagree ............................ 23
   d. Frequently disagree .............................. 50
   e. Almost always disagree .......................... 41
   f. Always disagree ................................ 14

95. During sexual intercourse are your physical reactions satisfactory?
   a. Very .............................................. 34
   b. Somewhat ........................................ 25
   c. A little .......................................... 23
   d. Not at all ........................................ 14

96. Is sexual intercourse between you and your mate an expression of love and affection?
   a. Always ........................................... 52
   b. Almost always ................................... 34
   c. Sometimes ........................................ 42
   d. Almost never ..................................... 22
   e. Never ............................................. 13

Questions 93 through 96 are actually a self-rating of sexual satisfaction. It has the weakness of self-rating but is considered a very important factor in Marital Adjustment. Several authors contend sex is the major problem area in marital adjustment (107, 173).

The following tables indicate the frequency of responses for the Married Student Study, by sex, for each of the possible answers for the Sexual Behavior Questions.
Table 22. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very enjoyable</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerable</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little enjoyable</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all enjoyable</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always agree</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always agree</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally disagree</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always disagree</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 24. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 95

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During sexual intercourse are your physical reactions satisfactory?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25. Frequency of response, by sex, for Question 96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th>Husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is sexual intercourse between your mate and you an expression of love and affection?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost never</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26. Distribution by quartile of marital adjustment scores for 400 respondents in Married Student Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quartiles:</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. marital adjustment scores</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Distribution of scores** The range of the scores for this test is from 49 points to 120 points, or a possible 71 points between the highest and lowest possible scores. According to Locke, a standard can be constructed by dividing the possible range of scores into approximate quarters. Scores from 103 to 120 represent the upper 25 percent of possible scores and can be considered an index of "good" marital adjustment. Scores from 85 through 102 represent the second 25 percent and indicate "above average". Scores of 67 through 84 are in the third quartile and indicate the adjustment is "questionable". Scores of 49 through 66 are in the lowest quartile and indicate "poor" marital adjustment. However, it must be remembered that the research which Locks conducted included divorced couples. In this dissertation no divorced couples were included; therefore, the marital adjustment scores could be expected not to be divided equally among all the four quartiles as suggested by Locke. Rather, there would be more scores in the upper quartiles. Table 26 presents the quartile distribution for the 400 respondents in this study, and Table 27 presents the total itemized distribution of the scores received by the respondents in this study.  

¹Correlation discussion presented on p. 189.
Table 27. Distribution of marital adjustment scores by spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of wives</th>
<th>% of wives</th>
<th>No. of husbands</th>
<th>% of husbands</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of wives</th>
<th>% of wives</th>
<th>No. of husbands</th>
<th>% of husbands</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>No. of wives</th>
<th>% of wives</th>
<th>No. of husbands</th>
<th>% of husbands</th>
<th>Total no.</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS:**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Range:</td>
<td>65-116</td>
<td>61-116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean:</td>
<td>99.04</td>
<td>95.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Score:</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Role**

Role has been defined as the ways of behaving which are expected of any individual who occupies a particular position. The different roles performed by the husband and wife have been discussed. The theoretical relationship of role to marital adjustment was presented in Chapter III.
Certain research works and studies were cited to illustrate the relationship of the general concept, role, to marital adjustment. In this dissertation role will be operationalized through the sub-concepts, or variable roles of the spouses. The sub-concepts include: the employed wife, the wife's occupation, husband's attitude regarding his wife employed, desire for children, the hours the wife works, wife's income, student enrollment of spouses, wife's major, wife's grade point, wife's student classification, quarter credit course load of wife, husband's and wife's attitude regarding the wife's going to school, parental help, religiosity, presence of children, number of children, premarital pregnancy, unplanned pregnancy, parents' marriage, decision-making patterns, and role-taking.

**The employed wife**

Employment is defined as that work one does for monetary return, either outside the home or in the home. If employment is in the home, it is in addition to what is customarily termed household duties and is for pay. An example of this type of employment would be the woman who babysits with children, other than her own, or a woman who takes in ironing. There was a total of 114 wives, or 57 percent, employed in this study. The use of the sub-concept, employment of wife, focuses on the role patterns of husband and wife and the hypothesized effect on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the individual respondents answered the following question:

**Question 33:** Other than activities, such as household duties, classes, and studying, are you employed? (Include assistantships as employment).

NO . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1
YES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 2
For the purpose of testing the hypothesis concerning the wife-only being employed, the following coding was used:

- Wife only employed: 3
- Husband and wife employed: 2
- Husband only employed: 1
- Neither husband nor wife employed: 0

For the purposes of testing the hypothesis concerning both spouses being employed, the following code was used:

- Husband and wife employed: 3
- Husband only employed: 2
- Wife only employed: 1
- Neither husband nor wife employed: 0

The theoretical range for these scores was 0 through three. However, for the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of the wife-only employed on marital adjustment, the marital adjustment scores for the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples where the wife-only was employed, and (2) spouses of all other couples. For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of both spouses being employed on marital adjustment, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples where both spouses were employed, and (2) spouses of all other couples. Through the process of coding the spouse's employment status is generated.

The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 2: The employment score is a measure of the employment roles of each spouse.

**Wife's occupation and role**

Occupation is defined as the vocational employment of the individual. The relationship of occupation and marital success has been the focus of many research workers including Burgess and Cottrell (20) and Locke (115).
For the purposes of this dissertation occupation is viewed as a sub-concept of the major concept role.

In previous studies occupation has been conceptualized at various levels of employment, ranging along a continuum from very high prestige (i.e., very desirable) to employment of very low prestige (i.e., very undesirable). The North-Hatt Scale has been developed and used as an operational measure for determining a continuum for occupational prestige and desirability.

However, the North-Hatt Scale is primarily for what are generally viewed as "male occupations". For the purpose of this dissertation the author listed all the occupations which were held by the female respondents in this study, consolidating like occupations. There was a total of 21 different occupations. Fifteen individuals, including both students and staff (academic and clerical) at Iowa State University rated the prestige of each occupation from 1 through 5 (1 being not desirable and 5 being very desirable). The scores for each occupation were added, thus developing a scale of prestige for the occupations held by the female respondents in this study. There is no assumption in this dissertation as to the certainty of measurement in the development of this scale. Rather, this scale was developed in order to facilitate the investigation of the hypothesized effect of various occupations on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. This scale (Appendix A) ranged along a continuum from those occupations of low prestige (1) to high prestige (21).

The use of the concept, occupation of wife, focuses on the social desirability of an occupation and the hypothesized effect on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the ini-
tial research instrument the individuals responded to the following ques-
tion:

**Question 34:** If you are employed, what is your occupation?

The wife's occupation is measured by the developed scale according to
the preceding discussion and rationale. In this conceptualization, occupa-
tions were ranked on a scale from 01 (low) to 21 (high), depending upon
the evaluation of the occupation. Therefore, the occupation of the wife
is given a score according to the social position-evaluation of the occupa-
tion. The following relationship is thereby stated:

**E. C. 3:** Rank of occupation score is a measure of
the prestige of the wife's occupation.

**Husband's attitude regarding wife's employment**

The husband's attitude regarding his wife's employment is defined as
the lack of dissatisfaction he expresses concerning the wife being employed.
The use of the husband's attitude as a sub-concept related to role focuses
on the male's attitude regarding his wife working, and the hypothesized
effect on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses. In the
initial research instrument the response of the male respondents was made
to the following question:

**Question 97:** How satisfied are you with your wife working
outside the home?

- DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT EMPLOYED.  Y
- VERY SATISFIED.  5
- SOMewhat SATISFIED.  4
- UNDECIDED .  3
- SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .  2
- VERY DISSATISFIED .  1

The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. Through the
process of coding a degree of satisfaction is generated.
The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 4: The husband's satisfaction with his wife in the labor force score is a measure of the husband's attitude regarding his wife's employment.

Hours wife works

The degree of employment is defined as the total number of hours which one works at a particular occupation or occupations. The use of the sub-concept, hours wife works per week, focuses on the degree to which the wife is employed and the hypothesized effect on marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 35: On the average, how many hours do you work per week?

1-10 HOURS PER WEEK .................................. 1
11-20 HOURS PER WEEK ................................. 2
21-30 HOURS PER WEEK ................................. 3
31-40 HOURS PER WEEK ................................. 4
OVER 40 HOURS PER WEEK ............................. 5

The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. Through the process of coding a score for the hours the wife works is generated.

The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 5: The number of hours a person works per week score is a measure of the hours which the wife works.

Wife's income in proportion to total income

Individual income is defined as the gross monthly income for each spouse at the time this study was conducted. Family income is defined as the total yearly income of all family members plus other income such as interest, investments, etc. The use of the sub-concept, wife's income in proportion to total income, focuses on the hypothesized effect of the wife's
income on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

**Question 36: Approximately what is your gross monthly income? (Your salary only)**

1. LESS THAN $100 PER MONTH
2. BETWEEN $101 and $200 PER MONTH
3. BETWEEN $201 and $300 PER MONTH
4. BETWEEN $301 and $400 PER MONTH
5. BETWEEN $401 and $500 PER MONTH
6. OVER $500 PER MONTH

**Question 74: Which of these categories best estimates your yearly gross family income? (Include husband's income, wife's income, plus any other income you might have.)**

1. $1 - 999
2. $1,000 - 1,999
3. $2,000 - 2,999
4. $3,000 - 3,999
5. $4,000 - 4,999
6. $5,000 - 5,999
7. $6,000 - 6,999
8. $7,000 - 7,999
9. $8,000 - 8,999
10. $9,000 - 9,999
11. $10,000 AND OVER

In order to determine the proportion of the wife's income in relation to the total family income, the wife's gross monthly income was multiplied by twelve. This total income was computed in proportion to the total family income and coded in tenths. The theoretical range for this score was 01 through 10. Through the process of coding a score for the proportion of the total family income, the wife's income constituted was generated.

The following relationship is stated:

**E. C. 6: The wife's income as a proportion to total family income score is a measure of the wife's contribution to total family income.**
**Student enrollment and role**

Student enrollment is defined as a person being enrolled in some type of formal schooling, either Iowa State University or other schools above the high school level such as a technical school. The use of the sub-concept, student enrollment, focuses on the hypothesized effect of the differential roles of husband and wife as students on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

**Question 1:** Are you a student?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of testing the hypothesis concerning the effect of both spouses being enrolled in school, the following coding was used:

- **BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE ENROLLED** 3
- **HUSBAND ONLY ENROLLED** 2
- **WIFE ONLY ENROLLED** 1

However, for the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of both spouses being enrolled in school on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses, the marital adjustment scores for the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples where both husband and wife were enrolled in school, and (2) spouses of all other couples.

For the purpose of testing the hypothesis concerning the effect of the husband-only being enrolled as a student the following code was used:

- **HUSBAND ONLY ENROLLED** 3
- **BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE ENROLLED** 2
- **WIFE ONLY ENROLLED** 1

For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of the husband-only
Table 28. Student enrollment by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student enrollment</th>
<th>Number of wives</th>
<th>Number of husbands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not a student</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student, not ISU</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
<td><strong>200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

being enrolled in school on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses, the marital adjustment scores for the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples where the husband-only was enrolled in school, and (2) spouses of all other couples.

Through the process of coding, a score for student enrollment of the spouses is generated. The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 7: Enrollment in school scores is a measure of the student-roles of husband and wife.

Table 28 presents the number of husbands and wives who were and who were not enrolled as students.

Wife's major

Major is defined as that area of concentration of course work which a student takes during their college career. The use of the sub-concept, wife's major, focuses on the hypothesized effect of various majors on marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual respondents was made to the following question:

Question 2: What is your major? _________________________

Different majors are viewed as having various degrees of prestige among
both students and faculty. For the purposes of this dissertation a continuum scale was developed and used as an operational measure for determining a continuum of prestige for the majors of the female respondents. This scale was developed very much like the scale for female occupations--15 people assigned weights (ranging from 1 to 5) for each major according to their perceived prestige of that major. These scores were then tabulated to form a scale of prestige of the majors of the wife-students in this study (Appendix A). There was a total of seventeen majors, ranging in order from Child Development as having the lowest prestige to Bacteriology which was classified as having the most prestige. There is no assumption, in this dissertation, as to the certainty of measurement in the development of this scale. Rather, this scale was developed in order to facilitate the investigation of the hypothesized effect various majors, of the wives in this study, on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

The theoretical range for this score is 1 (low) through 17 (high). Through the process of coding a score for the degree of prestige for the various majors of the female respondents is generated.

The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 8: Rank of major score is a measure of the role of the wife as a student.

Grade point

Grade point is defined as the overall average of grades received throughout a person's college career. This average is based on credits per course taken. An A is 4.0, a B is 3.0, a C is 2.0 and a D is 1.0. The use of the sub-concept, grade point, focuses on the hypothesized effect of grade point on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in
The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 9. Through the process of coding, a score for the different grade point levels is generated.

The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 9: The grade point score is a measure of the grade point of the wife in the student role.

Wife's student classification

Student classification is defined as the level at which the student was in their education at the time this study was conducted in June, 1968. There was a total of 49 wives who were enrolled as students in undergraduate school, graduate school, or a school other than Iowa State University. Table 29 presents the number of students wives in each of the student classification categories.

The use of the sub-concept, wife's student classification, focuses on the hypothesized effect of various student classifications on the marital adjustment of spouses. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Table 29. Student wives' classifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student classification</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent of student wives</th>
<th>Percent of total wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A student, not ISU</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate student</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71.43</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>6.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 16: At the present time what is your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. .......... -00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. ..................... -01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND H.S. .......... -02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE .................. -03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE. ......................... -04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE. ....................... -05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. OR EQUIVALENT) .... -06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE. ................. -07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED. ............... -08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE. ...................... -09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED. ...................... -10
POSTDOCTORATE. ............................. -11

For those wives enrolled in school, student classification was measured by the coding given above. The student classification of each student-wife was therefore given a score according to her response to this question. The theoretical range for this score was 00 through 11. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 10: The wife's student classification score is a measure of the role of the wife as a student.

Table 29b presents the student classification, according to the preceding classification, of student wives.
Table 29b. Student classification of student wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student classification</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent of student wives</th>
<th>Percent of total wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One year or less college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two years college</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three years college</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College completed (B.S. or equivalent)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree candidate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.28</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree completed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate candidate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>.23.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course load

Academic course load is defined as the number of quarter credits a student is taking in any particular quarter while enrolled in school. The use of the sub-concept, course load, focuses on the hypothesized influence of differential course loads of the student wives on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 5: On the average, how many credits do you take each quarter?

1 - 5 CREDITS PER QUARTER. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -1
6 - 10 CREDITS PER QUARTER. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -2
11 - 15 CREDITS PER QUARTER. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -3
16 - 20 CREDITS PER QUARTER. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -4
OVER 20 CREDITS PER QUARTER. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -5

Student course load is measured by the coding given above. The course load of each student-wife was therefore given a score according to her response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through
5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 11: Academic course load score is a measure of the wife's role as a student.

Husband's and wife's attitude regarding the wife's education

The attitude of the husband and wife toward the wife completing her education is defined as that expressed attitudes by the spouses regarding the wife completing her education. The use of this sub-concept focuses on the hypothesized effect of the spouses' attitudes regarding the wife's completing her education on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the response of each wife was made to the following questions:

Question 22: How often have you considered quitting college?

- VERY OFTEN: 1
- SOMETIMES: 2
- SELDOM: 3
- NEVER: 4

Question 24: How important is it to you that you complete your schooling?

- EXTREMELY IMPORTANT: 5
- VERY IMPORTANT: 4
- OF SOME IMPORTANCE: 3
- NOT VERY IMPORTANT: 2
- UNIMPORTANT: 1

The wife's attitude regarding her schooling is measured by the composite score derived from the coding given above. There was a .462 calculated correlational coefficient between the responses of these two questions; therefore, the responses to these questions are assumed to be additive. The wife's attitude regarding her schooling was therefore given a score according to her response to the stated questions. The theoretical range for this composite score is 2 through 9. The following relationship
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is thereby stated:

E. C. 12: The wife's desire to complete her education score is a measure of her attitude toward completing her schooling.

In order to generate a score for the husband's attitude regarding his wife's schooling in the initial research instrument, the response of each husband was made to the following questions:

Question 23: If your wife is a student, how often have you wished she would quit going to school?

VERY OFTEN. ....................................... -1
SOMETIMES ......................................... -2
SELDOM ............................................... -3
NEVER ............................................... -4

Question 25: If your wife is a student, how important is it to you that she finishes her schooling?

DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT A STUDENT. .......... -Y
EXTREMELY IMPORTANT. .............................. -5
VERY IMPORTANT ..................................... -4
OF SOME IMPORTANCE ................................. -3
NOT VERY IMPORTANT ................................. -2
UNIMPORTANT ....................................... -1

The husband's attitude regarding his wife as a student and her schooling is measured by the coding given above. The husband's attitude regarding his wife completing her education was therefore given a score according to the composite score derived from the coding given above. There was a .578 calculated correlational coefficient between the responses to these questions; therefore, the responses to these questions are assumed to be additive. The theoretical range for this composite score is 2 through 9.

The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 13: The husband's desire for his wife to complete her education score is a measure of his attitude regarding his wife completing her schooling.
Parental help

Parental help is defined as monetary help which parents make available to the married college student and/or spouse in forms of either gifts or loans, and which the married college student and/or spouse use. Parental gifts are defined as the monetary help which parents give their married college student and/or spouse without plans of repayment, while parental loans is monetary help given to the married student and/or spouse with plans of repayment by the married student and/or spouse. There are three categories of parental help investigated in this dissertation: those where both sets of parents (husband's and wife's) are helping the married student(s) and/or spouse, those where only the husband's parents are helping the married college student and/or spouse; and those where only the wife's parents are helping the married college student and/or spouse. The use of the sub-concept, parental help, and which set of parents are helping, focuses on the hypothesized effect of parental help on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 67: Other than you and/or your husband's (wife's) employment (including assistantships), what other sources of income do you have?

Parental help, both gifts and loans, was measured by the coding system of 1 = no, 2 = yes. The type of parental help for each couple, by category, was therefore given a score according to the response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 2.

However, for the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of parental
help through loans on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples which had parental help through loans, and (2) spouses of all other couples. For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of parental help through gifts on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples which had parental help through gifts, and (2) spouses of all other couples. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 14: Parental loans and parental help through gifts scores are measures of parental help to the married college student and/or spouse.

To determine which spouse's parents were helping the couple, in the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 68: If you have parental help, either loans or gifts, whose parents are helping?

- DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING. . . . . -Y
- WIFE'S PARENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -1
- HUSBAND'S PARENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -2
- BOTH SETS OF PARENTS. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -3

Both sets of parents helping is measured by the coding given above. The category of parental help for each couple was therefore given a score according to the response to the question. The theoretical range for this score is from 1 through 3.

For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of both spouses' parents helping the couple on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by
the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the indi-
vidual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples
where both sets of parents were helping the couple, and (2) spouses of all
other couples. Therefore, the following relationship is stated:

E. C. 15: The both parents helping score is a
measure of parental help to the married
college student and/or spouse.

By the process of recoding the theoretical range of scores for the
husband's parents the following code was developed:

| HUSBAND'S PARENTS HELPING | -3 |
| WIFE'S PARENTS HELPING     | -2 |
| BOTH SETS OF PARENTS HELPING | -1 |

The husband's parents helping is measured by the coding given above.
The category of parental help for each couple was therefore given a score
according to the response to the previously stated question. The theoreti-
cal range for this score is from 1 through 3.

However, for the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of hus-
band's parents only helping on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by
the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the indi-
vidual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples
where the husband's parents only were helping, and (2) spouses of all other
couples.

Therefore, the following relationship is stated:

E. C. 16: The husband's parents only helping score
is a measure of the parental help to the
married college student and/or spouse.

By the process of recoding the theoretical range of scores for the
wife's parents helping the following code was developed:
The theoretical range for these scores was 1 through 3. Through the process of coding a score was generated for the wife's parents only helping the married college student and/or spouse. For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of wife's parents only helping on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples where the wife's parents only were helping, and (2) spouses of all other couples.

Therefore, the following relationship is stated:

E. C. 17: The wife's parents only helping score is a measure of parental help to the married college student and/or spouse.

Religiosity

Religiosity is defined as the degree to which one identifies with a particular religion, is religious minded, and takes part in religious activities. The use of the sub-concept, religiosity, focuses on the hypothesized effect of religiosity on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

Question 43: What is your religion?

JEWISH. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -5
CATHOLIC. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -4
PROTESTANT. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -3
OTHER . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -2
NONE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -1

Question 44: Other than going to church, how religious minded would you say you are?
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VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED .................. -4
FAIRLY RELIGIOUS MINDED ............... -3
NOT VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED ............. -2
NOT RELIGIOUS MINDED AT ALL ........... -1

Question 45: On the average, how many times a month do you go to church?

NEVER ........................................ -0
LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH ................ -1
ONCE A MONTH ............................... -2
TWICE A MONTH .............................. -3
THREE TIMES A MONTH ..................... -4
FOUR TIMES A MONTH ...................... -5
MORE THAN FOUR TIMES A MONTH ......... -6

Question 46: To what extent are religious activities such as family prayer, reading the Bible, saying grace at meals, etc., included in your family?

VERY FREQUENTLY .......................... -6
FAIRLY OFTEN ................................ -5
NOW AND THEN ................................ -4
FAIRLY INFREQUENTLY ..................... -3
VERY INFREQUENTLY ....................... -2
NEVER ......................................... -1

Table 30 and 31 show the matrix form of zero order correlations for the respondents to the questions comprising the composite religiosity score. As evidenced by these tables the calculated correlational coefficients between the responses of Questions 43, 44, 45, and 46 were significant at the .01 level, for both the male and female respondents; therefore, for the purposes of this dissertation the responses of these questions are assumed to be additive.

The theoretical range for the scores for Question 44 was 1 through 4, for Question 45 was 0 through 6, and for Question 46 was 1 through 6. There was a minimum score of 2 points which one could have secured from Questions 44 through 46 and a maximum of 16 points. In addition, 5 points were added to the total religiosity score of each respondent for answers 2, 3, 4, and
Table 30. Zero-order correlations, matrix form, for female respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Which religion</th>
<th>Religious minded</th>
<th>Church attendance</th>
<th>Religious activities</th>
<th>Total religiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.446</td>
<td>.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D.F. = 198. .138 significant at .05 level, .185 significant at .01 level.

Table 31. Zero-order correlations, matrix form, for male respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Which religion</th>
<th>Religious minded</th>
<th>Church attendance</th>
<th>Religious activities</th>
<th>Total religiosity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.445</td>
<td>.648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*D.F. = 198. .138 significant at .05 level, .185 significant at .01 level.
5 on Question 43, and 0 points were given for answer 1. This assignment of different values was in order to differentiate between those respondents who identified with a particular organized religion and those who did not identify with a particular organized religion. Therefore, the maximum religiosity score would have been 21 points and the minimum score 2 points.

Religiosity is measured by the coding given above. The religiosity of each individual was therefore given a composite score according to his or her responses to these four preceding questions. The theoretical range for this score is from 2 through 21 points. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 18: The religiosity score is a measure of the religious role of the individual.

**Presence of children**

The presence of children is defined as the presence of children in the home as compared to there being no children in the home. The presence of children is not concerned with the number of children a couple might have, rather it is concerned with the dichotomous situation of presence or absence of children in the home. The use of this sub-concept, presence of children, focuses on the hypothesized effect of the presence of children in the home on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

**Question 53:** How many children do you have at this time? (If you (your wife) are pregnant, count it as a child.)

- NONE ...................................................... 0
- ONE ...................................................... 1
- TWO ....................................................... 2
- THREE .................................................... 3
- FOUR ..................................................... 4
The theoretical range of this score is 0 through 6. However, in order to test the hypothesized effect of the presence of children on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of couples who had at least one child in the home, and (2) spouses of couples who did not have any children in the home. Through the process of coding a score for the presence or absence of children in the home is generated.

The following relationship is stated:

E. C. 19: The number of children in a family score is a measure of the presence or absence of children in the family.

**Number of children**

Number of children is defined as the total number of children, including pregnancies, which a couple had at the time this study was conducted in June, 1968. The use of the sub-concept, number of children, focuses on the hypothesized effect of the number of children on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by a couple in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

**Question 53:** How many children do you have at this time? (If you (your wife) are pregnant, count it as a child.)

- NONE: 0
- ONE: 1
- TWO: 2
- THREE: 3
- FOUR: 4
- FIVE: 5
- MORE THAN FIVE: 6
The number of children is measured by the coding given above. The number of children each couple had was therefore given a score according to the spouses' responses to the question. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 6. However, for the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of the number of children a couple had on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, only the spouses of the 115 couples who had at least one child were used in this analysis. It is assumed that for the purposes of this dissertation, and due to the presence versus the absence of children in the home tested in a previous hypothesis, that analyzing only the couples with children, and the hypothesized effect on marital adjustment, would be more meaningful. Therefore, the theoretical range for this score is 1 through 6.

The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 20: The number of children score is a measure of the number of children present in the family of each couple.

Desire for children

The desire for children is defined as the degree to which each spouse expresses a belief in the importance of having children in marriage, and the degree to which the person wanted to have children during their married life. The use of the sub-concept, desire for children, focuses on the hypothesized effect of this desire on the marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

Question 50: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In life, one of the most important things is to have children.

STRONGLY AGREE. . . . . . . . . . . . . -5
Question 51: At the time you were married, how strongly did you want you and your husband (wife) to have children sometime in your married life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY STRONGLY</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY STRONG</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY STRONG</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DID NOT WANT CHILDREN</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The desire for children is measured by the coding given above. The desire for children of each individual was therefore given a composite score based on his or her responses to the preceding questions. The theoretical range for the total score is 2 through 10. There was a .368 calculated correlational coefficient between the responses to these two questions for the male respondents in this study, and a .421 calculated correlational coefficient between the responses to these two questions for the female respondents in this study. Both these calculated correlational coefficients are significant at the .01 level, therefore are assumed to be additive.

The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 21: The desire for children score is a measure of the attitude concerning the parental role.

Premarital pregnancy

Premarital pregnancy is defined as the occurrence of pregnancy before the couple is married. The use of the sub-concept, premarital pregnancy, focuses on the hypothesized effect of premarital pregnancy on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the ini-
tial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

**Question 54:** If you have children or you (your wife) are pregnant, fill out the following chart concerning your children. Start with the oldest child and include only living children. (If pregnant, write "pregnant" by the appropriate number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accidental premartial pregnancy</th>
<th>Planned premartial pregnancy</th>
<th>Unplanned after marriage</th>
<th>Planned after marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Premarital pregnancy is measured by the coding system of raw numbers of each premarital pregnancy. The theoretical range for this score was 0 through the number of premarital pregnancies listed by any one couple. However, the maximum number of premarital pregnancies listed was 1; therefore, the theoretical range was 0 through 1. This applied to both unplanned and planned premarital pregnancy. The number of premarital pregnancies was therefore given a score according to an individual's response to this question. For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of the occurrence of premarital pregnancy on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of those couples who reported having had a premarital pregnancy, and (2) spouses of all other
Table 33. Planned and unplanned premarital pregnancies, by sex of spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental premarital pregnancy</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned premarital pregnancy</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

couples. For the purpose of testing this hypothesis, the planned and unplanned premarital pregnancies were not separated. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 22: The premarital pregnancy score is a measure of the role of parenthood.

Table 33 presents the number of premarital pregnancies, both planned and unplanned as reported by all respondents in this sample.

Unplanned pregnancy

Unplanned pregnancy is defined as pregnancy or pregnancies which were described by the spouses as not being planned at the time the pregnancy occurred. These are often referred to as "accidental pregnancies". The use of this sub-concept focuses on the hypothesized effect of unplanned pregnancies after marriage affects the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the question which was presented in the preceding section on premarital pregnancy. Table 34 presents the number of planned and unplanned pregnancies after marriage as reported by all respondents in this sample.
Table 34. Planned and unplanned pregnancies after marriage, by sex of spouses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Husbands</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Wives</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unplanned pregnancies</td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned pregnancies</td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after marriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>274</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unplanned pregnancies are measured by the coding of raw numbers. The number of unplanned pregnancies was therefore given a score according to each spouse's response to the question relevant to unplanned pregnancies. The theoretical range for this score was 0 through 4, as four was the maximum number of unplanned pregnancies after marriage listed by any one respondent.

For the purpose of testing the hypothesized effect of an unplanned pregnancy or pregnancies on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage, the marital adjustment scores of the individual spouses were divided into two categories: (1) spouses of those couples who reported having had at least one unplanned pregnancy, and (2) spouses of all other couples. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 23: The unplanned pregnancy after marriage score is a measure of the role of parenthood.

Parents' marriage

The degree of happiness of the spouse's parents' marriage is defined as that degree of happiness perceived by their child concerning his or her
parents' marriage. The use of this sub-concept focuses on the degree of happiness of the parents' marriage and its hypothesized effect on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 19: Everything considered, how happy would you say your parents' marriage is?

- EXTREMELY HAPPY -6
- VERY HAPPY -5
- FAIRLY HAPPY -4
- FAIRLY UNHAPPY -3
- VERY UNHAPPY -2
- MY PARENTS ARE DIVORCED -1

Happiness of parents' marriage is measured by the coding given above. The happiness of each respondent's parents' marriage was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is from 1 through 6. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 24: The happiness score for parents' marriage is a measure of the happiness of the parents' marriage.

Decision-making

Decision-making is defined as the process by which decisions concerning certain subjects are made. In this case the focus is on the person who makes these particular decisions. The use of the sub-concept, decision-making, focuses on the hypothesized effect of differential patterns of decision-making on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by a couple in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Question 62: In every family a number of decisions has to be made. Many couples talk things over first, but the final decision often has to be made by one person, either the husband or wife. Now, for example, if you have children and the child needs punished, who makes this decision? Is it always the wife, wife more than husband, wife and husband about equally, husband more than wife, or always the husband who decides this? (Check appropriate space to indicate how decisions are made in your family.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides about?</th>
<th>Wife always</th>
<th>Wife more than husband</th>
<th>Wife and husband about equally</th>
<th>Husband more than wife</th>
<th>Husband always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How much to spend on food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How much life insurance the family should have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Whether or not to use charge accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Where to live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Whether or not the wife should work outside the home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Going out, as to the movies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Visiting wife's relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Visiting husband's relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Whether or not the husband goes to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Whether or not the wife goes to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 35. Frequency of responses on decision-making of spouses, by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wife always</th>
<th>Wife more than husband</th>
<th>Wife and husband about equally</th>
<th>Husband more than wife</th>
<th>Husband always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How much to spend on food</td>
<td>37 35</td>
<td>70 68</td>
<td>77 72</td>
<td>14 22</td>
<td>02 03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How much life insurance the family should have</td>
<td>02 02</td>
<td>04 02</td>
<td>59 60</td>
<td>84 77</td>
<td>52 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Whether or not to use charge accounts</td>
<td>12 02</td>
<td>15 16</td>
<td>101 80</td>
<td>42 68</td>
<td>29 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Where to live</td>
<td>00 01</td>
<td>06 14</td>
<td>165 123</td>
<td>29 39</td>
<td>10 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Whether or not the wife should work outside the home</td>
<td>06 01</td>
<td>13 28</td>
<td>172 121</td>
<td>14 26</td>
<td>06 09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Going out, as to the movies</td>
<td>01 00</td>
<td>21 29</td>
<td>129 119</td>
<td>46 48</td>
<td>02 06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Visiting wife's relatives</td>
<td>09 10</td>
<td>61 73</td>
<td>117 108</td>
<td>10 09</td>
<td>03 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Visiting husband's relatives</td>
<td>00 01</td>
<td>18 11</td>
<td>133 110</td>
<td>36 72</td>
<td>15 04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Whether or not the husband goes to school</td>
<td>00 00</td>
<td>03 04</td>
<td>132 105</td>
<td>34 41</td>
<td>31 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Whether or not the wife goes to school</td>
<td>20 16</td>
<td>33 50</td>
<td>132 109</td>
<td>10 16</td>
<td>05 09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The frequency of responses, by sex, to the preceding question is presented in Table 35.

Decision-making is measured by coding. There were three separate coded scores for this question. The coding used for testing the hypothesized effect of equalitarian decision-making on the marital adjustment of the spouses was as follows:

- HUSBAND AND WIFE ABOUT EQUALLY... -5
- HUSBAND MORE THAN WIFE... -4
- WIFE MORE THAN HUSBAND... -3
- HUSBAND ALWAYS... -2
- WIFE ALWAYS... -1

The decision-making patterns, as perceived by each spouse, was therefore given a score according to that spouse's response to the question. The theoretical range for this score is from 10 through 50. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 25: The equalitarian decision-making score is a measure of the decision-making patterns of a couple in their marriage.

The coding used for testing the hypothesized effect of husband domination score in decision-making on the marital adjustment of the spouses was as follows:

- HUSBAND ALWAYS... -5
- HUSBAND MORE THAN WIFE... -4
- WIFE AND HUSBAND ABOUT EQUALLY... -3
- WIFE MORE THAN HUSBAND... -2
- WIFE ALWAYS... -1

The decision-making patterns as perceived by each spouse was therefore given a score according to that spouse's response to the question. The theoretical range for this score is from 10 through 50. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 26: The husband-dominant decision-making
score is a measure of the decision-making patterns of a couple in their marriage.

The coded score for the wife-dominant score was as follows:

- WIFE ALWAYS -5
- WIFE MORE THAN HUSBAND -4
- WIFE AND HUSBAND ABOUT EQUALLY -3
- HUSBAND MORE THAN WIFE -2
- HUSBAND ALWAYS -1

The decision-making patterns as perceived by each spouse was therefore given a score according to that spouse's response to the question. The theoretical range for this score is from 10 through 50. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 27: The wife-dominant decision-making score is a measure of the decision-making patterns of a couple in their marriage.

Role-taking

Role-taking is defined as that degree to which a person perceives the attitudes and/or feelings of another person. The use of this sub-concept focuses on the hypothesized effect of accurate role-taking on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

**Question 51:** At the time you were married, how strongly did you want you and your husband (wife) to have children sometime in your married life?

- VERY STRONGLY -5
- FAIRLY STRONG -4
- UNDECIDED -3
- NOT VERY STRONG -2
- DID NOT WANT CHILDREN -1

**Question 56:** At the time you were married, how strongly do you feel your wife (husband) wanted the two of you to have children sometime during your married life?
The theoretical range for each of these scores is 1 through 5. Therefore, the differences in the scores is 0 through 4. To determine the degree to which each spouse accurately perceived the other spouse's attitude regarding the desire to have children during their married life, the score from these two questions was compared with the scores received by their spouse on each question. For example, the wife's response score to Question 51 regarding the degree to which she wanted she and her husband to have children sometime in their married life would be compared with the score which husband received on Question 56 concerning the degree to which he thought his wife wanted them to have children sometime in their married life. The same procedure was followed for the husband's response to Question 51 and the wife's response to Question 56. The difference between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's response to Question 56 and the actual response of each spouse to Question 51 would determine the degree of role-taking accuracy for this set of questions. The greater the score, the lower would be the role-taking accuracy of each spouse. The role-taking ability of each spouse concerning desire for children was therefore given a score according to his response to these questions. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 4. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 28: The degree of agreement scores between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's desire for children and his or her spouse's actual desire for children is a measure of role-taking.
The second set of questions used to determine the degree of role-taking for each spouse were:

**Question 52:** How many children would you like for you and your husband (wife) to have during your married life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN FIVE</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question 57:** How many children do you think your husband (wife) would like for the two of you to have during your married life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONE</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWO</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN FIVE</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The theoretical range for the score of each of the preceding questions is 0 through 6. Therefore, when the spouses' responses were compared, the range of difference between their scores could be 0 through 6. To determine the degree to which each spouse accurately perceived the number of children their spouse wanted, the scores for each spouse was compared. Role-taking regarding the number of children wanted in their marriage is measured by the coding.

For example, the wife's response score to Question 52, regarding the number of children she would like for her and her husband to have during their married life would be compared with the score which the husband received for Question 57 concerning the number of children he thought his wife would like for them to have during their married life. The same proce-
dure was followed for the husband's response to Question 52 and the wife's response to Question 57. The difference between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's response to Question 57 and the actual response of each spouse to Question 52 would determine the degree of role-taking accuracy for this set of questions. The greater the score, the lower would be the role-taking accuracy of each spouse. The role-taking ability of each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to these questions. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 6. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 29: The degree of agreement scores between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's desired number of children and the number of children his or her spouse actually desires is a measure of role-taking.

The third set of questions used to determine the degree of role-taking achieved by each spouse in a couple were those questions dealing with the frequency the couple takes part in specified activities together. In the initial research instrument the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

Question 60: How satisfied are you with the frequency you and your husband take part in the above activities together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 61: How satisfied do you think your husband (wife) is with the frequency you and he get to participate in the above activities together?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The theoretical range for the score for each of the preceding questions is 1 through 5. To determine the degree to which each spouse accurately perceived the satisfaction of their spouse the scores for each spouse were compared. For example, the wife's response score to Question 60 regarding her satisfaction with the frequency she and her husband take part in specified activities together would be compared with the score which the husband received for Question 61 regarding the degree to which he thought his wife was satisfied with the frequency they take part in specified activities together. The same procedure was followed for the husband's response to Question 60 and the wife's response to Question 61. The difference between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's response to Question 61 and the actual response of each spouse to Question 60 would determine the degree of role-taking accuracy for this set of questions. The greater the score, the lower would be the role-taking accuracy of each spouse.

The role-taking of each individual was therefore given a score according to the differences in responses to these questions. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 4. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 30: The degree of agreement score between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's satisfaction with taking part in specified activities together and his or her spouse's actual satisfaction with taking part in specified activities together is a measure of role-taking.

A fourth set of questions used to determine the degree of role-taking achieved by a couple were regarding satisfaction expressed regarding their
present method of contraception. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

**Question 64:** How satisfied are you with your present method of birth control? (If you do not use any, answer for satisfaction concerning not using any.)

- VERY SATISFIED: -5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED: -4
- NEUTRAL: -3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED: -2
- VERY DISSATISFIED: -1

**Question 66:** How satisfied do you think your husband (wife) is with your present method of birth control?

- VERY SATISFIED: -5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED: -4
- NEUTRAL: -3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED: -2
- VERY DISSATISFIED: -1

The theoretical range for the score for each of the preceding questions is 1 through 5. To determine the degree to which each spouse accurately perceived the satisfaction of their spouse, the scores for each spouse were compared. For example, the wife's response score to Question 64 regarding her satisfaction with their present method of birth control would be compared with the score which the husband received for Question 66 regarding the degree to which he thought his wife was satisfied with their present method of birth control. The same procedure was followed for the husband's response to Question 64 and the wife's response to Question 66. The difference between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's response to Question 66 and the actual response of each spouse to Question 64 would determine the degree of role-taking accuracy for this set of questions. The greater the score, the lower would be the role-taking accuracy of each spouse.
The role-taking of each individual was therefore given a score according to the differences in the responses to these questions. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 4. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 31: The degree of agreement score between each spouse's perception of his or her spouse's satisfaction with their present method of contraception and his or her spouse's actual satisfaction with their present method of contraception is a measure of role-taking.

In order to generate a total score for role-taking for each spouse, the total score of each of the preceding four sets of questions were added. The theoretical range for this score was 0 through 18. The higher the score, the lower the role-taking ability of the spouse. Through the process of coding the degree to which each spouse accurately perceived the attitudes and feelings of their spouses concerning certain subjects is generated. Therefore, the following relationship is stated:

E. C. 32: The score derived from the spouse accurately perceiving their spouse's attitudes and feelings regarding the specified subjects, desire for children, number of children desire, satisfaction with frequency couple gets to take part in specific activities together, and satisfaction with present method of contraception, is a measure of role-taking ability.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction has been defined as a lack of discrepancies between the expectations and reality of an individual in marriage. This definition of satisfaction can be extended to include those things which bring gratification, pleasure, or contentment to the individual. Satisfactions received
in an interaction situation is perceived as the primary factor which stimulates people to continue within this context of interaction. Satisfaction will be operationalized in this dissertation through several sub-concepts. The concept satisfaction was included in this dissertation in order to determine the hypothesized effect of satisfaction on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by each spouse in their marriage.

**Housing and satisfaction**

Housing is defined as the house, apartment, trailer, etc. in which a couple was living in June, 1968. There were four categories of housing in this study: Pammel Court, Hawthorne Court, University Village, and non-university housing. The sub-concept of satisfaction with housing was included in this dissertation to determine the hypothesized effect of this sub-concept on the marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the individual responded to the following question:

**Question 28:** All things considered, how satisfied are you with where you are living? (Apartment, house, etc.)

- VERY SATISFIED: \( -5 \)
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED: \( -4 \)
- UNDECIDED: \( -3 \)
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED: \( -2 \)
- VERY DISSATISFIED: \( -1 \)

Satisfaction with housing is measured by the coding given above. The satisfaction with housing of each individual was therefore given a score according to his or her response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

**E. C. 33:** The housing satisfaction score is a measure of satisfaction.
Satisfaction with Ames

Ames is defined as the small city in which Iowa State University is located. The use of this sub-concept focuses on the hypothesized effect of satisfaction with living in Ames has on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of each respondent was made to the following question:

Question 29: Generally, how satisfied are you with living in Ames?

- VERY SATISFIED - 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED - 4
- UNDECIDED - 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED - 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED - 1

Satisfaction with Ames is measured by the coding given above. The satisfaction with Ames of each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 34: The satisfaction with living in Ames score is a measure of satisfaction.

Evaluation of marriage and satisfaction

Satisfaction with marriage is defined as the evaluation each spouse has of their marriage. The use of the sub-concept, satisfaction with marriage, focuses on the hypothesized effect of the spouses' evaluation of their marriage and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 26: In comparison with other couples you know, how would you evaluate you and your husband's (wife's) marriage relationship?

- MUCH BETTER THAN OTHERS - 5
Satisfaction with marriage is measured by the coding given above. The evaluation of marriage of each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 35: The spouses' evaluation score of their marriage is a measure of satisfaction with their marriage.

**College marriage and satisfaction**

An individual's attitude toward college marriage is defined as the expressed feeling each spouse holds concerning college marriage, marrying under the same circumstances, and advising others to get married while in college. To operationalize the sub-concept, attitude toward college marriage, three empirical measures were used. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

**Question 47:** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Marriage helps the college student do better work.

- STRONGLY AGREE -5
- AGREE -4
- UNDECIDED -3
- DISAGREE -2
- STRONGLY DISAGREE -1

**Question 48:** Complete the following sentence by filling in the blank with one of the choices below: I think I would not have gotten married if I had known circumstances concerning my marriage would be as they are.

- VERY OFTEN -5
- FAIRLY OFTEN -4
- NOW AND THEN -3
- SELDOM -2
Table 36a. Zero-order correlations, matrix form, for male respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do better work in college marriage $X_1$</th>
<th>Marry under same circumstances $X_2$</th>
<th>Advise child to marry $X_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* D.F. = 198. .185 significant at .01 level.

Table 36b. Zero-order correlations, matrix, form, for female respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do better work in college marriage $X_1$</th>
<th>Marry under same circumstances $X_2$</th>
<th>Advise child to marry $X_3$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* D.F. = 198. .185 significant at .01 level.
Question 49: If you had a child who was thinking of getting married and their circumstances were similar to your present circumstances, would you advise them to go ahead and get married?

YES, DEFINITELY. ........................................... -5
YES, MAYBE ................................................... -4
UNDECIDED. ................................................... -3
NO, MAYBE. .................................................... -2
NO, DEFINITELY .............................................. -1

Tables 36 and 36b present the matrix form of zero-order correlations for the responses to these three questions.

Due to the fact that the correlations between these three questions are not consistently significant for the male and female respondents, they are not assumed to be additive. Satisfaction with college marriage, therefore, will be measured by the separate coding of the three given questions. The satisfaction with college marriage of each individual was therefore given three separate scores according to his response to these questions. The theoretical range for each of these scores is 1 through 5. The following relationships are thereby stated:

E. C. 36: The marriage helps the college student do better work score is a measure of satisfaction with college marriage.

E. C. 37: The attitude toward getting married under the same circumstances score is a measure of college marriage.

E. C. 38: The attitude regarding advising one's child to get married under the same circumstances score is a measure of satisfaction.

Satisfaction with present life

Comparison of a married college student's present life with the life of those who are not in college is defined as one's evaluation of where one
is with where one would like to be. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following questions:

**Question 20:** To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: *As married college students, my husband (wife) and I are having to live too much for the future and not enough for today.*

- STRONGLY AGREE .................. -5
- AGREE .................................. -4
- UNDECIDED ............................. -3
- DISAGREE .............................. -2
- STRONGLY DISAGREE ................ -1

**Question 21:** Think of friends you and your husband (wife) have, or people you know, who are in the "outside" world (not in school) and who are buying homes, rearing families, and getting established in their business or profession. How often do you wish you were living a life such as the one they are living rather than what you are now doing?

I wish I were living a life such as they are living:

- VERY OFTEN .......................... -5
- FAIRLY OFTEN ........................ -4
- NOW AND THEN ........................ -3
- SELDOM ................................ -2
- NEVER ................................ -1

There was a .391 correlation coefficient between the responses to these two questions (.121 significant at .01 level, 398 d.f.). Satisfaction with present life is measured by the composite coding given above. The higher the score, the lower the satisfaction with the present life is assumed to be. The satisfaction of each individual was therefore given a total score according to his responses to the two questions. The theoretical range for this total score was 2 through 10. The following relationship is thereby stated:

**E. C. 39:** The comparison of present life with "outside" life and "future" life score is a measure of satisfaction with present life.
Satisfaction with "going out"

"Going out" is defined as the process by which the husband and/or wife go outside the home for various activities, such as visiting with friends and recreation. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 30: How satisfied are you with the frequency you get to go out?

- VERY SATISFIED -5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED -4
- NEUTRAL -3
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED -2
- VERY DISSATISFIED -1

Satisfaction with "going out" is measured by the coding given above. The satisfaction with "going out" for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 40: Satisfaction with going out score is a measure of the concept satisfaction.

Satisfaction and contraception

Contraception is defined as any method which a spouse, or a couple, uses to regulate the birth of their children. The use of the sub-concept, satisfaction with contraception, focuses on the hypothesized effect on the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. Table 37 presents the frequency of response, by sex, for the different forms of contraception used by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Table 37. Frequency of responses, according to sex, as to method spouses reported they and/or their husbands or wives used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of contraception</th>
<th>No. of wives who reported they and/or husband used this method</th>
<th>No. of husbands who reported they and/or wife used this method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do not use any</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Withdrawal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Douche</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Jelly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Foam</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Jelly + diaphragm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Rhythm</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Diaphragm</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Condom (rubber)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. IUD, loop, coil</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pill</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sterilization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pregnant</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 64: How satisfied are you with your present method of birth control? (If you do not use any, answer for satisfaction concerning not using any.)

- VERY SATISFIED .............. -5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED ........ -4
- NEUTRAL ..................... -3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED .... -2
- VERY DISSATISFIED .......... -1
Satisfaction with contraception is measured by the coding given above. The satisfaction with the present method of contraception was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 5. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 41: The satisfaction with contraception score is a measure of the concept, satisfaction.

Communication

Communication has been defined as both the verbal and non-verbal means of conveying messages from one spouse to the other. In the case of marriage communication would primarily be for purposes of conveying each spouse's role-expectations, intentions, and feelings. Communication is viewed as a prerequisite for adjustment in marriage. The concept, communication, was included in this dissertation in order to emphasize the effect of satisfaction of each spouse on marital adjustment.

Talking things over

Talking things over is defined as the frequency certain topics are discussed by married couples. A specified list of topics is not meant to imply these are all the topics discussed in marriage. Rather, a specified list is only a sampling of topics perceived as relevant to this study. The sub-concept, talking things over, was included in this dissertation in order to determine the hypothesized effect of couples talking with each other on the marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Question 73: As you know, there are married couples who discuss things while other married couples do not discuss these same things. Would you say you discuss the following with your husband (wife): Always, Fairly often, Once in awhile, Seldom, or Never?

Also, do you feel your husband (wife) and you have the same ideas or different ideas about the following? (Check appropriate square to indicate your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very often (5)</th>
<th>Fairly often (4)</th>
<th>Once in awhile (3)</th>
<th>Seldom (2)</th>
<th>Never (1)</th>
<th>We have: Same ideas</th>
<th>Different ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's work or school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's household</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 38 presents the frequency of responses to the preceding question. The degree to which couples discussed the preceding listed topics is mea-
Table 38. Responses to frequency of discussion of specified topics, by husbands and wives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very often Wives</th>
<th>Fairly often Wives</th>
<th>Once in awhile Wives</th>
<th>Seldom Wives</th>
<th>Never Wives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future plans</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's work</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's household responsibilities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex relations</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sured by the coding given above. The degree of "talking things over" for each individual was therefore given a score according to his responses to these questions. The theoretical range for this score is 8 through 40. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 42: The talking things over score is a measurement of the concept communication.

Consensus

Consensus is defined as the degree to which couples agree regarding specified topics. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the question presented in the preceding section dealing with "talking things over". Consensus is measured by the raw score of the number of ideas each spouse checked as "same ideas". The degree of consensus for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 8. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 43: The consensus score is a measure of the concept communication.

Personal Characteristics

The following are considered as personal characteristics and will be operationally defined by indices. These indices will be used to measure the extent to which these personal characteristics influence the marital adjustment which spouses have achieved in their marriage.

Age when married

Age when married is defined as the age in years of the husband and wife at the time of marriage. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Question 8: What was your age at the time you were married?

(Write answer in years)

Age when married is measured by the coding given to the above question. The age when married for each individual was given a score according to his response to this question. These responses were coded in years. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 44: Age in years score is a measure of the personal characteristic age when married.

Age differences of spouses

Age differences of spouses is defined as the difference, in years, between the age of the husband and the wife. To determine the difference in the age of the spouses, the responses to the following question were compared:

Question 6: What is your age? (Write answer in years)

Age difference is measured by coding assigned to the above. These differences in ages were coded as the actual difference, in years, between the spouses' ages. The age difference between each set of spouses was therefore given a score according to the husband and wife's response to this question. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 45: Age difference in years score is a measure of the personal characteristic age differences of spouses.

Length of engagement

Length of engagement is defined as that period of time when a couple decides to get married to the time they do get married. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:
Question 11: How long were you and your husband (wife) engaged before you were married?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Engagement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO ENGAGEMENT</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 MONTHS OR LESS</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 6 MONTHS</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9 MONTHS</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12 MONTHS</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 15 MONTHS</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 - 18 MONTHS</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVER 18 MONTHS</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of engagement is measured by the coding given above. The length of engagement for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 46: The length of engagement score is a measure of the personal characteristic length of engagement.

Length of acquaintance

Length of acquaintance is defined as the length of time which a couple knew each other before they were married. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 9: How long did you and your husband (wife) know each other before you were married?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of Acquaintance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN ONE YEAR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF ONE YEAR OR MORE, WRITE IN NEAREST YEAR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Length of acquaintance is measured by the coding given to the response to this question. These answers were coded in months. The length of acquaintance for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 47: The length of acquaintance score is a
Social class difference

Social class difference is defined as the difference between the social class of the parents of the spouses. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 32: What is your father's occupation? (If father is not living, what was his occupation?)

Differences in social class is measured by the difference in the coding to the question above. The father's occupation is measured by use of the North-Hatt Scale, ranked on a scale from 33-96, depending upon the social evaluation of the occupation. Therefore, the occupation of the father is given a score according to the social position-evaluation of the occupation of the father. The difference in the scores of the spouses' fathers' occupations constituted the score for differences in the social class of the spouses. The theoretical range for this score is from 0 through 66. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 48: The social class difference score is a measure of the personal characteristic social class difference of the spouses.

Social class of parents

Social class of parents is defined as the rank in relation to other people or groups in a society. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 32: What is your father's occupation? (If father is not living, what was his occupation?)

Occupation is measured by use of the North-Hatt Scale as explained in the preceding section of this chapter. The social class of the parents of
the spouses in this study is measured by the coding assigned to each occupation of the North-Hatt Scale. The social class of parents for each spouse's parents was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 33 through 96. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 49: The ranking on the North-Hatt scale is a measure of the personal characteristic social class of parents.

Level of education at the time of marriage

Level of education is defined as that place a person is on a continuum of educational achievement. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 15: When you were married, what was your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. .............. -00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. ....................... -01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND H.S. ........ -02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE ................. -03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE. .......................... -04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE ....................... -05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. OR EQUIVALENT) ...... -06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE. ................. -07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED. ............... -08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE. ................. -09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED. ................. -10
POSTDOCTORATE. ............................ -11

Level of education at the time of marriage is measured by the coding given above. The level of education for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 00 through 11. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 50: The level of education at the time of marriage score is a measure of the personal characteristic level of education.
Educational differences are defined as the difference between the educational level of husband and wife. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 16: At the present time what is your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. . . . . . . . -00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND H.S. . . . . . . -02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE . . . . . . . . . . . . -03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. OR EQUIVALENT) . . -06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE. . . . . . . . . . . -07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED. . . . . . . . . . . -08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED. . . . . . . . . . . . . . -10
POSTDOCTORATE. . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . -11

Educational differences between spouses are measured by comparing the coding given above. The educational differences between each set of spouses were therefore given a score according to the difference in the spouses' responses to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 0 through 11. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. G. 51: The score computed by the differences in the spouses' educational level scores is a measure of the personal characteristic educational differences.

Income

Income in this study refers only to money income. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 75: Which of these categories best estimates your gross family income? (Include husband's income, wife's
Income was measured by the coding given above. The income of each family was therefore given a score according to the spouses' responses to this question. The theoretical range for this score is 1 through 11. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 52: The income in dollars score is a measure of the personal characteristic income.

Length of time married

Length of time married is defined as the years and/or months which a couple has been married. In the initial research instrument, the response of the individual was made to the following question:

Question 7: How long have you and your husband (wife) been married? (If married more than once, all questions referring to marriage refer only to your present marriage.)

WE HAVE BEEN MARRIED_____YEARS + _____MONTHS

Length of time married is measured by coding applied to the answer to the above question. These answers were coded in months. The length of time married for each individual was therefore given a score according to his response to this question. The following relationship is thereby stated:

E. C. 53: The length of time married in months
score is a measure of the personal characteristic length of time married.

Method of Data Analysis

The fundamental task of the social scientist is to describe the relationship between multiple variables in order to explain and to predict human behavior. The correlational coefficient is a statistical measure which describes the degree of relation between two or more variables.

The correlational coefficient not only allows one to measure the degree of relationship between two variables, thereby quantifying what otherwise might be left to subjective appraisal, but also permits the comparison of the strength of one relation to that of another. The correlational coefficient is used in this dissertation as the statistical measure for the relationship between variables for the following reasons:

1. The correlational coefficient is a general measure, i.e., the statistical measurement is independent of the specific units of measurement employed to measure the variables being related.

2. The correlational coefficient technique is a statistical measurement not restricted to limited data, but has wide applicability encompassing many kinds of data.

3. The correlational coefficient technique is a statistical measurement having fixed reference points, indicating the extremes of little or strong association between variables. The correlational coefficient technique is particularly applicable to data which also have fixed upper and lower
limits, i.e., because upper and lower limits of association are defined and described, interpretation of a measure of association will be more meaningful for data that also has an upper and lower limit.

4. The correlational coefficient technique is a statistical measurement whose size depends entirely on the extent to which the two or more sets of data are related.

5. The correlational coefficient technique is a statistical measurement that employs the full range of scores for each variable, rather than compress or group for analysis.

However, in the cases in this dissertation where the hypotheses were tested in order to determine if there was a significance difference between two groups, the "t" test of means was used.

Three assumptions are made concerning the data that related to the correlational coefficient and the "t" test of difference of means as the statistical measurements for the data. These assumptions are:

1. Linearity of data is assumed.
2. Interval-scale measurement is assumed.
3. Normal distribution of data is assumed.

The above tests are not sensitive to spread if the distribution is normal. Since the distribution of data is assumed to be normal, the calculated values for each comparison of data is reported at two levels of significance. In the cases the correlational coefficient is used, these values have been computed between the variables as given. In cases where the "t" test of means was used, the "t" values between the means of the two groups being compared were computed. By comparison with the "t" value, the
significance of the calculated correlational coefficient is given. The significant "t" values are also presented for the "t" test of means. In order to statistically make inference about the data when direction is predicted, a "one-tailed" value for both measurements is given in the analysis of data.

It should also be pointed out that in cases where the correlation coefficient values derived from the relation of variables were not significant, the author of this dissertation plotted the variables on an XY axis in order to determine possible curvilinear relationships. In no cases which were plotted was there a curvilinear relationship.
ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

As previously stated in this dissertation the factors related to the marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage is being investigated. Therefore, implicit in each hypothesis is the wife's marital adjustment and the husband's marital adjustment. In cases where the husband's and wife's responses to the independent variable are identical, there would be two correlation coefficient values or two "t" values computed: one between the independent variable and the wife's marital adjustment and one between the independent variable and the husband's marital adjustment. For example, length of time married is the same for both spouses. In this case there is a correlation coefficient between the length of time married and the marital adjustment of the wife and between the length of time married and the husband's marital adjustment. These are referred to as two-relation hypotheses.

However, in cases where the spouses' responses are not identical to the independent variables, there would be four correlation coefficients computed. For example, the wife's religiosity score would be correlated with: (1) the wife's marital adjustment score, and (2) the husband's marital adjustment score. In addition, the husband's religiosity score would be correlated with: (3) the wife's marital adjustment score, and (4) the husband's marital adjustment score. These are referred to as four-relation hypotheses.

The total number of individuals in the Married Student Study at Iowa State University is 400. However, in no case is this total "N" used in the analysis and findings for this study. Rather, the "N" refers to the 200
husbands and another "N" refers to the 200 wives. Throughout the analysis
and findings of this study the marital adjustment of husbands and wives are
analyzed separately.

The significant values for the correlation coefficient are .138 at the
.05 level of significance and .185 at the .01 level of significance for an
N of 200 (200 husbands and 200 wives). However, for the sub-samples which
are analyzed in this dissertation the following significant values apply:

1. For an N of 114, the calculated correlation coefficient
   is .163 at the .05 level of significance and .229 at the
   .01 level of significance.

2. For an N of 48, the calculated correlation coefficient is
   .244 at the .05 level of significance and .339 at the .01
   level of significance.

3. For an N of 94, the calculated correlation coefficient is
   .175 at the .05 level of significance and .245 at the .01
   level of significance.

The significant values for the "t" test of difference in means are
1.645 at the .05 level and 2.326 at the .01 level for an N of 200. How­
ever, for the sub-samples which are analyzed in this dissertation the fol­
lowing significant values apply:

1. For an N of 114, the significant "t" value is 1.658 at
   the .05 level of significance and 2.358 at the .01 level
   of significance.

2. For an N of 94, the significant "t" value is 1.665 at the
   .05 level of significance and 2.374 at the .01 level of
   significance.
3. For an N of 48, the significant "t" value is 1.684 at the .05 level and 2.423 at the .01 level of significance.

Each of the empirical hypotheses in this dissertation stated the expected direction of the relationship between the variables. These hypotheses are stated in such form that it is possible to test whether there is a relationship between two or more variables. The general hypotheses for this dissertation have been generated, and the empirical measures used to operationalize the concepts in the general hypotheses have been developed. The empirical hypotheses have been stated. In this section a summary and interpretation of the results of the tests of the empirical hypotheses will be given for each of the empirical hypotheses which is used to test the general hypotheses.

General Hypothesis 1: The various roles played by the husband and wife of married college couples is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

E. H. 1: The wife-only employed is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N. H. 1: There is no relationship between the wife-only being employed and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .222 for the wife and .689 for the husband.

The calculated "t" values were not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

\(^1\)N. H. refers to Null Hypothesis.
E. H. 2: Both spouses employed is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 2: There is no relationship between both spouses being employed and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .141 for the wife and .233 for the husband.

The calculated "t" values were not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 3: The rank of the wife's occupation is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 3: There is no relationship between the rank of the wife's occupation and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 114: Analysis refers to couples where wife is employed.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .010 for the wife and .019 for the husband.

The values of the calculated correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 4: The husband's satisfaction with his wife in the labor force is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 4: There is no relationship between the husband's satisfaction with his wife in the labor force and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 114: Analysis refers to couples where wife is employed.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .129 for the wife and .163 for the husband.
The value of the correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level for the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is significant for the husband at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife's marital adjustment, but do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's marital adjustment.

E. H. 5: The number of hours the wife works at her employment is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 5: There is no relationship between the hours the wife works at her employment and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 114: Analysis refers to couples where wife is employed.)

The calculated correlational coefficients were .088 for the wife and .158 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 6: The proportion of the wife's income to the family income is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 6: There is no relationship between the proportion of wife's income to the family income and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 114: Analysis refers to couples where wife is employed.)

The calculated correlational coefficients were -.090 for the wife and .007 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 7: Both spouses being enrolled in school is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
N.H. 7: There is no relationship between both spouses being enrolled in school and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .236 for the wife and .811 for the husband.

The calculated "t" values are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 8: The husband-only enrolled in school is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 8: There is no relationship between the husband-only enrolled in school and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .621 for the wife and .872 for the husband.

The calculated "t" values are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 9: The prestige of the wife's major is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 9: There is no relationship between the prestige of the wife's major and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .123 for the wife and .174 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.
E. H. 10: The wife's grade point is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 10: There is no relationship between the wife's grade point and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .213 for the wife and .191 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 11: The student classification of the wife is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 11: There is no relationship between the student classification of the wife and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to those couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.010 for the wife and .128 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 12: The average quarter-credits course load of the wife is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 12: There is no relationship between the average quarter-credits course load of the wife and the marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to those couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .150 for the wife and -.148 for the husband.
The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

**E. H. 13:** The student-wife's commitment to completing her education is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**N.H. 13:** There is no relationship between the student-wife's commitment to completing her education and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to those couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .259 for the wife and .158 for the husband.

The correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level for the wife. The correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level of the husband. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

**E. H. 14:** The husband's attitude regarding his student-wife completing school is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

**N.H. 14:** There is no relationship between the husband's attitude regarding his student-wife completing school and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 48: Analysis refers to those couples where the wife is a student.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .259 for the wife and .226 for the husband.

The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level for the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level for the husband.

These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.
E. H. 15: Parental help through loans will be positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 15: There is no relationship between parental help through loans and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .551 for the wife and .256 for the husband.

The "t" values are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 16: Parental help through gifts will be negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 16: There is no relationship between parental help through gifts and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were .636 for the wife and 3.10 for the husband.

The "t" value is not significant at the .05 level for the wife. The "t" value is significant at the .01 level for the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

E. H. 17: Both sets of parents helping the couple is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 17: There is no relationship between both sets of parents helping the couple and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 94: Analysis refers to couples receiving parental help.)

The calculated "t" values were .270 for the wife and .258 for the husband.
The "t" values are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 18: Only the wife's parents helping the married couple is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 18: There is no relationship between only the wife's parents helping the married couple and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 94: Analysis refers to those couples receiving parental help.)

The calculated "t" values were .772 for the wife and .646 for the husband.

The "t" values are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 19: Only the husband's parents helping the couple is negatively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 19: There is no relationship between only the husband's parents helping the couple and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

(N = 94: Analysis refers to those couples receiving parental help.)

The calculated "t" values were .189 for the wife and 1.83 for the husband.

The calculated "t" value is not significant at the .05 level for the wife. The calculated "t" value is significant at the .05 level for the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

E. H. 20: The religiosity of the spouses is positively related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

N.H. 20: There is no relationship between the religiosity of the spouses and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.
The calculated correlation coefficients were .005 for the wife and .083 for the husband in reference to the wife's religiosity. The calculated correlation coefficients were .144 for the wife and .104 for the husband in reference to the husband's religiosity.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 21: The presence of children in the home score will be negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 21: There is no relationship between the presence of children in the home score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

The calculated "t" values were 3.21 for the wife and 3.86 for the husband.

The "t" values are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 22: The number of children a couple has score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 22: There is no relationship between the number of children a couple has score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.226 for the wife and -.197 for the husband.

The correlational coefficient is significant at the .01 level for the wife. The correlational coefficient is significant at the .05 level for the husband. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 23: The desire for children score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual
spouses.

N.H. 23: There is no relationship between the desire for children score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.016 for the wife and -.019 for the husband in reference to the wife's desire for children. The calculated correlation coefficients were .108 for the wife and .169 for the husband in reference to the husband's desire for children.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant for the husband or wife at the .05 level in relation to the wife's desire for children. The correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level for the wife in relation to the husband's desire for children. The correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level for the husband in relation to the husband's desire for children. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife's desire for children for either the husband or wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's desire for children for the wife. These data do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's desire for children for the husband.

E. H. 24: The occurrence of premarital pregnancy score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 24: There is no relationship between the occurrence of premarital pregnancy score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were 4.21 for the wife and 5.56 for the husband.

The calculated "t" values are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 25: The occurrence of unplanned pregnancy after marriage score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.
N.H. 25: There is no relationship between the occurrence of unplanned pregnancy after marriage score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated "t" values were 2.21 for the wife and 5.28 for the husband.

The calculated "t" value is significant at the .05 level for the wife. The calculated "t" value is significant at the .01 level for the husband. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 26: The happiness of the parents' marriage score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 26: There is no relationship between the happiness of the parents' marriage score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .147 for the wife and .034 for the husband in reference to the happiness of the wife's parents' marriage. The calculated correlation coefficients were .139 for the wife and .068 for the husband in reference to the happiness of the husband's parents' marriage.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant for the husband at the .05 level. The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level for the wife. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

E. H. 27: The equalitarian decision-making score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 27: There is no relationship between the equalitarian decision-making score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)
The calculated correlation coefficients were .217 for the wife and .212 for the husband in relation to the wife's responses as to the equalitarian decision-making of the couple. The calculated correlation coefficients were .253 for the wife and .236 for the husband in relation to the husband's responses as to the equalitarian decision-making of the couple.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 28: The husband dominating in the decision-making score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 28: There is no relationship between the husband dominating in the decision-making score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .017 for the wife and -.085 for the husband in relation to the wife's responses as to the dominance of the husband. The calculated correlation coefficients were .031 for the wife and .038 for the husband in relation to the husband's responses as to the dominance of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 29: The wife dominating in the decision-making score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 29: There is no relationship between the wife dominating in the decision-making score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.017 for the wife and .079 for the husband in relation to the wife's responses as to the dominance of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .010 for the wife and .109 for the husband in relation to the husband's responses as to the dominance of the wife.
The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 30: The degree of accuracy in role-taking score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 30: There is no relationship between the degree of accuracy in role-taking score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .228 for the wife and .179 for the husband in relation to the degree of role-taking accuracy of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .166 for the wife and .177 for the husband in relation to the degree of role-taking accuracy of the husband.

The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .01 level between the role-taking accuracy of the wife and the wife's marital adjustment. The values of the remaining correlation coefficients for this hypothesis is significant at the .05 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

The thirty sub-hypotheses, relative to marital adjustment, representing general hypothesis one were tested by thirty empirical hypotheses. Included in these thirty empirical hypotheses were twenty-four two-relation hypotheses and six four-relation hypotheses. Of the twenty-four two-relation hypotheses only four empirical hypotheses were supported by the data at the designated significance level for both husband and wife. In addition, two empirical hypotheses were supported at the designated significance level for the wife but not for the husband. Three of the two-relation hypotheses were supported by the data at the designated significance level for the husband but not for the wife.

Of the six four-relation hypotheses only two empirical hypotheses were
supported by the data at the designated significance level for all investigated relationships. In addition, one empirical hypothesis was supported by the data at the designated significance level for the husband's marital adjustment in relation to both the husband's and wife's responses. Another empirical hypothesis was supported by the data at the designated significance level for the husband's marital adjustment in relation to the husband's responses. None of the four-relation hypotheses was supported by the data at the designated significance level for the wife and not for the husband. Based on this data, it is concluded that these empirical hypotheses, in general, do not support the hypothesized relationship between the different roles of the spouses and their marital adjustment.

General Hypothesis 2: The degree of satisfaction expressed by the spouses regarding various aspects of their marriage and surrounding factors will be related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

E. H. 31: The satisfaction with housing score expressed by each spouse is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 31: There is no relationship between the satisfaction with housing score expressed by each spouse and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .316 for the wife and .210 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .152 for the wife and .101 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level between the wife's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment achieved by
husband and wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level between the husband's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment of the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient between the husband's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment of the husband is not significant at the .05 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment of the husband and wife. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment of the wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's satisfaction with housing and the marital adjustment of the husband.

E. H. 32: The satisfaction with living in Ames score expressed by each spouse is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 32: There is no relationship between the satisfaction with living in Ames score expressed by each spouse and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .025 for the wife and .176 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were -.018 for the wife and .120 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the husband.

The value of the correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level between the wife's marital adjustment in relation to the wife's satisfaction with living in Ames. The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level between the marital adjustment achieved by the husband and the wife's satisfaction with living in Ames. The values of the correlation coefficients between the marital adjustment achieved by the husband and the wife and the husband's satisfaction with living in Ames is not significant at the .05 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife's satisfaction with living in Ames and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife's satisfaction with living in Ames and the degree of marital adjustment achieved
by the wife. Likewise, these data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband's satisfaction with living in Ames and the marital satisfaction of husband or wife.

E. H. 33: The spouses' evaluation of their marriage score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 33: There is no relationship between the spouses' evaluation of their marriage score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .526 for the wife and .479 for the husband in relation to the evaluation of the marriage by the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .366 for the wife and .486 for the husband in relation to the evaluation of the marriage by the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 34: The attitude the spouses hold concerning college marriage helping one do better work score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 34: There is no relationship between the attitude the spouses hold concerning college marriage helping one do better work score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .127 for the wife and .160 for the husband in relation to the wife's attitude. The calculated coefficients were .112 for the wife and .181 for the husband in relation to the husband's attitude.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level between the wife's attitude or the husband's attitude regarding college marriage helping one do better work and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the wife. The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05
level between the wife's attitude and the husband's attitude regarding college marriage helping one do better work and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

E. H. 35: The attitude the spouses hold concerning getting married under the same circumstances score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 35: There is no relationship between the attitude the spouses hold concerning getting married under the same circumstances score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .492 for the wife and .439 for the husband in relation to the expressed attitude of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .368 for the wife and .531 for the husband in relation to the expressed attitude of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 36: The attitude the spouses hold concerning advising their child to get married under circumstances similar to theirs score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 36: There is no relationship between the attitude the spouses hold concerning advising their child to get married under circumstances similar to theirs score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .429 for the wife and .425 for the husband in relation to the expressed attitude of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .342 for the wife and .353 for the husband in relation to the expressed attitude of the husband.
The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 37: The degree to which an individual is satisfied with his present life score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 37: There is no relationship between the degree to which an individual is satisfied with his present life score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .204 for the wife and .354 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .233 for the wife and .296 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 38: The satisfaction expressed concerning the frequency each spouse gets to go out score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 38: There is no relationship between the satisfaction expressed concerning the frequency each spouse gets to go out score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .223 for the wife and .194 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .185 for the wife and .216 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 39: The satisfaction expressed by the spouses concerning
the form of contraception they are using score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 39: There is no relationship between the satisfaction expressed by the spouses concerning the form of contraception they are using score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .061 for the wife and .144 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .090 for the wife and .150 for the husband in relation to the expressed satisfaction of the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level between the wife's expressed satisfaction or the husband's expressed satisfaction and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the wife. The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level between the expressed satisfaction of the wife and the expressed satisfaction of the husband and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

The nine sub-hypotheses, relative to marital adjustment and satisfaction, representing general hypotheses two were tested by nine empirical hypotheses. All the empirical hypotheses tested in relation to general hypothesis two were four-relation hypotheses. Five of the nine empirical hypotheses were supported by the data at the designated significance level. Two of the empirical hypotheses were supported by the data at the designated significance level for the marital adjustment achieved by the husband in relation to the wife's and husband's responses. One empirical hypothesis was supported by the data at the designated significance level for the husband's marital adjustment in relation to the husband's and wife's responses,
and for the wife's marital adjustment in relation to the husband's responses. Another empirical hypothesis was supported by the data at the designated significance level for the wife's marital adjustment in relation to the husband's and wife's responses and for the husband's marital adjustment in relation to the wife's responses. Based on these data, that none of the empirical hypotheses were completely non-supported by the data at the designated significance level, and that the majority of the empirical hypotheses was supported by the data in all the tested relationships, it is concluded these empirical hypotheses, in general, support the hypothesized relationship between satisfaction and marital adjustment.

General Hypothesis 3: The degree of communication between a couple is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

E. H. 40: The couples talking things over together score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 40: There is no relationship between the couple talking things over together score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .085 for the wife and .116 for the husband in relation to the wife's responses regarding the couple talking things over together. The calculated correlation coefficients were .032 for the wife and .134 for the husband in relation to the husband's responses regarding the couple talking things over together.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 41: The degree of consensus between a couple regarding certain subjects score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.
N.H. 41: There is no relationship between the degree of consensus between a couple regarding certain subjects score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .246 for the wife and .392 for the husband in relation to the consensus of the couple as expressed by the wife. The calculated correlation coefficients were .298 for the wife and .414 for the husband in relation to the consensus of the couple as expressed by the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .01 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

The two sub-hypotheses relative to marital adjustment and communication, representing general hypothesis three, were tested by two empirical hypotheses. Both of the empirical hypotheses representing general hypothesis three were four-relation hypotheses. Only one of the two empirical hypotheses was supported by the data at the designated significance level. Based on these data, it is concluded that these empirical hypotheses, in general, do not support the hypothesized relationship between communication and marital adjustment.

General Hypothesis 4: Selected personal characteristics of the couple are related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the individual spouses in their marriage.

E. H. 42: The age of the spouses in years at the time of marriage is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 42: There is no relationship between the age of the spouses at the time of marriage and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)
The calculated correlation coefficients were .073 for the wife and .190 for the husband in relation to the wife's age at marriage. The calculated correlation coefficients were .149 for the wife and .127 for the husband in relation to the husband's age at marriage.

The value of the correlation coefficient was not significant at the .05 level between the wife's age at marriage and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .01 level between the wife's age at marriage and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband. The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level between the husband's age at marriage and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level between the husband's age at marriage and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband.

These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife.

E. H. 43: The age difference in years of the spouses is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 43: There is no relationship between the age difference of the spouses and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .086 for the wife and .112 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 44: The length of the couple's engagement in months is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 44: There is no relationship between the length of the couple's engagement in months and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)
The calculated correlation coefficients were .139 for the wife and .132 for the husband.

The value of the correlation coefficient is significant at the .05 level for the wife. The value of the correlation coefficient is not significant at the .05 level for the husband. These data support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the wife. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis in reference to the husband.

E. H. 45: The length of time a couple was acquainted before marriage score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 45: There is no relationship between the length of time a couple was acquainted before marriage score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .063 for the wife and -.060 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 46: The wife being from a higher social class than the husband score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 46: There is no relationship between the wife being from a higher social class than the husband score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.026 for the wife and .016 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 47: The husband being from a higher social class than the wife score is positively related to the marital
adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 47: There is no relationship between the husband being from a higher social class score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.075 for the wife and -.071 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 48: The social class of the parents of the spouses score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 48: There is no relationship between the social class of the parents of the spouses score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .002 for the wife and .095 for the husband in relation to the social status of the wife's parents. The calculated correlation coefficients were -.067 for the wife and -.012 for the husband in relation to the social status of the husband's parents.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 49: The educational level of the spouses at the time of marriage score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 49: There is no relationship between the educational level of the spouses at the time of marriage score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)
The calculated correlation coefficients were .008 for the wife and .026 for the husband in relation to the wife's educational level at the time of marriage. The calculated correlation coefficients were .044 for the wife and .099 for the husband in relation to the husband's educational level when married.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 50: The wife's educational level being higher than the husband's educational level score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 50: There is no relationship between the wife's educational level being higher than the husband's educational level score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.008 and .065 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 51: The income of the couple score is positively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

N.H. 51: There is no relationship between the income of the couple score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were .038 for the wife and .018 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are not significant at the .05 level. These data do not support the empirical hypothesis.

E. H. 52: The length of time the spouses have been married score is negatively related to the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.
N.H. 52: There is no relationship between the length of time the spouses have been married score and the marital adjustment score of the individual spouses.

(N = 200: Analysis refers to entire sample.)

The calculated correlation coefficients were -.180 for the wife and -.172 for the husband.

The values of the correlation coefficients are significant at the .05 level. These data support the empirical hypothesis.

These eleven sub-hypotheses, relative to marital adjustment and personal characteristics, were tested by eleven empirical hypotheses. Included in the eleven empirical hypotheses were three four-relation hypotheses and eight two-relation hypotheses. Of the four-relation hypotheses only one was at least partially supported by the data at the designated significance level. This hypothesis was supported by the data, at the designated significance level, for the husband's marital adjustment in relation to the wife's responses, and for the wife's marital adjustment in relation to the husband's responses.

Only one of the eight two-relation hypotheses was supported by the data at the designated significance level for both husband and wife. In addition, one was supported in reference to the wife's marital adjustment but not for the husband's marital adjustment.

Summary of the test of hypotheses

Having tested all the empirical hypotheses for statistical significance, the findings in the analyses of the four general hypotheses using the correlation coefficient test and the "t" test for difference of means will be summarized.

General hypothesis one hypothesized a relationship between the roles
of the spouses and marital adjustment. This hypothesis was tested by thirty empirical hypotheses, including twenty-four two-relation hypotheses and six four-relation hypotheses. Four of the two-relation hypotheses were fully supported by the data, and two of the two-relation hypotheses were partially supported by the data. Two of the four-relation hypotheses were fully supported by the data, and two were partially supported by the data.

General hypothesis two, which hypothesized a relationship between satisfaction and marital adjustment, was tested by nine four-relation hypotheses. Five of these empirical hypotheses were fully supported by the data, and four were at least partially supported by the data. General hypothesis three, which hypothesized a relationship between communication and marital adjustment was tested by two four-relation empirical hypotheses. One of these two hypotheses was supported by data and one was not supported by data.

General hypothesis four hypothesized a relationship between situational characteristics and marital adjustment. This hypothesis was tested by eleven empirical hypotheses, including three four-relation hypotheses and eight two-relation hypotheses. One of the four-relation hypotheses was partially supported by the data and one of the two-relation hypotheses was supported by the data. The remaining hypotheses were not supported by the data.

However, it should be pointed out that in the majority of cases the empirical hypotheses which were statistically significant and thereby supported their respective sub-hypotheses had low correlation coefficient and "t" values. Also, all the empirical hypotheses which were not supported by the data at the designated significance level did not have relationships in
the hypothesized direction. The reasons and explanations for the lack of significance or only tentative support of a number of empirical hypotheses which were explicated and tested will be discussed in the next chapter of this dissertation.
It has been stated in the previous chapter that only one of the four general hypotheses was supported by the data. It was also stated that in the cases when the empirical hypotheses were supported by the data, the relationships were not strong. In other cases where the empirical hypotheses were not supported by the data at the designated significance level, the relationships were not in the hypothesized direction. It is the purpose of this chapter to present possible explanations as to why these hypotheses were not supported by the data.

One of the reasons which seems to stand out and can be offered as an explanation for the lack of significance or only tentative support of a number of empirical hypotheses which were explicated and tested to ascertain the hypothesized relationship of the four general hypotheses is the method which was used to measure the degree of marital adjustment achieved by couples in their marriage. Consciously, or unconsciously, if a respondent is set on showing others that his or her marriage is successful, even though in fact he may know it is not, he may respond in a fashion contrary to fact. Also, some respondents could resent being asked personal questions which were on the marital adjustment test and so may refuse to answer questions or may not answer them honestly. Also, the author of this dissertation delivered each questionnaire and talked with each couple who was a part of the sample for this study. She had had several of these couples, or at least one spouse, in her classes while teaching at Iowa State University and some as advisees in the Sociology Department at Iowa State University. Because of this fact and the nature of the questions, even though
anonymity was guaranteed, some persons could have been trying to impress the investigator, thus attempting to make his score high.

In view of the particular population under consideration in this study and the unique situation of at least one spouse being enrolled in school, this author questions whether The Test of Marital Adjustment is actually applicable to a population such as this. Upon viewing the marital adjustment test, it is evident it is based on "togetherness". In a college marriage at least one spouse is involved in school, and in the majority of cases the other is either involved in school and/or working. Because of the couples' crowded schedules, it is doubtful a "togetherness" test can actually measure the degree of marital adjustment achieved by couples in their marriage in a married student population. Also, in today's society individuality in marriage is increasingly emphasized. It is this author's opinion that the test used to measure marital adjustment in this study does not really allow room for the individuality of the spouses.

The method of distributing the questionnaires and the fact they were self-administered could be another reason for the fact that several empirical hypotheses were not supported by the data. However, due to the fact that this author is very familiar with the data of this study after collecting, coding, and analyzing it, it is believed the couples did not discuss the questionnaire and decide how they were going to answer the questions. If this were the case, they agreed to disagree. Even though the responses to the various questions which have been presented in previous chapters of this dissertation give the appearance that spouses might have answered the questions alike, upon close analysis of each questionnaire, this was not the case. In only a very few instances were the respondents' answers to
questions of the marital adjustment test, or questions related to the other variables identical.

Another reason why the hypotheses were not supported by empirical data could be theoretical. Very little, if any, conceptualization and research has been done to determine the marital adjustment of present day married college students. In order to explicate the variables which are closely related to marital adjustment in married college students and their spouses, sufficient past research and theory is needed. Sufficient research data and theory are lacking in this study to adequately determine those factors which best represent the determinants of marital adjustment of the married student group which constituted the population of the present study. Until enough factual data can be gathered to increase the body of knowledge concerning married college students, a lack of significant empirical support, or low empirical support for the theoretical hypotheses would be expected.

Another possible reason why the hypotheses were not supported could be the fact of the skewed distribution of the marital adjustment scores of the spouses. As was stated in a previous chapter, the marital adjustment scores of the spouses were not evenly distributed into quartiles, but rather were skewed toward the upper quartiles.

There was a lack of control for possible intervening variables in this study. It was not the purpose of this study to investigate intervening variables or multiple relationships, but rather to investigate one-way relationships between the various independent variables and the dependent variable, marital adjustment. However, there is the possibility of variables which were not investigated in this study affecting the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage. Also, the smaller
"n's" of the various sub-samples which were investigated imposed limitations on the findings relevant to these sub-samples.

Other than the marital adjustment test there was no assurance as to the reliability or validity of the other measures used in this study. As stated previously, the interview schedule was constructed for the purpose of this particular study; therefore, there is no indication as to reliability or validity of the various measures used. This could be very applicable to the procedure used in formulating the measures used to determine the prestige of the wife's occupation and the wife's major.

First of all, it should be emphasized that the majority of the empirical hypotheses which were explicated in order to test the general hypotheses were based on past research, and in many cases, past research dealing with the married college student. As was pointed out in the introduction of this dissertation, the married college students of the 40's and 50's were generally elder, many times veterans, and lived by different economic standards than the married students of today. Therefore, it could possibly be concluded that the past research conducted with married students is not applicable to the married student of today. Also, past research which is applicable to non-college marriages is possibly not applicable to the married college couple.

General hypothesis one, which hypothesized a relationship between marital adjustment and the various roles of husband and wife, was not supported by the empirical data. In reference to the effect on the marital adjustment of the spouses of the wife-only employed, there was practically no difference between the marital adjustment of these spouses and the marital adjustment of other spouses. The same findings applied to the marital
adjustment of the spouses where both were employed. This lack of difference could possibly be explained by the fact that perhaps the students and/or their spouses' primary focus is that of completing school and they do not have the time or are not concerned with the particular roles each spouse performs as far as the income of the family is concerned.

The empirical hypothesis relating the prestige of the wife's occupation and the marital adjustment achieved by the spouses was not significant. This could be partially attributed to the homogenous nature of many of the jobs which the women held, very few being in the professional class. Also, this lack of a relationship could be due to the construction of the scale which was used to determine the prestige of these occupations.

The empirical hypothesis negatively related the hours the wife works at her employment and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses was not supported by the data. This lack of relationship could be because few wives worked any number of hours other than forty hours per week. Also, there is a possibility the working wife is better organized than her non-working counterpart, therefore not necessarily behind in her household chores. Also, perhaps her husband is more understanding and possibly helps the wife with household chores because she is contributing to the family income. Also, today with the vast production of such items as convenience foods, housework does not take as long to do, and the woman who works would be more likely to have the money to buy such conveniences with. The fact the husband showed a positive relationship in this area also might be explained by the fact that in the past "togetherness" has been interpreted as "happiness". However, this author questions as to whether this is true. Also, the more hours the wife works, the fewer are
the hours she is going to be left sitting idle at home while the husband is at school and the greater the likelihood she might feel she is really contributing something to this goal of achieving an education.

The empirical hypothesis negatively relating proportion of the wife's income to family income and marital adjustment was not supported by the data. This could be attributed to the fact that with her income they would be in a higher income bracket, therefore could possibly afford to do more and have more of the things they would like to have. It could also mean the couple could possibly live in better housing. Also, with the possible decrease in the apparent concern of differential roles of the spouses, couples could be moving from "my money" versus "your money" to "our money", particularly in this case of the goal of education viewed as for the couple's future.

The empirical hypothesis dealing with both spouses as students was not supported by data. The positive, but not significant relationship, between both spouses being enrolled in school and the husband's marital adjustment is a point of interest. This same situation produced a smaller positive relationship for the wife. Perhaps there has been a decrease in the attitude that it is not really so important for the wife to go to school, or perhaps there would be more "sharing" if both spouses were in school.

The hypothesized negative relationship between the wife's major and the marital adjustment of the spouses was not significant, but did indicate a relationship in the hypothesized direction. It is this author's opinion that with more refined research techniques this hypothesis would be significant. Also, the positively hypothesized relationship between the wife's grade point and marital adjustment was in the hypothesized direction, even
though not significant. The negatively hypothesized relationship between the student classification of the wife and the marital adjustment of the spouses produced almost no relationship for the wife but a .128 (not significant) relationship for the husband. This positive relationship could be the result of the higher the wife's student classification, the more likely she would be to understand the facets of her husband's educational process, and also the more highly she could value education, either for herself and/or her husband.

The spouses' attitudes regarding the wife completing her education was significant for the wife, whether the wife or husband's attitude is considered, but not significant for the husband. This could possibly indicate that it is possibly not of paramount importance to the husband whether or not his wife completes her schooling. Also, the wife is viewed as being more dependent on the home for her satisfactions of marriage, where the husband is viewed as gaining more satisfaction from outside sources, therefore the spouses' different attitudes could more easily affect the wife than the husband. The empirical hypotheses relating various factors of parental help with marital adjustment could emphasize the fact that the probability is greater for the husband's marital adjustment to be affected by parental help than is the wife's. This could be attributed to the fact that if the couple is receiving help, the husband could feel he is not fulfilling the role of provider for his family. Also, this could evolve from the attitude of the husband that a couple is not independent from parental involvement in their life.

The happiness of the parents' marriage produced a significant positive relationship for the wife, but not for the husband. This could be the re-
suit that daughters are usually viewed as being closer to the parental home, both emotionally and in learning the role of the spouses. The slight positive (non-significant) relationship for the husband in the case of the wife-dominating could be an indication of the involvement of the husband in the role of student, and in many cases as provider. Therefore, the husband might not have time to make all the decisions in the family and would be satisfied with his wife making decisions.

Concerning the empirical hypotheses relating satisfaction with marriage and surrounding factors, it is evident that the wife's satisfaction with both housing and with living in Ames could greatly affect the marital adjustment of both of the spouses. A possible explanation for this could be that the wife is in the home more, therefore closer to the environment of the home. Also, women are generally viewed as identifying more with the place of residence and if she is satisfied, this could result in the couple's having less conflict over where they are living and the husband could be more at ease about going to school.

The hypothesized positive relationship between satisfaction with method of contraception and marital satisfaction was significant for the man, but not for the woman. This could be an indication that the "double standard" regarding concern and expression of concern over sex in marriage is still in existence. There was wide discrepancy in the replies of the spouses regarding the questions concerning sex on the marital adjustment test and on questions regarding sex in the independent variables.

The non-significant relationship for the husband and wife regarding talking things over with their spouses brings forth a very interesting question in the area of communication in marriage research. Talking things
over has been viewed as an indication of a "good marriage". However, the lack of talking things over could be a method of controlling conflict within a marriage, or perhaps the spouses simply know when to "keep their mouths shut", thus avoiding conflict.

Even though non-significant, there were positive relationships for the husband's marital adjustment and the wife being from a higher social class than the husband. This was a very unexpected relationship. However, past research indicates the wife's parents are more likely to help the married couple than are the husband's parents. Therefore, if the parents were from a higher social class, they could possibly afford to help the couple more, thus easing the financial load of the couple while in school. The lack of significant relationships for the husband being from a higher social class and the unexpected relationship concerning the wife's being from a higher social class could also result from the fact that the social classes for the sample in this study were quite homogenous. Over 50 percent of the respondents' parents were farmers, and many were from parents of the blue-collar categories including factory workers and janitors.

The unexpected, but slightly negative, relationship between the higher social class of the parents of the spouses and the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the husband in marriage could be an indication that children of parents in the higher social classes who marry while in school, and live in a university community such as ISU, and being identified with the image of the married college student could not be living the roles of their social class to the degree of those spouses whose parents were in the lower class. As stated in a previous chapter, those students of lower-class parents were actually following the pattern of their social class
with limited incomes, and marrying young, more so than the children of higher social class parents. Also, in regard to the hypothesized relationship between social class of spouses and marital adjustment, it must be remembered that a university atmosphere is definitely a "leveler" of classes.

It was hypothesized there would be a negative relationship between the wife having a higher education than the husband and the marital adjustment of the spouses. However, there was a slight positive (non-significant) relationship in reference to the husband's marital adjustment. However, upon analyzing this situation it would seem if the wife had the higher education and her husband was enrolled in school, she would be more likely to encourage him to succeed and continue in school and since she had already experienced that level of school the husband is now at, she would also be more understanding of his experiences in school. The number of couples who were in this category were definitely in the minority.

If a couple has a higher income in a married college student atmosphere, it could produce a desire to live better than they are living at this time. Also, if a couple has a higher income, they might desire to do more things than a town the size of Ames provides or the limitations of going to school will allow. In addition, there would possibly be non-acceptance by neighbors who were also in school but at a different economic level, therefore producing an unpleasant atmosphere in which to live with this unpleasantness being reflected in their marriage.

The discrepancy between the sexes in the empirical hypotheses was evident. This is an indication of how various aspects of marriage and factors related to the couple's marriage affects the husband and wife differently. Also, in view of several of the hypotheses which were significant
for the man and not for the woman, this author wonders if too much stress has been put on the non-involvement of the husband/father with his marriage and family while concentrating on the wife. However, it should be stressed there was a .827 calculated correlational coefficient between the marital adjustment scores of the husbands and wives. Therefore, it cannot be discounted that even though there were discrepancies between the sexes in regard to empirical hypotheses, which were supported by the data at the specified significance levels, there was a very strong correlation between the overall marital adjustment of husbands and wives.

As was previously stated, the general hypothesis relating satisfaction of the spouses and marital adjustment was generally supported. However, it should be stressed that satisfaction was one of the general concepts which was included in The Test to Measure Marital Adjustment. Therefore, the inclusion of the general concept, satisfaction, in both the independent variables and the dependent variables could result in a built-in relationship between these variables. However, with the exception of evaluation of the marriage, the independent variables dealt primarily with factors which were outside the marriage dyad, such as college marriage, going out, and contraception rather than the direct satisfaction with the marriage. In addition, the satisfaction score is only one part of the total score of the marital adjustment test; therefore, the other portions of the total score could contribute to eliminating this built-in relationship.
SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

On the basis of the findings and retrospective thinking, certain suggestions for future research will be given. These suggestions are made primarily on the basis of the principal weaknesses of the present study as judged by the author.

It is this author's opinion that in order for researchers to get a really clear picture of the impact of college marriage on marital adjustment, it would necessitate a longitudinal study with the same couples. There are very few longitudinal studies in the area of the family. This author has secured the names of all respondents in this study and intends to do a follow-up study with this same population in about five years from this time and again at a later date.

In this author's view one of the shortcomings of this research is The Test to Measure Marital Adjustment. As was explained in a previous chapter dealing with why the hypotheses were not supported by the data, this present test is based on "togetherness". However, in today's marriages we are stressing individuality. This test was originally formulated in 1939 and even though it has been revised many times since, it is still basically very much like the original test. Few people will disagree that marriage relationships between spouses have definitely changed since 1939.

The field of methodology can be made more precise by more accurate measures being formulated for women's occupations and fields of study. Collection of data procedures could possibly be improved by personal interviews, including "prob" questions, rather than the self-administered interview such as was used in this study.
In view of the many non-supported hypotheses, it is this author's view there is much need for research in the area of roles of the spouses, communication between the spouses, and the situational characteristics (which we have taken for granted for decades). It is this author's opinion that this research can be developed and refined both theoretically and methodologically to direct future research efforts advantageously in the general areas of both marital adjustment and married college students.

It is the opinion of this author, after completing this study, that actually the approach used in this study and which has been used in past studies is not the initial approach which should be used in studying married college students. It is evident that much of the past research which is relevant to non-college marriages is not relevant to college marriages. Instead of an initial structured approach to the investigation of the characteristics of the married college students and/or spouses and factors related to their marriage, it is this author's opinion that in-depth practically unstructured interviewing would reveal aspects of the married student and/or spouse that is being missed through approaches such as the one used in this study. After the in-depth interviewing, then the author would suggest, using the possible secured information, that the married student and/or spouse could be studied through a more structured approach.

In conclusion, in view of the apparent lack of data to support three of the four general hypotheses and in turn the empirical hypotheses which were based on past research dealing with the family, the probability of a new family-form evolving is increasingly evident. There seems, from the data in this study, to be less concern with roles and status, and more concern with the interpersonal relationships within the marriage dyad itself.
Also, it could be that the past research with the family and with college marriages will not apply to the situation of college marriages. Rather, one might conclude the college marriage is a unique type of marriage.
SUMMARY

A social system-interactional model has been used in this dissertation as the framework for studying factors related to marital adjustment among married college students at Iowa State University. The major specific objectives of this dissertation were: (1) to gain insight into the characteristics of the married college students and spouses at Iowa State University, (2) to determine the relationship, if any, between certain variables and the degree of marital adjustment which the spouses involved in college marriages at Iowa State University have achieved; and (3) to focus on the impact of the wife being a student and/or employed. In reference to part (2) above, five general concepts are: marital adjustment, role, communication, satisfaction and situational characteristics. Through the use of the social system-interactional model, the research worker can more meaningfully evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of earlier studies dealing with marital adjustment and/or college marriages, as well as make appropriate use of earlier findings relevant to the current research.

A stratified random sample of households, based on the various categories of housing included in this study (Pammel Court, Hawthorne Court, University Village, and non-university housing), and meeting specified criteria were selected in Ames, Iowa. A total of 200 couples (400 respondents) were contacted and interviewed using a self-administered questionnaire-type survey instrument. The data for this study were collected during the summer of 1968 by the author of this dissertation. The interview schedule had three main sections. The first section contained questions to elicit background information on various personal characteristics. The second section
contained questions dealing with the spouses' various attitudes regarding college marriages, their marriage, and factors related to their marriage. The third section included A Test to Measure Adjustment in Marriage. This test was developed by Ernest E. Burgess, Harvey J. Locke, and Mary Margaret Thomas (25).

The concepts of marital adjustment, role, satisfaction, and communication were explicated and operationalized by several sub-concepts. Past empirical research, generalizations, and conceptual models were used to build an ex post facto rationale or logic applicable to this study.

The methodology used in this dissertation reduced the general level concepts into lower level concepts for the purpose of analysis. The analytical components for marital adjustment were: (1) companionship, (2) consensus, (3) affection, and (4) sexual behavior. The analytical components of role were: (1) the employed wife, (2) the wife's occupation, (3) the husband's attitude regarding the wife's employment, (4) hours the wife works, (5) the wife's income in proportion to total family income, (6) the spouses' student-enrollment, (7) the wife's major areas of study, (8) grade point of the wife, (9) wife's student classification, (10) wife's course load, (11) the husband and wife's attitude regarding the wife's education, (12) parental help, (13) the husband's or wife's parents helping, (14) religiosity, (15) presence of children, (16) desire for children, (17) pre-marital pregnancy, (18) unplanned pregnancy after marriage, (19) parents' marriage, (20) decision-making and role, (21) role-taking, and (22) number of children.

The analytical components of satisfaction were satisfaction with: (1) housing, (2) living in Ames, (3) marriage, (4) college marriage, (5) present
life, (6) with going out, and (7) contraception. The analytical components of communication were: (1) talking things over and (2) the degree of consensus. The concept of situational characteristics was defined as characteristics external to the individual which may influence the individual’s behavior and action. The situational characteristics considered in this study were: (1) age when married, (2) age differences of spouses, (3) length of engagement, (4) length of acquaintance, (5) social class differences, (6) social class of parents, (7) level of education, (8) educational differences of spouses, (9) income, and (10) length of time married.

Four general hypotheses were generated relevant to the four major concepts. These four hypotheses were:

General Hypothesis 1: The respective roles which are played by husbands and wives as a result of their various positions is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

Hypothesis one was tested by twenty-four two-relation hypotheses and six four-relation hypotheses. Four of the two-relation hypotheses were fully supported by the data and two of the two-relation hypotheses were partially supported by the data. Two of the four-relation hypotheses were fully supported by the data, and two were partially supported by the data.

General Hypothesis 2: The degree of satisfaction expressed by the spouses regarding various aspects of their marriage and surrounding factors will be related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

This hypothesis was tested by nine four-relation hypotheses. Five of these empirical hypotheses were fully supported by the data, and four were at least partially supported by the data.
General Hypothesis 3: The degree of communication between the couple is related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

This hypothesis was tested by two four-relation hypotheses. One of these hypotheses was supported by the data and one was not supported by the data.

General Hypothesis 4: Selected situational characteristics of the couple are related to the degree of marital adjustment achieved by the spouses in their marriage.

This hypothesis was tested by three four-relation hypotheses and eight two-relation hypotheses. One of the four-relation hypotheses was partially supported by the data, and one of the two-relation hypotheses was supported by the data. The remaining hypotheses were not supported by the data.

The findings were discussed and suggestions were made for further research.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

How can I thank the many people who have helped me in so many ways to accomplish a goal I set for myself? There are my many friends who laughed with me, who listened to me when I needed someone to talk with, who had a drink with me when I needed it, who encouraged me when I was depressed, and who came to work when I needed them. There were my professors who set goals for me to reach, who had seemingly endless faith in me, who "badgered" me when necessary, who encouraged me when I was slowing down, and who stood as the symbol of what I wanted to accomplish. There were my students at Iowa State University who helped me keep my mind alert and who helped me not to become so self-centered I did not have time to think of others. And there were those that loved me and that I loved--giving me that special emotional support that only love can provide. These are the people, and many more, to whom a "thank you" could never convey my deep gratitude and sentiment I feel for them.
Table 39. Classification of occupations of wives in Married Student Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Points received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior chemist</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile consultant</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service supervisor</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistantship</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab technician</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draftsman</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank teller</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier - Beautician</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key punch operator</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical nurse</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales clerk</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller brush sales</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby sitter</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory worker</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housework</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 40. Rank of majors for student-wives in Married Student Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Points given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bacteriology</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoology</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics Education</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and Clothing</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Art</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41. North-Hatt Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Supreme Court Justice</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Governor</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet member in the federal government</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomat in the U. S. Foreign Service</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor in a large city</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College professor</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Representative in Congress</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banker</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government scientist</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Judge</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of a department in state government</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemist</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member of the board of directors of a large corporation</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear physicist</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airline pilot</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artist (pictures exhibited in galleries)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner of factory that employs about 100 people</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociologists</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant for a large business</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biologist</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musician in a symphony orchestra</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author of novels</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain in the regular army</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building contractor</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economist</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor in the public school</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public school teacher</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County agricultural agent</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad engineer</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm owner and operator</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official of an international labor union</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio announcer</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper columnist</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-operator of a printing shop</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained machinist</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare worker for a city government</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertaker</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporter for a daily newspaper</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager of a small store in a city</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bookkeeper</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance agent</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant farmer (owns livestock, machinery, manages farm)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traveling salesman for a wholesale concern</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playground director</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policeman</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad conductor</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail carrier</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobile repairman</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumber</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage mechanic</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local official of a labor union</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-operator of a lunch stand</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporal in the regular army</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machine operator in a factory</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 41 (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerk in a store</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisherman who owns his own boat</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetcar motorman</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk routeman</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant cook</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck driver</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumberjack</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling station attendant</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer in a nightclub</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmhand</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coal miner</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi driver</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad section hand</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant waiter</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock worker</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night watchman</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothes presser in a laundry</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soda fountain clerk</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartender</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitor</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share cropper (owns nothing, not the manager)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collector</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street sweeper</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe shiner</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

Interview Schedule for Wife
MARRIED STUDENT STUDY
Iowa State University
June, 1968
(Wife's questionnaire)
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SOCIOLOGY RESEARCH
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY
AMES, IOWA

This household has been chosen from a Random Sample of households of married college students at Iowa State University. In this study we are trying to determine the opinions and characteristics of married college students. In this matter the researchers are completely neutral. We would also like to assure you that any information will be anonymous and will remain completely confidential. There are separate interview forms for husband and wife. It is necessary that husbands and wives neither discuss nor compare answers given before or during the completion of the questionnaire. If you would like a copy of the results of this study, please write your name and address on the enclosed 3 x 5 card.
Please circle the letter or number which designates your answer. Please answer every question. If you are a student during the regular school year, but are not a student during this Summer Session, please answer as if you are a student.

1. Are you a student?
   NO .................................. 1
   YES .................................. 2
*(If "YES" go to question #2)
(If "NO" go to question #6)

2. What is your major? (WRITE ANSWER IN BLANK)
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT ............... Y

3. What is your cumulative grade point?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT ............... Y
   BELOW 2.00 .................................. 1
   2.00 to 2.25 .................................. 2
   2.26 to 2.50 .................................. 3
   2.51 to 2.75 .................................. 4
   2.76 to 3.00 .................................. 5
   3.01 to 3.25 .................................. 6
   3.26 to 3.50 .................................. 7
   3.51 to 3.75 .................................. 8
   3.76 to 4.00 .................................. 9

4. What is your student classification?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT ............... Y
   ATTENDING SCHOOL, BUT NOT ISU ............... 1
   SPECIAL STUDENT (ISU) ......................... 2
   UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT (ISU) ............. 3
   GRADUATE STUDENT (ISU) ....................... 4
   OTHER (SPECIFY) ................................ 5

5. On the average, how many credits do you take each quarter?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT ............... Y
   1-5 CREDITS PER QUARTER ......................... 1
   6-10 CREDITS PER QUARTER ....................... 2
   11-15 CREDITS PER QUARTER ..................... 3
   16-20 CREDITS PER QUARTER ..................... 4
   OVER 20 CREDITS PER QUARTER .................. 5

6. What is your age?
   (Write answer in years)

7. How long have you and your husband been married? (If married more than once, all questions referring to marriage refer only to your present marriage.)
   WE HAVE BEEN MARRIED _______ YEARS + ____ MONTHS
8. What was your age at the time you were married?  
   (Write answer in years)

9. How long did you and your husband know each other before you were married?  
   LESS THAN ONE YEAR .................. 0  
   IF ONE YEAR OR MORE, WRITE IN NEAREST YEAR __________________________

10. How long did you and your husband date before you were married?  
    6 MONTHS OR LESS .................. 0  
    7-12 MONTHS .................. 1  
    13-18 MONTHS .................. 2  
    19-24 MONTHS .................. 3  
    25-30 MONTHS .................. 4  
    31-36 MONTHS .................. 5  
    OVER 3 YEARS .................. 6

11. How long were you and your husband engaged before you were married?  
    NO ENGAGEMENT .................. 0  
    3 MONTHS OR LESS .................. 1  
    4-6 MONTHS .................. 2  
    7-9 MONTHS .................. 3  
    10-12 MONTHS .................. 4  
    13-15 MONTHS .................. 5  
    16-18 MONTHS .................. 6  
    OVER 18 MONTHS .................. 7

12. At the time you and your husband were married, were you a college student?  
   (Include student in technical training, secretarial training, business school,  
   beauty school, etc; anything above high school.)  
   NO .................. 1  
   YES .................. 2  
   (IF "YES" GO TO QUESTION #13)  
   (IF "NO" GO TO QUESTION #15)

13. If you were a student at the time you were married, and you are no longer a student,  
   why is this so?  
   DOESN'T APPLY, I WAS NOT A STUDENT AT THE TIME OF MARRIAGE ........... 0  
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM STILL A STUDENT .................. 1  
   STUDIES COMPLETED .................. 2  
   DIDN'T WANT TO GO TO SCHOOL .................. 3  
   HEALTH REASONS .................. 4  
   PLANNED CHILDREN .................. 5  
   FINANCIAL REASONS .................. 6
14. If you were a student at the time you got married, and you dropped out of school before your studies were completed, how often have you regretted having done this?

DOESN'T APPLY, I WASN'T A STUDENT AT THE TIME OF MARRIAGE... Y
DOESN'T APPLY, I COMPLETED MY STUDIES BEFORE QUITTING ... 0
I REGRET HAVING QUIT VERY OFTEN ... 4
I SOMETIMES REGRET HAVING QUIT ... 3
I SELDOM REGRET HAVING QUIT ... 2
I NEVER REGRET HAVING QUIT ... 1

15. When you were married what was your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ... 00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ... 01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL ... 02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE ... 03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE ... 04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE ... 05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. OR EQUIVALENT) ... 06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE ... 07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED ... 08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE ... 09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED ... 10
POST-DOCTORATE ... 11

16. At the present time what is your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ... 00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ... 01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL ... 02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE ... 03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE ... 04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE ... 05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. OR EQUIVALENT) ... 06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE ... 07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED ... 08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE ... 09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED ... 10
POST-DOCTORATE ... 11
17. Considering only the time since you and your husband have been married, how long have you been a student?

DOESN'T APPLY, I HAVE NOT BEEN A STUDENT SINCE WE WERE MARRIED ................................................. Y
LESS THAN ONE SCHOOL YEAR ................................................. 1
ONE YEAR OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN TWO YEARS ....................... 2
TWO YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN THREE YEARS ..................... 3
THREE YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN FOUR YEARS .................... 4
FOUR YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN FIVE YEARS ..................... 5
FIVE YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN SIX YEARS ....................... 6
SIX YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS .................... 7
SEVEN YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN EIGHT YEARS ................... 8
EIGHT YEARS OR MORE ......................................................... 9

18. Approximately how much longer do you anticipate you will be a student?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT AND DO NOT PLAN ON BEING A STUDENT ................................................. Y
LESS THAN ONE YEAR ......................................................... 1
ONE YEAR OR MORE, LESS THAN TWO YEARS ............................. 2
TWO YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN THREE YEARS ....................... 3
THREE YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN FOUR YEARS ...................... 4
FOUR YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN FIVE YEARS ....................... 5
FIVE YEARS OR MORE .......................................................... 6
INDEFINITE ................................................................. 7

19. Everything considered, how happy would you say your parents' marriage is?

EXTREMELY HAPPY .......................................................... 6
VERY HAPPY ................................................................. 5
FAIRLY HAPPY .............................................................. 4
FAIRLY UNHAPPY ............................................................ 3
VERY UNHAPPY .............................................................. 2
MY PARENTS ARE DIVORCED ................................................. 1

20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: As married college students, my husband and I are having to live too much for the future and not enough for today.

STRONGLY AGREE .......................................................... 5
AGREE ................................................................. 4
UNDECIDED ............................................................... 3
DISAGREE ................................................................. 2
STRONGLY DISAGREE .................................................... 1
21. Think of friends you and your husband have, or people you know, who are in the "outside" world (not in school) and who are buying homes, rearing families, and getting established in their business or profession. How often do you wish you were living a life such as the one they are living rather than what you are now doing?

I wish I were living a life such as they are living:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY OFTEN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW AND THEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How often have you considered quitting college?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. If your husband is a student how often have you wished he would quit going to school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, HE IS NOT A STUDENT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How important is it to you that you complete your schooling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF SOME IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If your husband is a student, how important is it to you that he finishes his schooling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, HE IS NOT A STUDENT</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF SOME IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. In comparison with other couples you know, how would you evaluate you and your husband's marriage relationship?

MUCH BETTER THAN OTHERS ....................... 5
SOMewhat BETTER THAN OTHERS .................. 4
ABOUT THE SAME AS OTHERS .................... 3
NOT AS GOOD AS OTHERS ......................... 2
DEFINITELY WORSE THAN OTHERS ............... 1

27. When you become upset about having to take care of the house plus your other responsibilities, is your husband as understanding as you would like him to be?

YES, HE IS AS UNDERSTANDING AS I WOULD LIKE HIM TO BE ........ 5
YES, HE IS UNDERSTANDING MOST OF THE TIME .................. 4
SOMETIMES HE IS, SOMETIMES HE IS NOT ................ 3
USUALLY HE IS NOT VERY UNDERSTANDING ............. 2
HE IS NOT UNDERSTANDING ............................. 1

28. All things considered, how satisfied are you with where you are living?
(Apartment, house, etc.)

VERY SATISFIED ........................................ 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED .................................. 4
UNDECIDED ............................................ 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .............................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED .................................... 1

29. Generally, how satisfied are you with living in Ames?

VERY SATISFIED ........................................ 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED .................................. 4
UNDECIDED ............................................ 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .............................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED .................................... 1

30. How satisfied are you with the frequency you get to go out?

VERY SATISFIED ........................................ 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED .................................. 4
NEUTRAL ................................................. 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .............................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED .................................... 1
31. If you do not think you get to go out often enough, why is this?

DOESN'T APPLY, I GET TO GO OUT OFTEN ENOUGH .......... Y
HUSBAND HAS TO STUDY ......................................... 1
I HAVE TO STUDY ...................................................... 2
NOT ENOUGH TIME .................................................. 3
NOT ENOUGH MONEY ............................................... 4
NO ONE TO CARE FOR CHILDREN .............................. 5
HUSBAND DOESN'T WANT TO ................................. 6
OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY) ........................................ 7

32. What is your father's occupation? (If father is not living, what was his occupation?
_______________________________________________________)(Write in answer)

33. Other than activities, such as household duties, classes, and studying, are you
employed? (Include assistantships as employment.)

NO ............................................... 1
YES ................................. 2

*(IF"YES" GO TO QUESTION #34)
(If "NO" GO TO QUESTION #40)

34. If you are employed what is your occupation?
(If you have more than one job, list only the one at which you spend the most time.)

35. On the average, how many hours do you work per week?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED .......... Y
1-10 HOURS PER WEEK ............................................. 1
11-20 HOURS PER WEEK ....................................... 2
21-30 HOURS PER WEEK ...................................... 3
31-40 HOURS PER WEEK .................................... 4
OVER 40 HOURS PER WEEK .................................. 5

36. Approximately what is your gross monthly income? (Your salary only.)

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED .......... Y
LESS THAN $100 PER MONTH .............................. 1
BETWEEN $101 and $200 PER MONTH .................. 2
BETWEEN $201 and $300 PER MONTH ................... 3
BETWEEN $301 and $400 PER MONTH .................. 4
BETWEEN $401 and $500 PER MONTH .................. 5
OVER $500 PER MONTH ................................. 6
37. How satisfied are you with your present job and working conditions?

- VERY SATISFIED: 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED: 4
- UNDECIDED: 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED: 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED: 1

38. How often do you feel you should not be working (employed)?

- DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED: Y
- VERY OFTEN: 5
- FAIRLY OFTEN: 4
- NOW AND THEN: 3
- SELDOM: 2
- NEVER: 1

40. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is all right for a married woman without children to work outside the home.

- STRONGLY AGREE: 5
- AGREE: 4
- UNDECIDED: 3
- DISAGREE: 2
- STRONGLY DISAGREE: 1

42. How satisfied do you feel your husband is with his present working conditions?

- DOESN'T APPLY, HE IS NOT EMPLOYED: Y
- VERY SATISFIED: 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED: 4
- UNDECIDED: 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED: 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED: 1

43. What is your religion?

- JEWISH: 5
- CATHOLIC: 4
- PROTESTANT: 3
- OTHER: 2
- NONE: 1

44. Other than going to church, how religious minded would you say you are?

- VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED: 4
- FAIRLY RELIGIOUS MINDED: 3
- NOT VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED: 2
- NOT RELIGIOUS MINDED AT ALL: 1
45. On the average, how many times a month do you go to church?

NEVER ................................................. 0
LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH .................. 1
ONCE A MONTH ................................. 2
TWICE A MONTH ................................. 3
THREE TIMES A MONTH ...................... 4
FOUR TIMES A MONTH ....................... 5
MORE THAN FOUR TIMES A MONTH .......... 6

46. To what extent are religious activities, such as family prayer, reading the Bible, saying grace at meals, etc., included in your family?

VERY FREQUENTLY .............................. 6
FAIRLY OFTEN .................................. 5
NOW AND THEN .................................. 4
FAIRLY INFREQUENTLY ....................... 3
VERY INFREQUENTLY .......................... 2
NEVER ............................................. 1

47. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: **Marriage helps the college student do better work.**

STRONGLY AGREE ............................... 5
AGREE ............................................. 4
UNDECIDED ....................................... 3
DISAGREE ......................................... 2
STRONGLY DISAGREE ........................... 1

48. Complete the following sentence by filling in the blank with one of the choices below: I ____________ think I would not have gotten married if I had known circumstances concerning my marriage would be as they are.

VERY OFTEN ....................................... 5
FAIRLY OFTEN .................................... 4
NOW AND THEN ................................... 3
SELDOM ........................................... 2
NEVER ............................................. 1

49. If you had a child who was thinking of getting married and their circumstances were similar to your present circumstances would you advise them to go ahead and get married?

YES, DEFINITELY ............................... 5
YES, MAYBE ....................................... 4
UNDECIDED ....................................... 3
NO, MAYBE ........................................ 2
NO, DEFINITELY ................................. 1
50. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In life, one of the most important things is to have children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51. At the time you were married, how strongly did you want you and your husband to have children sometime in your married life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very Strongly</th>
<th>Fairly Strong</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Not Very Strong</th>
<th>Did Not Want Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. How many children would you like for you and your husband to have during your married life?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>Five</th>
<th>More Than Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53. How many children do you have at this time? (If you are pregnant count it as a child.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>One</th>
<th>Two</th>
<th>Three</th>
<th>Four</th>
<th>More Than Five</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(IF "NONE" GO TO QUESTION #55)*

54. If you have children, or are pregnant, fill out the following chart concerning your children. Start with the oldest child and include only living children. (If you are pregnant write "pregnant" by the appropriate number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accidental Pre-Marital Pregnancy</th>
<th>Planned Pre-Marital Pregnancy</th>
<th>Unplanned After Marriage</th>
<th>Planned After Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
55. Compared to other things you like to do that are not usually related to children, how much do you like to spend time with children?

- MUCH MORE THAN MOST OTHER THINGS ................ 5
- SOMewhat more than most other things ................ 4
- ABOUT the same as most other things ................ 3
- LESS than most other things ............................ 2
- MUCH LESS than most other things .................... 1

56. At the time you were married, how strongly do you feel your husband wanted the two of you to have children sometime during your married life?

- VERY STRONGLY ........................................ 5
- FAIRLY STRONG ......................................... 4
- UNDECIDED .............................................. 3
- NOT very STRONG ....................................... 2
- he did not WANT children .............................. 1

57. How many children do you think your husband would like for the two of you to have during your married life?

- NONE ..................................................... 0
- ONE .................................................... 1
- TWO .................................................... 2
- THREE .................................................. 3
- FOUR .................................................... 4
- FIVE ..................................................... 5
- MORE than five ......................................... 6

58. To what extent do you think children help keep a marriage together? Would you say they help a great deal, somewhat, not at all, or do they cause marriages to break up?

- CHILDREN help KEEP a MARRIAGE TOGETHER A GREAT DEAL .... 5
- CHILDREN help SOMewhat TO keep a MARRIAGE TOGETHER .......... 4
- CHILDREN MAKE NO DIFFERENCE in reference TO KEEPING A MARRIAGE TOGETHER ........................................... 3
- CHILDREN do NOT HELP keep a MARRIAGE TOGETHER AT all ........ 2
- CHILDREN help BREAK UP a MARRIAGE .......................... 1

59. Concerning the following activities, we would like to know how often you and your husband take part in these activities together. (Check appropriate space to indicate answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Always With Husband</th>
<th>Sometimes with him and sometimes without him</th>
<th>Almost always without him</th>
<th>Always without him</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to movies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
60. How satisfied are you with the frequency you and your husband take part in the above activities together?

- VERY SATISFIED ........................................... 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED .................................. 4
- NEUTRAL .................................................. 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED .............................. 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED ...................................... 1

61. How satisfied do you think your husband is with the frequency you and he get to participate in the above activities together?

- VERY SATISFIED ........................................... 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED .................................. 4
- NEUTRAL .................................................. 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED .............................. 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED ...................................... 1

62. In every family a number of decisions have to be made. Many couples talk things over first, but the final decision often has to be made by one person, either the husband or wife. Now, for example, if you have children and the child needs punishing, who makes this decision? Is it always the wife, wife more than husband, husband more than wife, or always the husband who decides this? (Check appropriate space to indicate how decisions are made in your family.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides about?</th>
<th>Wife always</th>
<th>Wife more Than Husband</th>
<th>Wife and Husband About Equally</th>
<th>Husband More Than Wife</th>
<th>Husband Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How much to spend on food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How much life insurance the family should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Whether or not to use charge accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Where to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Whether or not the wife should work outside the home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Going out, as to movies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Visiting wife's relatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Visiting husband's relatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Whether or not the husband goes to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Whether or not the wife goes to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63. Indicate the major method of contraception which you and/or your husband use at this time.

- **DO NOT USE ANY** ........................................ 00
- **WITHDRAWAL** .......................................... 01
- **DOUCHE** .................................................. 02
- **JELLY** ..................................................... 03
- **FOAM** ..................................................... 04
- **JELLY + DIAPHRAM** .................................... 05
- **RHYTHM OR ABSTINENCE** ............................... 06
- **DIAPHRAM** ................................................ 07
- **CONDOM (RUBBER)** ..................................... 08
- **IUD, LOOP, OR COIL** ................................... 09
- **PILL** ....................................................... 10
- **STERILIZATION** ......................................... 11
- **OTHER (SPECIFY)** ....................................... 12

64. How satisfied are you with your present method of birth control? (If you do not use any, answer for satisfaction concerning not using any.)

- **VERY SATISFIED** ........................................... 5
- **SOMEWHA T SATISFIED** ................................. 4
- **NEUTRAL** .................................................. 3
- **SOMEWHA T DISSATISFIED** .............................. 2
- **VERY DISSATISFIED** ..................................... 1

65. Do you feel your present method of birth control has had a positive or negative effect on your marriage. (Again, if you do not use any form of birth control, answer how you feel this has affected your marriage.)

- **IT HAS DEFINITELY HAD A POSITIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE** .... 5
- **IT HAS HAD SOMEWHAT OF A POSITIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE** .. 4
- **IT HAS HAD NO EFFECT ON OUR MARITAL RELATIONSHIP** ............... 3
- **IT HAS HAD SOMEWHAT OF A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE** .. 2
- **IT HAS DEFINITELY HAD A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE** .... 1

66. How satisfied do you think your husband is with your present method of birth control?

- **VERY SATISFIED** ........................................... 5
- **SOMEWHA T SATISFIED** ................................. 4
- **NEUTRAL** .................................................. 3
- **SOMEWHA T DISSATISFIED** .............................. 2
- **VERY DISSATISFIED** ..................................... 1
67. Other than you and/or your husband's employment (including assistantships), what other sources of income do you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Sources</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT HAVE ANY OTHER SOURCES</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS (LOAN)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS (GIFT)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAVINGS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOANS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FELLOWSHIPS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER SOURCES (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(IF YOU DID NOT ANSWER "PARENTS (LOAN)" OR "PARENTS (GIFT)" GO TO QUESTION #72)*

68. If you have parental help, either loans or gifts, whose parents are helping?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parents Helping</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIFE'S PARENTS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUSBAND'S PARENTS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH SETS OF PARENTS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

69. How satisfied are you with the idea of parents helping you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70. How satisfied do you think your or your husband's parents are with helping you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. How satisfied do you think your husband is with parents helping you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
72. The following are considered areas of stress in college marriages. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being no problem and 5 being a very significant problem) rate each area as it applies to your marriage. (Circle the number for your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Doesn't Apply</th>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Finances</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Leisure time activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Unplanned children</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grades</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Communication gap between husband and wife</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Wife earning a portion of family's income</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

73. As you know there are married couples who discuss things while other married couples do not discuss these same things. Would you say you discuss the following with your husband: Always, Fairly Often, Once in A While, Seldom, or Never? Also, do you feel your husband and you have the same ideas or different ideas about the following? (Check appropriate square to indicate your answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>We discuss this topic:</th>
<th>We have:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Fairly Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's work or school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My household responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
74. Which of these categories best estimates your yearly gross family income? (Include husband's income, wife's income, plus any other income you might have.)

- $1 - 999 ........................................... 01
- $1,000 - 1,999 ................................... 02
- $2,000 - 2,999 ................................... 03
- $3,000 - 3,999 ................................... 04
- $4,000 - 4,999 ................................... 05
- $5,000 - 5,999 ................................... 06
- $6,000 - 6,999 ................................... 07
- $7,000 - 7,999 ................................... 08
- $8,000 - 8,999 ................................... 09
- $9,000 - 9,999 ................................... 10
- $10,000 AND OVER ............................... 11

75. When disagreements arise they generally result in:

- HUSBAND GIVING IN ............................... 1
- WIFE GIVING IN ................................... 2
- NEITHER GIVING IN ............................... 3
- AGREEMENT BY MUTUAL GIVE AND TAKE ...... 4

76. Do you and your mate agree on right, good, and proper behavior?

- ALWAYS AGREE ..................................... 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ......................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ..................... 5
- ALWAYS DISAGREE ................................ 6

77. Do husband and wife engage in outside activities together?

- ALL OF THEM ........................................ 1
- SOME OF THEM ....................................... 2
- FEW OF THEM ........................................ 3
- NONE OF THEM ....................................... 4

78. In leisure time, which do you and your mate prefer?

- BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE STAY AT HOME ...... 1
- BOTH TO BE ON THE GO ........................... 2
- ONE TO BE ON THE GO AND THE OTHER TO STAY AT HOME ......................... 3
79. Do you and your mate agree on aims, goals, and things believed important in life?

- ALWAYS AGREE ................................ 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ........................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ...................... 5

80. Do you and your mate agree on friends?

- ALWAYS AGREE ................................ 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ........................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ...................... 5
- ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... 6

81. Do you and your mate agree on ways of dealing with in-laws?

- ALWAYS AGREE ................................ 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ........................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ...................... 5
- ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... 6

82. Do you and your mate agree on handling family finances?

- ALWAYS AGREE ................................ 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ........................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ...................... 5
- ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... 6

83. Do you and your mate agree on amount of time spent together?

- ALWAYS AGREE ................................ 1
- ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... 2
- OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
- FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ........................... 4
- ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ...................... 5
- ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... 6
84. How often do you kiss your mate?

EVERY DAY ........................................ 1
NOW AND THEN .................................... 2
ALMOST NEVER .................................... 3

85. How frequently do you and your mate get on each other's nerves around the house?

NEVER ............................................. 1
ALMOST NEVER ................................... 2
OCCASIONALLY .................................. 3
FREQUENTLY ..................................... 4
ALMOST ALWAYS .................................. 5
ALWAYS ............................................. 6

86. Do you and your mate agree on demonstration of affection?

ALWAYS AGREE .................................... 1
ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ......................... 2
OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ....................... 3
FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ......................... 4
ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ..................... 5
ALWAYS DISAGREE ................................ 6

87. Check any of the following items which you think has caused serious difficulties in your marriage:

DIFFICULTIES OVER MONEY ...................... 01
LACK OF MUTUAL FRIENDS ....................... 02
CONSTANT BICKERING ............................... 03
INTERFERENCE OF IN-LAWS ...................... 04
LACK OF MUTUAL AFFECTION .................... 05
UNSATISFYING SEX RELATIONS .................. 06
SELFISHNESS AND LACK OF COOPERATION ...... 07
ADULTERY ........................................... 08
MATE PAID ATTENTION TO ANOTHER PERSON . 09
DRUNKENNESS OR ALCOHOLISM ................ 10
OTHER REASONS .................................. 11
NOTHING ............................................ 12

88. Have you ever wished you had not married?

FREQUENTLY ....................................... 1
OCCASIONALLY ..................................... 2
RARELY ............................................... 3
NEVER ................................................ 4
89. Do you and your mate generally talk things over together?

NEVER .................................................. 1
NOW AND THEN ................................. 2
ALMOST ALWAYS ............................... 3
ALWAYS ............................................. 4

90. How happy would you rate your marriage?

VERY HAPPY ................................................. 1
HAPPY ...................................................... 2
AVERAGE .................................................. 3
UNHAPPY ............................................... 4
VERY UNHAPPY ............................... 5

91. If you had your life to live over again would you:

MARRY THE SAME PERSON ..................... 1
MARRY A DIFFERENT PERSON ................ 2
NOT MARRY AT ALL ............................ 3

92. What is the total number of times you left your mate or your mate left you because of conflict?

NO TIMES ................................................. 1
ONE TIME ................................................ 2
TWO OR MORE TIMES ....................... 3

93. What are your feelings on sex relations with your mate?

VERY ENJOYABLE ....................................... 1
ENJOYABLE ............................................. 2
TOLERABLE ............................................. 3
A LITTLE ENJOYABLE ............................. 4
NOT AT ALL ENJOYABLE ....................... 5

94. Do you and your mate agree on sex relations?

ALWAYS AGREE ........................................ 1
ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ....................... 2
OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE .................... 3
FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ....................... 4
ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE .................. 5
ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... 6
95. During sexual intercourse are your physical reactions satisfactory?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A LITTLE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AT ALL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

96. Is sexual intercourse between your mate and you an expression of love and affection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST ALWAYS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97. How satisfied do you think your husband is with your working outside the home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Schedule for Husband
This household has been chosen from a Random Sample of households of married college students at Iowa State University. In this study we are trying to determine the opinions and characteristics of married college students. In this matter the researchers are completely neutral. We would also like to assure you that any information will be anonymous and will remain completely confidential. There are separate interview forms for husband and wife. It is necessary that husbands and wives neither discuss nor compare answers given before or during the completion of the questionnaire. If you would like a copy of the results of this study please write your name and address on the enclosed 3 X 5 card.
Please circle the letter or number which designates your answer. Please answer every question. If you are a student during the regular school year, but are not a student during this Summer Session, please answer as if you are a student.

1. Are you a student?
   NO ........................... 1
   YES ........................... 2
*(IF "YES" GO TO QUESTION #2)  
(IF "NO" GO TO QUESTION #6)

2. What is your major? (WRITE ANSWER IN BLANK)
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT...  

3. What is your cumulative grade point?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT...  
   BELOW 2.00 ........................... 1
   2.00 to 2.25 ............................ 2
   2.26 to 2.50 ............................ 3
   2.51 to 2.75 ............................ 4
   2.76 to 3.00 ............................ 5
   3.01 to 3.25 ............................ 6
   3.26 to 3.50 ............................ 7
   3.51 to 3.75 ............................ 8
   3.76 to 4.00 ............................ 9

4. What is your student classification?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT...
   ATTENDING SCHOOL, BUT NOT ISU..... 1
   SPECIAL STUDENT (ISU)............... 2
   UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT (ISU)...... 3
   GRADUATE STUDENT .................... 4
   OTHER (SPECIFY) ........................... 5

5. On the average, how many credits do you take each quarter?
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT...
   1 - 5 CREDITS PER QUARTER .......... 1
   6 - 10 CREDITS PER QUARTER ....... 2
   11 - 15 CREDITS PER QUARTER ....... 3
   16 - 20 CREDITS PER QUARTER ....... 4
   OVER 20 CREDITS PER QUARTER ........ 5

6. What is your age?  
   (Write answer in years)

7. How long have you and your wife been married? (If married more than once, all questions referring to marriage refer only to your present marriage.)
   WE HAVE BEEN MARRIED ______ YEARS + ______ MONTHS
8. What was your age at the time you were married? (Write answer in years)

9. How long did you and your wife know each other before you were married?

   LESS THAN ONE YEAR ................. 0
   IF ONE YEAR OR MORE, WRITE IN NEAREST YEAR ________

10. How long did you and your wife date before you were married?

   6 MONTHS OR LESS .................. 0
   7 - 12 MONTHS ....................... 1
   13 - 18 MONTHS ...................... 2
   19 - 24 MONTHS ...................... 3
   25 - 30 MONTHS ...................... 4
   31 - 36 MONTHS ...................... 5
   OVER 3 YEARS ....................... 6

11. How long were you and your wife engaged before you were married?

   NO ENGAGEMENT ..................... 0
   3 MONTHS OR LESS ................... 1
   4 - 6 MONTHS ......................... 2
   7 - 9 MONTHS ......................... 3
   10 - 12 MONTHS ....................... 4
   13 - 15 MONTHS ....................... 5
   16 - 18 MONTHS ....................... 6
   OVER 18 MONTHS ..................... 7

12. At the time you and your wife were married, were you a college student? (Include student in technical training, secretarial training, business school, beauty school, etc; anything above high school.)

   NO ......................... 1
   YES .......................... 2

   (IF "YES" GO TO QUESTION #13) (IF "NO" GO TO QUESTION #15)

13. If you were a student at the time you were married, and you are no longer a student, why is this so?

   DOESN'T APPLY, I WAS NOT A STUDENT AT THE TIME OF MARRIAGE ... Y
   DOESN'T APPLY, I AM STILL A STUDENT .......................... 0
   STUDIES COMPLETED ............................................. 1
   DIDN'T WANT TO GO TO SCHOOL .................................. 2
   HEALTH REASONS ................................................. 3
   PLANNED CHILDREN ............................................. 4
   FINANCIAL REASONS ............................................. 5
   ACADEMIC REASONS ............................................. 6
   UNPLANNED CHILDREN .......................................... 7
   WIFE OBJECTED .................................................. 8
   OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY) ...................................... 9
14. If you were a student at the time you got married, and you dropped out of school before your studies were completed, how often have you regretted having done this?

DOESN'T APPLY, I WASN'T A STUDENT AT THE TIME OF MARRIAGE ... Y
DOESN'T APPLY, I COMPLETED MY STUDIES BEFORE QUITTING ........ D
I REGRET HAVING QUIT VERY OFTEN ................................... 4
I SOMETIMES REGRET HAVING QUIT .................................... 3
I SELDOM REGRET HAVING QUIT ......................................... 2
I NEVER REGRET HAVING QUIT ........................................... 1

15. When you were married, what was your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ........................................ 00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ..................................................... 01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL .......................... 02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE .................................................. 03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE ............................................................. 04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE ........................................................... 05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. or equivalent) ................................ 06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE ............................................... 07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED ............................................... 08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE ......................................................... 09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED ......................................................... 10
POST-DOCTORATE ................................................................. 11

16. At the present time what is your highest educational attainment?

LESS THAN HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ........................................ 00
HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETED ..................................................... 01
NON-COLLEGE TRAINING BEYOND HIGH SCHOOL .......................... 02
ONE YEAR OR LESS COLLEGE .................................................. 03
TWO YEARS COLLEGE ............................................................. 04
THREE YEARS COLLEGE ........................................................... 05
COLLEGE COMPLETED (B.S. or equivalent) ................................ 06
MASTER'S DEGREE CANDIDATE ............................................... 07
MASTER'S DEGREE COMPLETED ............................................... 08
DOCTORATE CANDIDATE ......................................................... 09
DOCTORATE COMPLETED ......................................................... 10
POST-DOCTORATE ................................................................. 11
17. Considering only the time since you and your wife have been married, how long have you been a student?

DOESN'T APPLY, I HAVE NOT BEEN A STUDENT SINCE WE WERE MARRIED ............................................. Y
LESS THAN ONE SCHOOL YEAR ................................................. 1
ONE YEAR OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN TWO YEARS .................. 2
TWO YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN THREE YEARS ............ 3
THREE YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN FOUR YEARS .......... 4
FOUR YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN FIVE YEARS .......... 5
FIVE YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN SIX YEARS ............. 6
SIX YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN SEVEN YEARS .......... 7
SEVEN YEARS OR MORE, BUT LESS THAN EIGHT YEARS ....... 8
EIGHT YEARS OR MORE ........................................................... 9

18. Approximately how much longer do you anticipate you will be a student?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT AND DO NOT PLAN ON BEING A STUDENT ............................................. Y
LESS THAN ONE YEAR .............................................................. 1
ONE YEAR OR MORE, LESS THAN TWO YEARS ...................... 2
TWO YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN THREE YEARS ............... 3
THREE YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN FOUR YEARS ............ 4
FOUR YEARS OR MORE, LESS THAN FIVE YEARS ............ 5
FIVE YEARS OR MORE ............................................................. 6
INDEFINITE ........................................................................ 7

19. Everything considered, how happy would you say your parents' marriage is?

EXTREMELY HAPPY ............................................................... 6
VERY HAPPY ........................................................................ 5
FAIRLY HAPPY ................................................................. 4
FAIRLY UNHAPPY ............................................................... 3
VERY HAPPY ........................................................................ 2
MY PARENTS ARE DIVORCED .................................................. 1

20. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: As married college students, my wife and I are having to live too much for the future and not enough for today.

STRONGLY AGREE ............................................................... 5
AGREE ................................................................................ 4
UNDECIDED ....................................................................... 3
DISAGREE ........................................................................ 2
STRONGLY DISAGREE ........................................................... 1
21. Think of friends you and your wife have, or people you know, who are the "outside" world (not in school) and who are buying homes, rearing families, and getting established in their business or profession. How often do you wish you were living a life such as the one they are living rather than what you are now doing?

I wish I were living a life such as they are living:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY OFTEN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW AND THEN</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. How often have you considered quitting college?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT... Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. If your wife is a student how often have you wished she would quit going to school?

DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT A STUDENT... Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELDOM</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How important is it to you that you complete your schooling?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT A STUDENT... Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF SOME IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMIIMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. If your wife is a student, how important is it to you that she finishes her schooling?

DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT A STUDENT... Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXTREMELY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OF SOME IMPORTANCE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY IMPORTANT</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UMIIMPORTANT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
26. In comparison with other couples you know, how would you evaluate you and your wife's marriage relationship?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MUCH BETTER THAN OTHERS</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT BETTER THAN OTHERS</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOUT THE SAME AS OTHERS</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT AS GOOD AS OTHERS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFINITELY WORSE THAN OTHERS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. When you become upset about school and/or work plus your other responsibilities, is your wife as understanding as you would like her to be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES, SHE IS AS UNDERSTANDING AS I WOULD LIKE HER TO BE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES, SHE IS UNDERSTANDING MOST OF THE TIME</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES SHE IS, SOMETIMES SHE IS NOT</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USUALLY SHE IS NOT VERY UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHE IS NOT UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. All things considered, how satisfied are you with where you are living? (Apartment, house, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. Generally, how satisfied are you with living in Ames?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. How satisfied are you with the frequency you get to go out?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
31. If you do not think you get to go out often enough, why is this?

DOESN'T APPLY, I GET TO GO OUT OFTEN ENOUGH...... Y
WIFE HAS TO STUDY.............................................. 1
I HAVE TO STUDY.................................................. 2
NOT ENOUGH TIME................................................ 3
NOT ENOUGH MONEY.............................................. 4
NO ONE TO CARE FOR CHILDREN................................. 5
WIFE DOESN'T TO................................................... 6
OTHER REASONS (SPECIFY)........................................ 7

32. What is your father's occupation? (If father is not living, what was his occupation?)

(Write in Answer)

33. Other than activities such as classes and studying, are you employed?
(Include assistantships as employment.)

NO............ 1
YES........... 2

*(IF "YES" GO TO QUESTION # 34)
(IF "NO" GO TO QUESTION # 40)

34. If you are employed what is your occupation?
(If you have more than one job, list only the one at which you spend most of the time)

35. On the average, how many hours do you work per week?

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED... Y
1 - 10 HOURS PER WEEK ................. 1
11 - 20 HOURS PER WEEK................. 2
21 - 30 HOURS PER WEEK................. 3
31 - 40 HOURS PER WEEK................. 4
OVER 40 HOURS PER WEEK................. 5

36. Approximately what is your gross monthly income? (Your salary only.)

DOESN'T APPLY, I AM NOT EMPLOYED... Y
LESS THAN $100 PER MONTH ............. 1
BETWEEN $101 and $200 PER MONTH..... 2
BETWEEN $201 and $300 PER MONTH..... 3
BETWEEN $301 and $400 PER MONTH..... 4
BETWEEN $401 and $500 PER MONTH..... 5
OVER $500 PER MONTH....................... 6
37. How satisfied are you with your present job and working conditions?

   VERY SATISFIED ................................. 5
   SOMEWHAT SATISFIED ............................ 4
   UNDECIDED  ...................................... 3
   SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED  ......................... 2
   VERY DISSATISFIED  ............................... 1

38. How often do you feel your wife should not be working (employed)?

   DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT EMPLOYED ....... Y
   VERY OFTEN  ....................................... 5
   FAIRLY OFTEN  ..................................... 4
   NOW AND THEN  .................................... 3
   SELDOM  .......................................... 2
   NEVER ............................................... 1

40. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is all right for a married woman without children to work outside the home.

   STRONGLY AGREE  ................................. 5
   AGREE  ............................................. 4
   UNDECIDED  ......................................... 3
   DISAGREE ........................................... 2
   STRONGLY DISAGREE  .............................. 1

41. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: It is all right for a married woman with children to work outside the home.

   STRONGLY AGREE  ................................. 5
   AGREE  ............................................. 4
   UNDECIDED  ......................................... 3
   DISAGREE ........................................... 2
   STRONGLY DISAGREE  .............................. 1

42. How satisfied do you feel your wife is with her present working conditions?

   DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT EMPLOYED ....... Y
   VERY SATISFIED  ................................. 5
   SOMEWHAT SATISFIED  ......................... 4
   UNDECIDED ......................................... 3
   SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED ....................... 2
   VERY DISSATISFIED  .............................. 1

43. What is your religion?

   JEWISH ............................................. 5
   CATHOLIC .......................................... 4
   PROTESTANT ....................................... 3
   OTHER ............................................. 2
   NONE ............................................... 1
44. Other than going to church, how religious minded would you say you are?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religious Minded</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY RELIGIOUS MINDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT VERY RELIGIOUS MINDED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT RELIGIOUS MINDED AT ALL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

45. On the average, how many times a month do you go to church?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN ONCE A MONTH</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONCE A MONTH</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWICE A MONTH</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THREE TIMES A MONTH</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOUR TIMES A MONTH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN FOUR TIMES A MONTH</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. To what extent are religious activities, such as family prayer, reading the Bible, saying grace at meals, etc., included in your family?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY OFTEN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW AND THEN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY INFREQUENTLY</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY INFREQUENTLY</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: Marriage helps the college student do better work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Agreement</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGREE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

48. Complete the following sentence by filling in the blank with one of the choices below: I think I would not have gotten married if I had known circumstances concerning my marriage would be as they are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY OFTEN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRLY OFTEN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOW AND THEN</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
49. If you had a child who was thinking of getting married and their circumstances were similar to your present circumstances would you advise them to go ahead and get married?

YES, DEFINITELY ....................... 5
YES, MAYBE ............................ 4
UNDECIDED .............................. 3
NO, MAYBE ............................. 2
NO, DEFINITELY ....................... 1

50. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: In life, one of the most important things is to have children.

STRONGLY AGREE ...................... 5
AGREE .................................... 4
UNDECIDED .............................. 3
DISAGREE ............................... 2
STRONGLY DISAGREE .................. 1

51. At the time you were married, how strongly did you want you and your wife to have children sometime in your married life?

VERY STRONGLY ....................... 5
FAIRLY STRONG ....................... 4
UNDECIDED .............................. 3
NOT VERY STRONG ...................... 2
DID NOT WANT CHILDREN .............. 1

52. How many children would you like for you and your wife to have during your married life?

NONE ..................................... 0
ONE ...................................... 1
TWO ...................................... 2
THREE .................................. 3
FOUR .................................... 4
FIVE ..................................... 5

53. How many children do you have at this time? (If your wife is pregnant count it as a child.)

NONE ..................................... 0
ONE ...................................... 1
TWO ...................................... 2
THREE .................................. 3
FOUR .................................... 4
FIVE ..................................... 5
MORE THAN FIVE ....................... 6

* (IF "NONE" GO TO QUESTION #55)
54. If you have children, or your wife is pregnant, fill out the following chart concerning your children. Start with the oldest child and include only living children. (If your wife is pregnant write "pregnant" by the appropriate number.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Accidental Pre-Marital Pregnancy</th>
<th>Planned Pre-Marital Pregnancy</th>
<th>Unplanned After Marriage</th>
<th>Planned After Marriage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you classify this child as:
(check appropriate space)

1. Accidental
2. Planned
3. Unplanned

55. Compared to other things you like to do that are not usually related to children, how much do you like to spend time with children?

- MUCH MORE THAN MOST OTHER THINGS .................. 5
- SOMewhat MORE THAN MOST OTHER THINGS ............... 4
- ABOUT THE SAME AS MOST OTHER THINGS ............... 3
- LESS THAN MOST OTHER THINGS ........................ 2
- MUCH LESS THAN MOST OTHER THINGS ................... 1

56. At the time you were married, how strongly do you feel your wife wanted the two of you to have children sometime during your married life?

- VERY STRONGLY ....................................... 5
- FAIRLY STRONGLY ..................................... 4
- UNDECIDED ............................................ 3
- NOT VERY STRONGLY ................................... 2
- SHE DID NOT WANT CHILDREN .......................... 1

57. How many children do you think your wife would like for the two of you to have during your married life?

- NONE .................................................. 0
- ONE .................................................... 1
- TWO .................................................... 2
- THREE .................................................. 3
- FOUR .................................................... 4
- FIVE .................................................... 5
- MORE THAN FIVE ....................................... 6
58. To what extent do you think children help keep a marriage together? Would you say they help a great deal, somewhat, not at all, or do they cause marriages to break up?

- CHILDREN HELP KEEP A MARRIAGE TOGETHER A GREAT DEAL ....... 5
- CHILDREN HELP SOMEWHAT TO KEEP A MARRIAGE TOGETHER ....... 4
- CHILDREN MAKE NO DIFFERENCE IN REFERENCE TO KEEPING A MARRIAGE TOGETHER ................. 3
- CHILDREN DO NOT HELP KEEP A MARRIAGE TOGETHER AT ALL .... 2
- CHILDREN HELP BREAK UP A MARRIAGE ................. 1

59. Concerning the following activities, we would like to know how often you and your wife take part in these activities together. (check appropriate space to indicate answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Always With Wife</th>
<th>Sometimes with her and sometimes without her</th>
<th>Almost always without her</th>
<th>Always without her</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to movies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out to eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

60. How satisfied are you with the frequency you and your wife take part in the above activities together?

- VERY SATISFIED ........................................ 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED ................................... 4
- NEUTRAL ............................................... 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED ............................... 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED .................................... 1

61. How satisfied do you think your wife is with the frequency you and she get to participate in the above activities together?

- VERY SATISFIED ........................................ 5
- SOMEWHAT SATISFIED ................................... 4
- NEUTRAL ............................................... 3
- SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED ............................... 2
- VERY DISSATISFIED .................................... 1
In every family a number of decisions have to be made. Many couples talk things over first, but the final decision often has to be made by one person, either the husband or wife. Now, for example, if you have children and the child needs punishing, who makes this decision? Is it always the wife, wife more than husband, husband and wife about equally, husband more than wife, or always the husband who decides this? (Check appropriate space to indicate how decisions are made in your family.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who decides about?</th>
<th>Wife Always</th>
<th>Wife More than Husband</th>
<th>Wife and Husband about Equally</th>
<th>Husband more Than Wife</th>
<th>Husband Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. How much to spend on food.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. How much life insurance the family should have.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Whether or not to use charge accounts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Where to live.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Whether or not the wife should work outside the home.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Going out, as to the movies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Visiting wife's relatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Visiting husband's relatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Whether or not the husband goes to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Whether or not the wife goes to school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
63. Indicate the major method of contraception which you and/or your wife use at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT USE ANY</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITHDRAWAL</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOUCHE</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JELLY</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOAM</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JELLY + DIAPHRAM</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHYTHM OR ABSTINENCE</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAPHRAM</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONDOM (RUBBER)</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD, LOOP, OR COIL</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PILL</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STERILIZATION</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER (SPECIFY)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. How satisfied are you with your present method of birth control? (If you do not use any, answer for satisfaction concerning not using any.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. Do you feel your present method of birth control has had a positive or a negative effect on your marriage. (Again, if you do not use any form of birth control, answer how you feel this has affected your marriage.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect on Marriage</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT HAS DEFINITELY HAD A POSITIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT HAS HAD SOMEWHAT OF A POSITIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT HAS HAD NO EFFECT ON OUR MARITAL RELATIONSHIP</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT HAS HAD SOMEWHAT OF A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT HAS DEFINITELY HAD A NEGATIVE EFFECT ON OUR MARRIAGE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

66. How satisfied do you think your wife is with your present method of birth control?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUTRAL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
67. Other than you and/or your wife's employment (including assistantships) what other sources of income do you have?

DO NOT HAVE ANY OTHER SOURCES ............... 0
PARENTS (LOAN) ..................................... 1
PARENTS (GIFTS) ...................................... 2
SAVINGS ................................................. 3
LOANS .................................................. 4
FELLOWSHIPS .......................................... 5
OTHER SOURCES (SPECIFY) ......................... 6

*(IF YOU DID NOT ANSWER "PARENTS (LOAN)" OR "PARENTS (GIFT)" GO TO QUESTION #72.)

68. If you have parental help, either loans or gifts, whose parents are helping?

DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING ................. Y
WIFE'S PARENTS ......................................... 1
HUSBAND'S PARENTS ..................................... 2
BOTH SETS OF PARENTS .................................. 3

69. How satisfied are you with the idea of parents helping you?

DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING ................. Y
VERY SATISFIED ......................................... 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED ..................................... 4
NEUTRAL .................................................. 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .................................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED ...................................... 1

70. How satisfied do you think you or your wife's parents are with helping you?

DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING ................. Y
VERY SATISFIED ......................................... 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED ..................................... 4
NEUTRAL .................................................. 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .................................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED ...................................... 1

71. How satisfied do you think your wife is with parents helping you?

DOESN'T APPLY, PARENTS ARE NOT HELPING ................. Y
VERY SATISFIED ......................................... 5
SOMewhat SATISFIED ..................................... 4
NEUTRAL .................................................. 3
SOMewhat DISSATISFIED .................................. 2
VERY DISSATISFIED ...................................... 1
72. The following are considered areas of stress in college marriages. On a scale of 1 to 5 (1 being no problem and 5 being a very significant problem) rate each area as it applies to your marriage. (Circle the number for your answer.)

| Area                      | Doesn't Apply | No Problem | Scale | Very | Significant \n|---------------------------|---------------|------------|-------|------|----------------|
| A. Finances               | 0             | 1          | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5              |
| B. Leisure time activities| 0             | 1          | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5              |
| C. Unplanned children     | 0             | 1          | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5              |
| D. Housing                | 0             | 1          | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5              |
| E. Grades                 | 0             | 1          | 2     | 3    | 4    | 5              |
| F. Communication gap between husband and wife | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| G. Wife earning a portion of family's income | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

73. As you know there are married couples who discuss things while other married couples do not discuss these same things. Would you say you discuss the following with your wife: Always, Fairly Often, Once in awhile, Seldom, or Never? Also, do you feel you and your wife have the same ideas or different ideas about the following? (Check appropriate square to indicate answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>We discuss this topic:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's Work or school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's household responsibilies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
74. Which of these categories best estimates your yearly gross family income? (Include husband's income, wife's income, plus any other income you might have.)

$1 - 999 ........................................... -01
$1,000 - $1,999 ................................. -02
$2,000 - $2,999 ................................. -03
$3,000 - $3,999 ................................. -04
$4,000 - $4,999 ................................. -05
$5,000 - $5,999 ................................. -06
$6,000 - $6,999 ................................. -07
$7,000 - $7,999 ................................. -08
$8,000 - $8,999 ................................. -09
$9,000 - $9,999 ................................. -10
$10,000 AND OVER .............................. -11

75. When disagreements arise they generally result in:

HUSBAND GIVING IN ............................. -1
WIFE GIVING IN ................................. -2
NEITHER GIVING IN ............................. -3
AGREEMENT BY MUTUAL GIVE AND TAKE ... -4

76. Do you and your mate agree on right, good, and proper behavior?

ALWAYS AGREE ................................. -1
ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ......................... -2
OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ..................... -3
FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ......................... -4
ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ................... -5
ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................... -6

77. Do husband and wife engage in outside activities together?

ALL OF THEM ...................................... -1
SOME OF THEM ................................... -2
FEW OF THEM .................................... -3
NONE OF THEM ................................... -4

78. In leisure time, which do you and your mate prefer?

BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE STAY AT HOME .......................... -1
BOTH TO BE ON THE GO .................................. -2
ONE TO BE ON THE GO AND THE OTHER TO STAY AT HOME .......... -3

79. Do you and your mate agree on aims, goals, and things believed important in life?

ALWAYS AGREE ................................... -1
ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE .......................... -2
80. Do you and your mate agree on friends?

  ALWAYS AGREE ........................................... -1
  ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ................................ -2
  OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE .............................. -3
  FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ................................. -4
  ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. -5
  ALWAYS DISAGREE ....................................... -6

81. Do you and your mate agree on ways of dealing with in-laws?

  ALWAYS AGREE ........................................... -1
  ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ................................ -2
  OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE .............................. -3
  FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ................................. -4
  ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. -5
  ALWAYS DISAGREE ....................................... -6

82. Do you and your mate agree on handling family finances?

  ALWAYS AGREE ........................................... -1
  ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ................................ -2
  OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE .............................. -3
  FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ................................. -4
  ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. -5
  ALWAYS DISAGREE ....................................... -6

83. Do you and your mate agree on amount of time spent together?

  ALWAYS AGREE ........................................... -1
  ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ................................ -2
  OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE .............................. -3
  FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ................................. -4
  ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. -5
  ALWAYS DISAGREE ....................................... -6

84. How often do you kiss your mate?

  EVERY DAY ............................................... -1
  NOW AND THEN .......................................... -2
  ALMOST NEVER .......................................... -3
85. How frequently do you and your mate get on each other's nerves around the house?

NEVER ........................................ -1
ALMOST NEVER ............................... -2
OCCASIONALY ................................. -3
FREQUENTLY ................................. -4
ALMOST ALWAYS ............................. -5
ALWAYS ........................................ -6

86. Do you and your mate agree on demonstration of affection?

ALWAYS AGREE .................................. -1
ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ...................... -2
OCCASIONALY DISAGREE ..................... -3
FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ....................... -4
ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE ................. -5
ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. -6

87. Check any of the following items which you think has caused serious difficulties in your marriage?

DIFFICULTIES OVER MONEY ................... -01
LACK OF MUTUAL FRIENDS .................... -02
CONSTANT BICKERING ........................... -03
INTERFERENCE OF IN-LAWS .................... -04
LACK OF MUTUAL AFFECTION .................. -05
UNSATISFYING SEX RELATIONS ............... -06
SELFISHNESS AND LACK OF COOPERATIONS ... -07
ADULTERY ....................................... -08
MATE PAID ATTENTION TO ANOTHER PERSON -09
DRUNKENNESS OR ALCOHOLISM .............. -10
OTHER REASONS .................................. -11
NOTHING ......................................... -12

88. Have you ever wished you had not married?

FREQUENTLY .................................... -1
OCCASIONALLY ................................. -2
RARELY .......................................... -3
NEVER .......................................... -4

89. Do you and your mate generally talk things over together?

NEVER .......................................... -1
NOW AND THEN ................................... -2
ALMOST ALWAYS ............................... -3
ALWAYS .......................................... -4
90. How happy would you rate your marriage?

   362
   VERY HAPPY ................................... 1
   HAPPY ......................................... 2
   AVERAGE ...................................... 3
   UNHAPPY ....................................... 4
   VERY UNHAPPY .................................. 5

91. If you had your life to live over again would you:

   MARRY THE SAME PERSON ..................... 1
   MARRY A DIFFERENT PERSON .................. 2
   NOT MARRY AT ALL ............................ 3

92. What is the total number of times you left your mate or your mate left you because of conflict?

   NO TIMES ...................................... 1
   ONE TIME ...................................... 2
   TWO OR MORE TIMES .......................... 3

93. What are your feelings on sex relations with your mate?

   VERY ENJOYABLE .............................. 1
   ENJOYABLE .................................... 2
   TOLERABLE .................................... 3
   A LITTLE ENJOYABLE .......................... 4
   NOT AT ALL ENJOYABLE ........................ 5

94. Do you and your mate agree on sex relations?

   ALWAYS AGREE ............................... 1
   ALMOST ALWAYS AGREE ........................ 2
   OCCASIONALLY DISAGREE ..................... 3
   FREQUENTLY DISAGREE ....................... 4
   ALMOST ALWAYS DISAGREE .................... 5
   ALWAYS DISAGREE ............................. 6

95. During sexual intercourse are your physical reactions satisfactory?

   VERY .......................................... 1
   SOMewhat ..................................... 2
   A LITTLE ...................................... 3
   NOT AT ALL .................................... 4
96. Is sexual intercourse between your mate and you an expression of love and affection?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALWAYS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST ALWAYS</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALMOST NEVER</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEVER</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97. How satisfied are you with your wife working outside the home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOESN'T APPLY, SHE IS NOT EMPLOYED...</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY SATISFIED</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT SATISFIED</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDECIDED</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT DISSATISFIED</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY DISSATISFED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
### Table 42. Employment of spouses by Marital Adjustment Quartile (individual responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>First</th>
<th>Second</th>
<th>Third</th>
<th>Fourth</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No spouse employed</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife only employed</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband only employed</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both spouses employed</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 43. Employment by student classification (individual responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment status</th>
<th>Not a student</th>
<th>Student not ISU</th>
<th>Special Undergrad.</th>
<th>Grad.</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No spouse employed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-only employed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-only employed</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both spouses employed</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accidental premarital pregnancy</td>
<td>Planned premarital pregnancy</td>
<td>Unplanned after marriage</td>
<td>Planned after marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife-only a student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband-only a student</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both husband and wife students</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 45. Variables related to parental help, zero-order correlation matrix. N = 94  Significance levels: .05 level = .175, .01 level = .245

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Loans</th>
<th>Gifts</th>
<th>Both sets parents</th>
<th>Wife's parents</th>
<th>Husband's parents</th>
<th>Wife's M.A.</th>
<th>Husband's M.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X_1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.796</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.512</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.943</td>
<td>-.819</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.800</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>-.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 46. Zero-order correlation matrix for variables related to wife-employed. N = 114  D.F. = 112. Significance levels: .05 = .163, .01 = .229

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>X_1</th>
<th>X_2</th>
<th>X_3</th>
<th>X_4</th>
<th>X_5</th>
<th>X_6</th>
<th>X_7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank of wife's occupation X_1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's satisfaction with working wife X_2</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .007</td>
<td>.572</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours wife works X_3</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .044</td>
<td>.537</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with job of wife X_4</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife income in proportion to family income X_5</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>- .090</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wife's marital adjustment score X_6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Husband's marital adjustment score X_7</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 47. Variables related to student-wives, zero-order correlation matrix. N = 48 D.F. = 46.

Significance levels: .05 = .244, .01 = .339

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Grade</th>
<th>Student Classification</th>
<th>Course Load</th>
<th>Desire to Finish</th>
<th>Husband's Attitude</th>
<th>Wife's M.A.</th>
<th>Husband's M.A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X_1$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.202</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>-.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_2$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_3$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_4$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.248</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_5$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_6$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_7$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$X_8$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>