

THE RELATION OF ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TO PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND CERTAIN BACKGROUND FACTORS

By

WARREN WILLIAM McCLINTOCK

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1954

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1956

OKLAHOMA
AGRICULTURAL & MECHANICAL COLLEGE
LIBRARY
JAN 2 1957

THE RELATION OF ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TO PERSONALITY
CHARACTERISTICS AND CERTAIN BACKGROUND FACTORS

Thesis Approved:

Hazel L. Ingersoll
Thesis Adviser

Henry D. Schalock

Birdie H. Ware

Robert M. Martin
Dean of the Graduate School

369946

PREFACE

The study was undertaken to determine the relationship of "romantic attitudes" to personality traits and to compare personality characteristics of our sample with the norms for these characteristics to determine whether or not the sample was a select or special group in this respect.

The writer would like to thank all the people who made this study possible. Thanks go to Dr. Llewlyn Gross for allowing the writer to use his Attitude Scale and also to the Sheridan Supply Company for the use of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. To the staff of Marriage course instructors who helped in administering the tests, namely Mrs. Girdie H. Ware, Dr. Alfred S. Nickless, Mr. Owen W. Morgan, and Dr. Hazel L. Ingersoll the writer expresses his gratitude.

Particular thanks are due Dr. Alexis M. Anikeeff for his constructive criticism and most apt suggestions for improving the study.

Special thanks go to Dr. Hazel L. Ingersoll for her continued support, guidance, and encouragement. The insights and information gained from discussions with Dr. Ingersoll continually inspired the writer in this study.

Thanks must go to Ann, my wife, for continued help in typing, scoring tests, and the immeasurable amount of encouragement she gave me at times of difficulty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
PURPOSE	1
HISTORY OF ROMANTICISM.	2
DESCRIPTION OF GUILFORD-ZIMMERMAN TEMPERAMENT SURVEY.	8
DESCRIPTION OF A SCALE FOR MEASURING ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TOWARD COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE10
PROCEDURE14
SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY.17
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION21
COMPARISON OF SAMPLE WITH THE NORM.21
COMPARISON OF ROMANTIC AND NON-ROMANTIC GROUPS.27
BACKGROUND FACTORS.34
DISCUSSION.36
SUMMARY.39
IMPLICATIONS41
REFERENCES43
APPENDIX45
A. A Scale for Measuring Romantic Attitude Toward Courtship and Marriage.45
B. List of 40 Characteristics of the Romantic Culture Pattern51
C. Description of Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey Traits.57
D. Information Sheet61
VITA63
TYPIST'S PAGE.64

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Comparison of Scores of Romantic and Non-Romantic Groups	11
2. Reliability of A Scale for Measuring Romantic Attitude Toward Courtship and Marriage.	13
3. Distribution of Males and Females of the Sample According to College Classification.	17
4. Classification of Males and Females of the Sample According to Marital Status.	18
5. Distribution of Males and Females of the Sample According to Residence During Childhood.	18
6. Distribution of Males and Females of the Sample According to Residence in "Teens".	18
7. Classification of Males and Females of the Sample According to Church Attendance.	19
8. Comparison of the Means and Standard Deviations of our Sample with Means and Standard Deviations of GZTS Norms on the Personality Traits.	22
9. Comparison of the Means and Standard Deviations of our Male Sample with the Means and Standard Deviations of GZTS Male Norms on the Personality Traits.	23
10. Comparison of the Means and Standard Deviations of our Female Sample with Means and Standard Deviations of GZTS Female Norms on the Personality Traits.	26
11. Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Romantic Group with Means and Standard Deviations of the Non-Romantic Group both Male and Female on Personality Traits.	28
12. Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Male Sample with Means and Standard Deviations of the Non-Romantic Male Sample on Personality Traits.	30
13. Comparison of Means and Standard Deviations of Female Sample with Means and Standard Deviations of the Non-Romantic Female Sample on Personality Traits	33
14. The Significance of the Difference between the Means of College Classification as Determined by Analysis of Variance.	35
15. The Significance of the Difference between the Means of Resi- dence during Childhood Classification as Determined by Analysis of Variance	35

Table	Page
16. The Significance of the Difference between the Means of Residence during "Teens" Classification as Determined by Analysis of Variance	35
17. The Significance of the Difference between the Means of Church Attendance Classification as Determined by Analysis of Variance	35
18. The Significance of the Difference between the Means of Marital Status Classification as Determined by Analysis of Variance. .	35

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION

A. Purposes

At least as early as 1926 certain sociologists interested in studying family phenomena began to recognize and to comment, sometimes unfavorably, on what they designated as the "romantic complex". The "romantic complex" as we shall refer to it in this study can be described as a cultural pattern the main characteristics of which are: (1) individualism, (2) freedom, (3) personality growth, (4) social irresponsibility (6, 10). "Romantic attitude", on the other hand, while referring to the same characteristics applies to the degree to which they are present in the individual rather than the culture as in the "romantic complex". Some authors have postulated that the presence of this "romantic complex" may have some relation to the current high divorce rate (4, 12). However, few investigations to the author's knowledge, have served to verify this assumption by experimental and quantitative means.

Because the writer sensed the indefinite knowledge of the influences of the "romantic complex" he was prompted to undertake this study to determine the interrelationships, if any, that might possibly exist between "romantic attitude" and personality characteristics. In other words he is attempting to determine if certain personality characteristics are associated in the college student with "romantic attitude" or its absence. More specifically this study was undertaken to determine the interrelationships, if any, that may exist between "romantic attitude" as measured by A Scale for Measuring Romantic Attitude Toward Courtship and Marriage (p.46) and: (1) personality traits as measured

by the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (p.8), and (2) certain background factors such as residence, marital status, and age.

In addition to the above comparison, the writer also wished to compare the personality characteristics of the college students enrolled in the Marriage course at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College with the established norms on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey.

B. History of Romanticism

The writer would like to describe some of the particular historical developments of romanticism in Western Europe and America. However, this description will be brief since including all the ramifications of this topic would take on such broad aspects in history that it would be too lengthy to describe. The investigator would, however, like to point up some of the more important developments in the writings concerning romance and romanticism from the ancient cultural patterns to its status in the present American culture (5, 6, 17).

Some sort of romance was present in the classical cultures of Greece and Rome. For example, the devotion inspired in Pericles by the love of Aspasia was the pinnacle of romantic love (5). The prominent men of Greece and Rome devoted attention to the gracious courtesans of this Golden Age to such an extent that many present-day romantic magazines and movie-goers still thrive on it. During the 600 years after the fall of Rome, commonly known as the Dark Ages, romance languished mainly because love between the sexes was considered by the Roman Catholic Church as inspired by the devil and therefore wicked. Life was mundane and living was so difficult during these times that people had little time or energy to devote to romance.

Nevertheless the idea survived. One of the major factors that inspired romance and put it on a more "elevated" plane was the worship of the Virgin Mary. Furthermore, since men had venerated the Virgin Mary they gradually came to hold the so-called "pure" woman in higher esteem than formerly. This eventual idealization of women reached its pinnacle in the concept of courtly love during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. One of the most common manifestations of this courtly love was the development of chivalry from its rude and lusty beginnings to its gentler and more romantic idealizations. Love within and without marriage became the theme for the troubadours, knights, and poets who vowed eternal faithfulness to their ladies. Sometimes this feeling between lover and mistress which had so harmless and common a beginning grew to be so great that it superseded all else. Usually this all-consuming love was its own rationalization. Most of these relationships between lover and mistress were not within the marriage bonds. A predominant idea of the times was that "real" love could not exist within marriage. With the passing of the feudal system interest in romanticism receded.

During the days of Louis XIV interest in romantic love was revived. Marriage was still considered rather a dull and mundane relationship which mainly implied the union of two noble houses rather than a love relationship. Intrigue, chivalry, and romantic adventures were among the more popular pastimes for the leisure class. Many of the lovely and talented ladies of this time went to the noblemen's courts and became involved in intrigue and love affairs. Sometimes these ladies were clever enough to talk a nobleman into marriage and consummate their love affairs. There existed in these courts a state of licentiousness which is not conducive to the romantic pattern as it exists in Western

Europe and America today (2). Still this period is considered romantic because the motive and reason for choice of mate and pre-marital or extra-marital sexual relations were the physical attraction and pleasure of mutual association under ideal and unnatural courtship situations. According to Elliot and Merrill (5) the modern romantic tradition can be traced to one important literary source on which many subsequent writings on romance and sentiment have been based. This original source was Jean Jacque Rousseau's The New Heloise. An earlier story which emphasized this romantic love was the Celtic myth of Tristan and Iseult. Rousseau's novel appeared in 1761 and took Europe by storm. One of the main ideas advocated by Rousseau was freedom of the human heart which definitely broke away from the more classical traditions and prominent ideologies of the time.

✓ As the industrial and commercial revolution was ushering in capitalism the older institutions were crumbling and disappearing. In their place a new kind of relationship between individuals based upon deliberate choice was evolving. Where previously the romantic love was outside of marriage it now was becoming a motive for choice of a mate and was deemed an important part of the marriage relationship. This was particularly true in the Protestant countries where freedom of religion and freedom of marital choice developed concurrently. The middle class was a great force in promoting romantic love during these ages. Gradually the power of the middle class rose and that of the aristocracy concomitantly receded. One of the traditions that gradually receded with the aristocracy was the patriarchal authority in the family. There was a definite increase in equalitarian and democratic families with this rise of the middle class. Individual freedom, particularly in the choice of a marriage partner, was becoming an

accepted mode of behavior.

Romanticism in America

Early in the twentieth century Burgess (4) published an article which outlined the historical development of the "romantic complex" and pointed out the role which it played in the disorganization of the modern family. Burgess criticized and imputed much of the blame for the then high divorce rate (about one in seven) to the "romantic complex". Burgess seemed to feel that the "romantic complex", in courtship and marriage particularly, because it manifests itself in extreme individuality, connotes social irresponsibility, and therefore should be suppressed or at least replaced to an extent by such factors as mutual interests and companionability. But in the end Burgess did concede that romance had always existed and probably would always exist and that our best hope is in tempering it with wisdom so that our courtships and marriages will not be based exclusively on romantic choice.

About the time that Burgess' article appeared, Ernest Mowrer (12) made some comments which are somewhat similar to those of Burgess (4). One main difference between Mowrer's and Burgess' comments on the "romantic complex" is that the former does not stress that the "romantic complex" may be the cause of family disorganization. Instead, he said it was better to perceive this as a factor accompanying family disorganization. This writer's comment to the above mentioned articles is mainly that Mowrer appears more conservative and more hesitant to state a causal relationship between family disorganization and the "romantic complex". Considering the limited knowledge which was accessible during the time these articles were written this conserva-

tive point of view of non-causal relationship was scientifically justifiable. Burgess, however, seemed to be less interested in the correct description of the conditions and more interested in formulating hypotheses on methods of decreasing family disorganization. Therefore he made the assumption that the relationship between family disorganization and romantic complex was causal although he was unable to give positive evidence of this. The logical conclusion to which he came in his paper was, that if the "romantic complex" were reduced by replacing it with mutual interests and companionship, the high rate of family disorganization would tend to be reduced.

✓ In an article by Landis (12) some specific comments and criticisms were made regarding the "romantic complex" to this effect:

I contend that methods of selecting mates are a matter of custom and that our romance need not be sanctioned by marriage custom; that our present romantic notions have a bearing on our high divorce rate; that although back of all romance is the sex impulse, romance is subject to control and direction and in our society may be made to conform to the interests of a more permanent family.

Landis discussed each one of the previous speculations then finally concluded that each is true. The validity of Landis' conclusions is rather debatable since he gave no experimental evidence and little empirical evidence.

This writer has found but one article which has defended rather than attacked the "romantic complex" (10). Kolb says:

It is the thesis of this paper that when the criteria for marriage developed by the family sociologists and marriage educators are judged by the complex of ultimate values embodied in the Western European traditions, these criteria reveal themselves to be non-democratic and neglectful of the values of the dignity and infinite worth of the individual.

Throughout Kolb's article the "romantic complex" is defended and the family sociologists and marriage educators are refuted. The main

foci of Kolb's argument for romanticism and against the attitude of the family sociologists and marriage educators is that romanticism is best represented by, "individualism, freedom, and personality growth", which he contends are the central values of the "romantic culture complex". He believes that the critical attitude toward the "romantic complex" originated chiefly in the criticism of those persons who used it in extreme ways. For example, a person in selecting a mate might be extremely individualistic. But Kolb declares that the family sociologists and marriage educators criticize the whole "romantic complex" rather than the irrational and radical extremes of it.

This writer would like to point out that there apparently has been a misunderstanding by Kolb or the family sociologists and marriage educators in regard to the connotations of the "romantic complex". The majority of the characteristics sociologists list as descriptive of the "romantic complex" seem to imply extreme, irrational, or radical behavior while Kolb does not see the "romantic complex" itself as extreme behavior. The main things that are inherent in the "romantic complex" according to Folsom (6) are:

1. that in marriage will be found the only true happiness,
2. that affinities are ideal love relations,
3. that each may find an ideal mate,
4. that there is only one, and,
5. this one will be immediately recognized when met . . .

This culture complex has been further defined in broader terms by Truxall and Merrill (17) as comprising:

1. individual freedom and social irresponsibility in choice of partner . . . ;
2. exclusive devotion to the one love partner;

3. the man's preparedness to seize and take the woman . . . ;
4. the honoring of love . . . ;
5. idealization, aesthetic appreciation, and worship . . . of woman by man;
6. adventure and braving of dangers in the process of courtship;
7. aesthetic and dramatic settings for courtship.

The conclusion to be drawn from this is that the main difficulty in discussing the "romantic complex" is a semantic one. The statement made by Kolb that the family sociologists and marriage educators had been undemocratic is not here considered, for this writer does not feel it lies within the scope of the study inasmuch as it implied something of ethics rather than the aspect with which we are concerned, the "romantic complex".

There was only one objective study which this writer was able to find as he searched through the literature. This study was done at the University of Minnesota as a Master's thesis (8). The idea behind this study was to see if there was a romantic culture pattern and to discover and describe all of the components of this romantic culture pattern. Gross checked through popular and semi-scientific magazine articles, books, movies, popular music, and the like, to find some of the main romantic ideas which might prevail in our culture. After all this was done Gross came out with 40 separate characteristics of the romantic culture pattern which are listed in the Appendix. See page 52.

D. Description of the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey (9)

Until recently several of the personality inventories of the Guilford series were widely used. There were the Nebraska Personality Inventory (S. E. M.), Inventory of Factors (S. T. D. C. R.), Martin Personnel Inventory (O. E. Ag. Co.), and Inventory of Factors

Psychology

(G. A. M. I. N.). It was felt by Guilford and Zimmerman that a combination of these different inventories into a larger but more economical one would be an improvement. Intercorrelation studies of the 13 traits found in the above inventories indicated that some revision could be made combining them into one inventory of 10 traits. Guilford and Zimmerman constructed the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey with the following objectives in mind: "(1) a single booklet of items; (2) a single answer sheet; (3) an efficient scoring method; (4) a coverage of the traits proven to have the greatest utility and uniqueness; and (5) condensations and omissions of trait scores where intercorrelations were sufficiently high."

The survey included 300 items which measured 10 separate traits. Each trait had 30 items which were rotated systematically so as to assure that the answer for each trait would fall in the same column on the answer sheet. Guilford and Zimmerman (9) stated that:

The form of the statement of the items is unusual for inventories of this type. Items are stated affirmatively rather than in question form, using the second-person pronoun. Personal pronouns have been avoided wherever possible. Examples are: 'You like to play practical jokes on others' and 'Most people are out to get more than they give.'

The response to these statements was in the familiar form of "yes", "?", and "no".

The basis for the selection of the items for each trait rested upon much factor analysis information and also upon previous item analyses. Many years had elapsed since the previous analysis, so some new items were selected and some items were reworded. Also the position of the items in the inventory was changed. In order to score these items a weight of 0 and $\frac{1}{2}$ was used. To simplify the scoring $\frac{1}{2}$ was assigned to only one of the responses, either "yes"

or "no". The advantage in assigning a weight of $\frac{1}{2}$ to only one response is to keep the average proportion "passing" for any particular item near .50. The reliability is higher when the proportion of "passing" is kept at .50. As a result of this modification the proportion of "correct responses" amounted to about .60 for the standardization group used by Guilford and Zimmerman.

Reliability

Several methods for obtaining the reliability of each trait were used. Odd, even, first-half, second-half relations, and the Kuder-Richardson formulas were used on the men and women, separately and combined. The results of these reliability estimates range from .75 to .87. Norms were established using the instrument with several hundred subjects and are published in the instruction manual (9).

The description of each of the 10 traits on the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey may be found on pages 58 to 60 in the Appendix.

E. Description of A Scale for Measuring Romantic Attitude Toward Courtship and Marriage (8)

Gross formulated the 40 characteristics of "romantic culture pattern" then used each of these to make 3 negative and 3 positive statements about each characteristic. The statements were then judged by 4 judges who placed them into 1 of the 4 "issue classifications": (1) characteristics of lovers (2) characteristics of the courtship process (3) marriage and its relation to other institutions (4) philosophical implications. After this was done, each of the statements was placed by the judges into a two-fold category--either "romantic" or "realistic". The results of this classification showed

that 187 of the 240 were agreed upon by all judges as to "issue classification" and category. "Of the 80 statements used in the final arrangements of Form A of the scale, all except 8 were unanimously classified by all judges as to category and issue classification. Each of the remaining 8 items was approved by the judges on 7 of the 8 classifications." (8)

After the initial construction of the scale, Gross desired to determine the validity of his instrument. One method used by Gross to determine the validity of his scale was to administer this scale to 2 groups which he felt would be quite different on the particular attitude he was measuring. The first was a group of 43 psychologists and the second was a group of 106 high school students. Gross felt that the psychologists would be more realistic while the high school students would be more romantically inclined. The results of this can be seen in the table below:

TABLE 1
COMPARISON OF SCORES OF ROMANTIC AND NON ROMANTIC GROUPS

	N	Score	Diff.	SED	t
Psychologists	43	-15.36 ± 6.44	12.8	1.15	11.16
High School Students	106	-2.56 ± 6.11			

It is apparent from the table that this test discriminated between these two extreme groups and therefore supporting Gross' original statement that these would be different groups as far as "romantic attitude" is concerned. Assuming that this is true the Gross scale appears somewhat valid. In addition Gross chose another method of checking the validity. Forty-three sociologists were requested to classify each statement item into the two-fold classification of

"romantic" or "realistic". The "romantic" items were removed and scored with a $\neq 1$ for every item that was classified as "romantic", and scored with a -1 for every item classified as "realistic". The "realistic" items were removed and scored with a -1 for every item classified as "realistic" and $\neq 1$ for every item classified as "romantic". The "romantic" items and the "realistic" items were each averaged for the 43 sociologists's classification. Both of the classifications by chance would average about 0. Hence if the difference is divided by the SED we have a t score which indicates the possibility of the difference occurring by chance. The difference in these data of 34.7 with a SED of 1.28 gave a t of 27.11 which was significant below the .01 level of confidence. The final validity check was one of internal consistency. The test had been administered to 234 subjects. The lowest quartile and the highest quartile were then compared on each of the 80 items. The formula used to obtain the critical ratio was:

$$\text{Critical Ratio} = \frac{P_1 - P_2}{\sqrt{\frac{P_1 Q_1}{N_1} \neq \frac{P_2 Q_2}{N_2}}}$$

P_1 = Per cent of those in high group who checked the item in question.

Q_1 = Per cent of same group who did not check the item.

N_1 = Number of individuals in that group.

P_2 , Q_2 , and N_2 refer to corresponding responses made on the same item by the low score group (8).

Fifty-three of the eighty items had a critical ratio of 2.5 or higher. All but 14 of the statements had a critical ratio of above 1. This item analysis assures us in a limited sense of the internal validity of the scale.

Reliability

In order to find the reliability of this scale Gross gave two classes of sociology students Forms A and B of the scale on the same day. The correlation coefficient between the two was computed for each class. Twenty-three days later the first class took the retest on Form A. The results are in the table below:

TABLE 2
RELIABILITY OF A SCALE FOR MEASURING ROMANTIC ATTITUDE
TOWARD COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE

N	Reliability Alternate Form Form A and B	N	Reliability Test-Retest Form A
85 students	.723 \pm .052	66	.81 \pm .041
76 students	.663 \pm .064	--	--- ---

It can be seen in Table 2 that the reliability, although not extremely high, is nevertheless about as high as can be expected for a scale of this nature. A test-retest reliability of .81 is an indication of an acceptable degree of reliability for Form A.

CHAPTER II PROCEDURE

Students in five sections of a Marriage course offered at Oklahoma A & M College were chosen as subjects for this investigation. The procedure was as follows: First, the students were allowed to draw numbers which were designated as "code numbers" that served to conceal the identity of the individual. Secondly, the students were requested to fill out an information sheet. A Scale for Measuring Romantic Attitude Toward Courtship and Marriage, hereafter referred to as the RAT, was passed out to each student. The students were asked to read the instructions on the front page in order to determine whether the instructions were clear. After all questions were answered the writer emphasized the point to the class that there were no right or wrong answers to the questions and that they were to answer as they honestly felt.

Within the next three or four class meetings each section was given the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, hereafter referred to as GZTS. The answer sheets and test booklets were passed out to the class and each section was given time to read the directions and fill in the needed information.

After the RAT and the GZTS had been scored, the means and standard deviations from this sample were compared with the GZTS norms. This included a classification of the sample into male and female categories. Comparisons were then made of the men and women and their respective norms and a comparison of the entire group, male and female combined, with the norms.

When the RAT had been scored the individuals were divided into extreme groups for comparison purposes (13). This was done by separating the third with the highest scores and the third with the lowest scores. As a result we have one third labeled the "romantic" third and the other extreme third labeled the "non-romantic" third.

First the writer wanted to compare the "romantic" group with the "non-romantic" group on the ten personality traits. The t test was employed for this purpose (7).^{*} Standard deviations were compared by means of an F test (7).^{**}

Next this writer made a breakdown according to sex for further comparative purposes. Again the females of the "romantic" group were compared with the "non-romantic" females on each of the ten personality traits by means of a t test to determine if the differences were significant. Standard deviations were again compared by means of an F ratio. Tentative conclusions were drawn.

The investigator then compared the males of the "romantic" group with the "non-romantic" males on each of the ten personality traits by means of an t test. Standard deviations were again compared by means of an F ratio and tentative conclusions were drawn.

A slightly different procedure was used in analyzing the background data (7). For each of the five different background factors F ratios

^{*}The t test is a statistical technique that is used in determining whether the differences between two scores is significant or unlikely to happen more than a certain number of times out of 100. For the purposes of this study we used the 5% level of confidence which means that the phenomena would happen by chance only 5 times out of 100.

^{**}An F test is a statistical technique for determining whether the differences between two variances are significantly different. For the purpose of this study we used the 5% level of confidence.

(analysis of variance) were run to see if the different groups were significantly different in the RAT scores. For example an analysis of variance (7) was run on "residence in childhood" to see if there was a significant difference between the farm, town, city, and similar groups on the RAT.

After the analysis had been completed the results and a summary were written and implications drawn from the results of the investigation.

CHAPTER III SUBJECTS OF THE STUDY

During the first semester four sections of marriage classes were administered the RAT and the GZTS. During the second semester three different sections of marriage classes were administered the same tests. A total of 134 subjects consisting of 57 males and 77 females comprised the sample. These subjects completed an information sheet showing such data as age, classification, marital status, and frequency of church attendance. The tabulated results of this information sheet can be seen in Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. Since Marriage is a course at the junior level one could expect to have more upper classmen than lower classmen in the sample. The data in Table 3 bear this out in that almost two-thirds of the sample were classified as juniors and seniors.

TABLE 3
DISTRIBUTION OF MALES AND FEMALES OF THE SAMPLE
ACCORDING TO COLLEGE CLASSIFICATION

	Fresh.	Soph.	Jr.	Sr.	Grad.	Total
Males	4	5	21	26	1	57
Females	10	26	26	13	2	77
Total	14	31	47	39	3	134

It is likewise evident in Table 4 that the sample is predominantly composed of unmarried students.

In order to determine the residence of our sample the question on residence was divided into two parts. One part of the question concerned residence during childhood. The response to this part of the

question can be seen in the column designating rural or country residence which shows that more subjects lived in rural areas. See Table 5.

TABLE 4
CLASSIFICATION OF MALES AND FEMALES OF THE
SAMPLE ACCORDING TO MARITAL STATUS

	Single	Married	Other
Males	48	10	0
Females	69	8	0
Total	117	18	0

TABLE 5
DISTRIBUTION OF MALES AND FEMALES OF SAMPLE
ACCORDING TO RESIDENCE IN CHILDHOOD

	Lived during childhood:		City ¹	City ²
	Rural	Town		
Males	27	9	14	7
Females	33	12	20	12
Total	60	21	34	19

TABLE 6
DISTRIBUTION OF MALES AND FEMALES OF SAMPLE
ACCORDING TO RESIDENCE IN "TEENS"

	Lived during "teens":		City ¹	City ²
	Rural	Town		
Males	20	14	14	9
Females	30	13	20	14
Total	50	27	34	23

Legend for Tables 5 and 6:

Rural = less than 1,000
Town = 1,000 to 5,000

City¹ = 5,000 to 50,000
City² = over 50,000

The smallest group of students lived in cities over 50,000. The second category regarding the residence of subjects during their "teens"

again indicates that most of our sample come from rural areas and the least number from cities of over 50,000. Some of the subjects moved from country to towns and cities between childhood and adolescence. It can be noted that fewer students lived in the rural areas during their "teens" than during their childhood, while there was a slight increase in the subjects who lived in cities of over 50,000 and towns between 1,000 and 5,000. There was no change in the number residing in cities of 5,000 to 50,000 in their "teens".

Table 7 indicates the varying degrees of church attendance among our subjects. Slightly less than one-half of our sample attended church four or more times a month. From this we could judge that this group was relatively religious if church attendance is taken as an indication.

TABLE 7
CLASSIFICATION OF MALES AND FEMALES OF SAMPLE
ACCORDING TO CHURCH ATTENDANCE

	Church Attendance			
	A	B	C	D
Males	7	2	25	14
Females	3	3	17	54
Total	10	5	42	68

Legend:

A= Seldom or never

B= Less than once a month

C= One to three times a month

D= Four or more times a month

It is evident from the study of these tables that these subjects do not constitute a representative sample. In one respect this may be a select group because students enrolled in a marriage course may have characteristic interests and attitudes that have determined their choice of such an elective. Moreover, the fact that they are college

students and living in the southwestern region of the United States may have influenced some of their replies to the RAT.

CHAPTER IV RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The writer was interested in determining what differences if any existed between the subjects of the study and the population on which the GZTS was standardized. The purposes in determining these differences were: (1) to see how representative the sample was (assuming that the sample upon which the GZTS was standardized was a representative sample) (2) to see if this description of personality traits of this sample would have implications for marriage courses if it could be assumed that this sample is typical of students who take marriage courses.

A. Comparison of Sample with the Norms

First it was decided to take the ten GZTS trait means and standard deviations for our sample and compare them with the GZTS norms. This was followed by a breakdown into male and female categories and comparisons were made. The formula for the reliability of difference between means in small independent samples was used (7).

$$t = \frac{(M_1 - M_2) - 0}{\sqrt{\frac{SD^2}{N_1} + \frac{SD^2}{N_2}}}$$

1. Means and standard deviations of the total sample compared.

In Table 8 it can be seen that the GZTS trait means of our total sample were higher than the norm on seven of the ten traits. Of the seven traits on which our sample had higher means than the norms five of these are significantly different at the .01 level of confidence. These were: (R) Restraint, (E) Emotional Stability,

Table 8
COMPARISON OF THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF OUR SAMPLE WITH MEANS
AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GZTS NORMS ON THE PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	Marriage	Total	S.D.	GZTS		Diff.	Diff.	Sig. of Diff.		
	Course	Sample		N	Mean			of M	SED.	t
	N	Means								
General Activity	139	16.22	5.19	912	17.0	5.46	.78	.49	1.59	1.10
Restraint	139	17.63	4.72	912	16.4	4.89	1.23	.44	2.80**	1.08
Ascendance	139	14.74	5.34	912	15.0	5.82	.26	.52	.50	1.19
Sociability	139	20.09	6.15	912	18.8	6.56	1.29	.59	2.19*	1.14
Emotional Stability	139	19.06	5.90	912	16.3	6.02	2.76	.55	5.02**	1.04
Objectivity	139	19.34	5.48	912	17.4	5.18	1.94	.48	4.04**	1.12
Friendliness	139	17.62	5.36	912	14.6	5.06	3.02	.46	6.57**	1.12
Thoughtfulness	139	18.50	4.78	252	18.2	4.90	.30	.51	.59	1.06
Personal Relations	139	20.35	4.55	912	17.1	5.00	3.25	.45	7.22**	1.21
Masculinity	139	15.30	6.49	912	16.1	6.05	.80	.56	1.43	1.14

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

Table 9
 COMPARISON OF THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF OUR MALE SAMPLE WITH THE
 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GZTS MALE NORMS ON THE PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	Males in Marriage Classes			Male GZTS Norms			Diff. of		Sig. of Diff.	
	N	M	S.D.	N	M	S.D.	M	SED	t	F Ratio
General Activity	59	17.14	5.82	523	17.0	5.64	.14	.79	.18	1.06
Restraint	59	17.14	4.94	523	16.9	4.94	.51	.67	.75	1.00
Ascendance	59	15.81	5.45	523	15.9	5.84	.09	.76	.12	1.15
Sociability	59	19.39	6.31	523	18.2	6.97	1.19	.88	1.36	1.22
Emotional Stability	59	19.54	6.26	523	16.9	6.15	2.64	.86	3.08**	1.04
Objectivity	59	19.89	5.29	523	17.9	4.98	.99	.72	1.37	1.13
Friendliness	59	16.49	5.85	523	13.8	5.07	2.69	.79	3.39**	1.33
Thoughtfulness	59	18.85	4.69	116	18.4	5.11	.18	.78	.23	1.19
Personal Relations	59	18.63	5.09	523	16.7	5.05	1.93	.70	2.76**	1.15
Masculinity	59	20.83	3.73	523	19.9	3.97	.93	.52	1.80	1.13

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

(O) Objectivity, (F) Friendliness, and (P) Personal Relations. One of these traits, (S) Sociability, was significant at the .05 level of confidence. The standard deviations of our sample were not significantly different from the standard deviations of the GZTS norms. The following formula was used to determine the reliability of the difference between two standard deviations: (7)

$$F \text{ ratio} = \frac{\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_2^2}$$

2. GZTS means and standard deviations of male sample compared with norms for males on the GZTS.

Table 9 shows the means, standard deviations, number of the male subjects compared with the GZTS norms. It can be seen that the males in our population scored higher than the norms on nine out of ten personality traits. The single trait in which they scored lower than the norm was (A) Ascendence which is only .10 of a point lower than the norm. This difference does not appear significant. With regard to the nine traits on which the male population scored higher than the norm, three were significant at the .01 level of confidence, namely (E) Emotional Stability, (F) Friendliness, (P) Personal Relations, all three of these being significantly higher than the norms. The standard deviations for our male sample on the ten personality traits do not differ significantly from the standard deviation of the norm. The general results of Table 9 are that our male subjects differ significantly on three traits as far as a mean is concerned. As far as variance or standard deviation is concerned our male population does not differ significantly from the norm.

3. GZTS means and standard deviations of female sample compared with the norms of the GZTS.

Table 10 shows the means, standard deviations, and number of subjects of the female sample compared with the GZTS norms for women. It can be seen that our population of females is higher than the norm on nine of the ten personality traits. The one trait, (G) General Activity, on which the women are lower than the norm, is significant at the .02 level of confidence. Could it be that the female students who are usually upper classmen are not getting enough rest and are in too many activities? Of the nine traits on which our females were higher than the norms, five of these are significantly different at the .01 level of confidence. On (R) Restraint, (E) Emotional Stability, (O) Objectivity, (F) Friendliness, and (P) Personal Relations our female sample is significantly higher than the norms. Two of the standard deviations of our female sample are significantly different from the norms. On (M) Masculinity our population's variation or standard deviation is greater than the norms indicating somewhat more variability on the trait of Masculinity in our female sample than the norm; being significant at the .05 level of confidence. On (P) Personal Relations the variability or standard deviation for our female sample is significantly smaller than the norm; being significant at the .01 level of confidence. It is interesting here to note that also our female sample differed on the mean of (P) Personal Relations so greatly as to be significant above the .001 level of confidence. This would indicate that as far as Personal Relations is concerned our female sample seems to be more homogeneous and above average. The mean scores of men and women in our sample

Table 10
 COMPARISON OF THE MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF OUR FEMALE SAMPLE WITH MEANS
 AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF GZTS FEMALE NORMS ON THE PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	Females in Marriage Classes			Female GZTS Norms			Diff. of		Sig. of Diff.	
	N	M	S.D.	N	M	S.D.	M	SED	t	F Ratio
General Activity	80	15.55	4.61	389	17.0	5.20	1.45	.579	2.50*	1.27
Restraint	80	17.79	4.58	389	15.8	4.73	1.99	.565	3.52**	1.07
Ascendance	80	13.95	5.16	389	13.7	5.52	.25	.641	.39	1.15
Sociability	80	20.61	6.02	389	19.6	6.33	1.01	.745	1.36	1.11
Emotional Stability	80	18.71	5.64	389	15.5	5.76	3.21	.695	4.62**	1.04
Objectivity	80	18.94	5.62	389	16.8	5.37	2.14	.685	3.12**	1.10
Friendliness	80	18.46	4.77	389	15.7	4.79	2.76	.587	4.70**	1.01
Thoughtfulness	80	18.25	4.86	136	18.1	4.70	.15	.676	.22	1.07
Personal Relations	80	21.62	3.66	389	17.6	4.88	3.02	.479	6.30**	1.77*
Masculinity	80	11.23	4.87	389	10.8	4.12	.43	.583	.74	1.40

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

are not comparable because the GZTS norms were established for each sex group separately.

B. Comparison of "Romantic" and "Non-Romantic" Groups

1. To determine the "romantic" and non-romantic" groups the RAT was administered. The tests were scored, the distribution was determined and the sample was divided into approximately equal thirds. The extreme thirds were then designated "romantic" and "non-romantic" according to their appropriate extremes. Extreme thirds were used in order to eliminate people in the middle third who might be considered "contaminated". That is people in the middle third may not with definite assurance be classified as either "romantic" or "non-romantic".

Table 11 shows the means, standard deviations and number of subjects, difference of means, t tests, and F tests of the "romantic" and "non-romantic" groups. It is seen in this table that the "non-romantic" group scored higher than the "romantic" group on the means of all ten of the personality traits. Three of these traits, (E) Emotional Stability, (O) Objectivity, and (F) Friendliness were significantly different at the .05 level of confidence, with the "non-romantic" group being higher. One trait, (T) Thoughtfulness, was significantly different at the .02 level of confidence with the "non-romantic" group having the higher mean score. (P) Personal Relations is significantly different at the .01 level of confidence with the "non-romantic" group again being higher.

The standard deviations of all the traits were compared by an F test with no resultant significant differences.

Table 11

COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF ROMANTIC GROUP WITH MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE NON-ROMANTIC GROUP BOTH MALE AND FEMALE ON PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	"Romantic" third in Marriage Class			"Non-Romantic" third in Marriage Class			Sig. of Diff.		t	F Ratio
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	S. D.	M Diff.	S.E.D.		
General Activity	45	16.20	4.78	46	17.02	5.43	.82	1.07	.77	1.29
Restraint	45	16.60	5.17	46	18.24	4.54	1.64	1.04	1.58	1.30
Ascendance	45	13.91	4.73	46	14.96	5.56	1.05	1.08	.97	1.38
Sociability	45	19.38	5.45	46	20.89	6.73	1.35	1.29	1.05	1.52
Emotional Stability	45	18.44	5.16	46	20.70	4.68	2.26	1.03	2.19*	1.22
Objectivity	45	18.35	5.46	46	20.85	5.69	2.50	1.17	2.14*	1.09
Friendliness	45	16.48	5.11	46	18.89	5.72	2.41	1.14	2.11*	1.25
Thoughtfulness	45	17.20	5.37	46	19.78	4.21	2.58	1.01	2.55	1.63
Personal Relations	45	18.96	5.65	46	21.85	4.58	2.89	1.08	2.68**	1.51
Masculinity	45	15.42	6.47	46	15.58	5.96	.16	1.30	.12	1.18

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

The difference which we find between the "romantic" and "non-romantic" groups on (E) Emotional Stability may be associated with some of the things inherent in the romantic pattern. For example, because as De Rougemont declares, "The complete romanticist is not really in love with the person, but, with love itself," he contrives in various ways to frustrate love in order to increase its intensity. The frustration, therefore, may be basic to emotional instability as well as the "romantic attitude". It is conceivable that the more emotionally unstable person may have a greater need to be "romantic" than the emotionally stable. In other words, if his present situation is a frustrating or depressing one he may look forward to courtship and marriage as a panacea for all ills.

The significant difference that can be seen between the "romantic" and "non-romantic" group on the personality trait (O) Objectivity would be interpreted to mean, according to the GZTS, that the low (O) mean scores indicates self-interest, subjectivity, and hypersensitivity while the more objective person is less concerned about himself and his own interests and the subjective person is very much concerned with how situations affect him. "The romanticist," writes Truxal and Merrill (17), emphasizes "individual freedom and social irresponsibility . . ." and therefore may be more concerned with his own subjective feelings.

2. Comparison of "romantic" and "non-romantic" males

Table 12 shows the means, standard deviations, and number of subjects of the "romantic" males compared with the "non-romantic" males of our sample. Comparison of "romantic" males with the

Table 12
 COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF MALE SAMPLE WITH MEANS AND
 STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE NON-ROMANTIC MALE SAMPLE ON PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	"Non-Romantic" Males			"Romantic Males"			Diff. of M	SED	Sig. of Diff.	
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.			t	F Ratio
General Activity	18	16.72	6.27	22	17.77	4.94	1.04	1.78	.59	1.61
Restraint	18	18.17	4.36	22	17.22	5.08	.95	1.52	.62	1.35
Ascendance	18	15.00	5.64	22	15.18	4.56	.18	1.61	.11	1.53
Sociability	18	19.06	6.57	22	19.81	5.14	.75	1.85	.41	1.64
Emotional Stability	18	20.17	6.31	22	19.40	5.12	.77	1.81	.42	1.52
Objectivity	18	20.94	5.46	22	19.40	5.63	1.54	1.78	.87	1.06
Friendliness	18	17.56	7.04	22	15.40	5.96	2.16	2.08	1.03	1.39
Thoughtfulness	18	20.11	3.57	22	16.81	4.78	3.30	1.45	2.27*	1.79
Personal Relations	18	20.22	4.68	22	17.36	5.70	2.96	1.79	1.65	1.48
Masculinity	18	21.11	4.34	22	20.68	3.61	.43	1.26	.34	1.45

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

"non-romantic" males in Table 12 shows that the mean scores of the "non-romantic" were higher on seven of the ten personality traits than the "romantic" males. On (G) General Activity, (A) Ascendence, (S) Sociability, the "romantic" group scored higher than the "non-romantic" group, but none of these differences were significant. On (R) Restraint, (E) Emotional Stability, (O) Objectivity, (F) Friendliness, (T) Thoughtfulness, (P) Personal Relations, and (M) Masculinity, the mean for the "non-romantic" males was higher than that for the "romantic" males. Thoughtfulness was the only trait on which there was a significant difference and it was significant at the .05 level of confidence.

None of the standard deviations of the "romantic" group significantly differed from the standard deviations of the "non-romantic" thus indicating that the variability of the "romantic" and "non-romantic" group was not significantly different.

If the significant difference in the t score actually means that the "non-romantic" person is more reflective than the "romantic", the difference that can be seen between the "romantic" and "non-romantic" males on the trait of (T) Thoughtfulness may be due to the fact that the more reflective males are more apt to think about cultural patterns such as "romanticism" before they introject these attitudes into their own personalities. The less thoughtful person being more extraverted may, while spending less time thinking and more time interacting with people, be less scrutinizing and discriminating in introjecting cultural patterns and beliefs such as "romantic complex".

Another possible explanation for this difference might be that the more reflective person would tend to think before he answered

and then try to answer as he feels he should, while the less (T) Thoughtful person might be more apt to give spontaneous answers. The more thoughtful males may intellectualize and answer in a way which would make it appear that they are rational and not emotional since rational thinking is valued in males of the American culture.

3. Comparison of "romantic" and "non-romantic" females

Glancing at Table 13 we see that the mean scores of "romantic" females are lower than the means of the "non-romantic" females on all ten of the personality traits. On (E) Emotional Stability and (O) Objectivity the "non-romantic" females scored significantly higher than the "romantic" females. The difference is significant at the .05 level of confidence.

The difference which we find between "romantic" and "non-romantic" females on (E) Emotional Stability may be associated with some of the things inherent in the romantic pattern as previously stated in the discussion on "romantic complex" under Section B, 1; this significant difference in means might be similarly interpreted. For example, because as De Rougemont declares, "The complete romanticist is not really in love with the person, but, with love itself," he contrives in various ways to frustrate love in order to increase its intensity. The frustration, therefore, may be basic to emotional instability as well as to "romantic attitudes". It is conceivable that the more emotionally unstable person may have a greater need to be romantic than the more emotionally stable. In other words, if his present situation is a frustrating or depressing one he may look forward to courtship

Table 13

COMPARISON OF MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF FEMALE SAMPLE WITH MEANS AND
STANDARD DEVIATIONS OF THE NON-ROMANTIC FEMALE SAMPLE ON PERSONALITY TRAITS

Trait	"Non-Romantic" Females			"Romantic" Females			Diff. of M	SED	Sig. of Diff.	
	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.			t	F Ratio
General Activity	28	17.21	4.69	23	14.70	3.96	2.52	1.28	1.97	1.40
Restraint	28	18.29	4.57	23	16.00	5.09	2.29	1.39	1.64	1.24
Ascendance	28	14.93	5.42	23	12.70	4.39	2.23	1.44	1.56	1.52
Sociability	28	22.07	6.43	23	18.96	5.60	3.12	1.76	1.77	1.32
Emotional Stability	28	21.04	4.92	23	17.52	4.92	3.51	1.47	2.40*	1.00
Objectivity	28	20.79	5.57	23	17.35	4.95	3.44	1.59	2.16*	1.35
Friendliness	28	19.75	4.55	23	17.51	3.78	2.25	1.31	1.71	1.32
Thoughtfulness	28	19.57	4.47	23	17.57	5.50	2.19	1.46	1.50	1.51
Personal Relations	28	22.39	4.12	23	20.52	4.95	2.37	1.31	1.81	1.44
Masculinity	28	12.04	5.55	23	10.39	5.96	1.64	1.08	1.52	1.25

* = Significant at the .05 level

** = Significant at the .01 level

and marriage as the panacea for all ills.

The significant difference that can be seen between the "romantic" and "non-romantic" females on the personality trait (0) Objectivity would be interpreted to mean, according to the GZTS, that the low (0) mean scores indicate self-interest, subjectivity, and hypersensitivity. The more objective person is less concerned about herself and her own interests while the subjective person is very much concerned with how situations affect her. "The romanticist," writes Truxal and Merrill (17), emphasizes "individual freedom and social irresponsibility . . ." and therefore may be more concerned with her own subjective feelings.

C. Background Factors

Our primary objective in analyzing the five "background factors" was to see if people with differing "background factors" produced significantly different RAT mean scores.

Four of the five "background factors" studied contained four subgroups with RAT means. We desired under these circumstances to test the null hypothesis that the four different groups for each "background factor" did not have significantly differing means (7).

The value of analysis of variance in testing experimental hypotheses is most strikingly demonstrated in those problems in which the significance of the difference among several means is desired.*

The fifth "background factor", marital status contains only two groups with RAT means which are compared by analysis of variance although for this a t test would have been just as sufficient a technique of statistical analysis. We used analysis of variance because originally

*See Garrett (7) for a discussion and formula of analysis of variance.

in collecting the data there were four groups within marital status: "single", "married", "separated", and "divorced", but nevertheless proceeded with our original design of statistical analyses.

Observation of Table 14 shows no significant difference in "romantic attitude" of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students.

Tables 15 and 16 indicate that there are no significant differences in RAT mean scores of the people among groups differing in "residence during childhood" and "residence during adolescence". "Church attendance" as seen in Table 17 indicates that no significant difference in RAT mean scores existed among people attending church in differing degrees.

The difference in the RAT mean scores for single and married persons was not significant as can be seen in Table 18.

D. Discussion

The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Map (R-gram) gives us some pertinent information which will help in seeing what a combination of the personality traits might indicate (15). Following is the material and general information concerning the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Map (15):

- A. General Neuroticism: Very high correlations with E and O; moderate correlations with A, S, F, T, P, and M; little or no correlation with G, R, and T.
 - I. Social Adaptation: Significant correlations with F and P.
 - II. Sex Differences: Significant correlation with M.
 - III. Energy: High correlation with G; moderate with A; probably slight correlation with S and R.
 - IV. Introversion-Extraversion: Fairly high correlations with T and R; lower but significant correlation with S.

This observer used the configuration above as a frame of reference in interpreting his findings. On pages 21 to 22 we see that when comparing the total sample with the norms, (E) Emotional Stability and (O) Objectivity were significantly higher in our sample indicating that this sample is better "integrated" and less "generally neurotic" than the norm. On this same page it can be noted that our sample was significantly more "friendly" and had significantly better "personal relations" a combination of which indicates that this sample was more "socially adaptable" than the norms.

Looking next at the comparison of the female sample with the norms (p.26) we see that the females have a significantly better "personal relation" and were significantly more "friendly" than the norms again indicating that our sample of females was more "socially adaptable" than the norms. The male population (p.23) also had significantly higher scores on "friendliness" and "personal relations" showing that they also were more "socially adaptable". The female population scored significantly higher on (E) Emotional Stability and (O) Objectivity than the norms. Using the combination implications from the Temperament map this would mean that our female sample was better "integrated" and less "generally neurotic" than the norm. In observing page 28 we may see that the "romantic" group (both male and female) is significantly less (E) Emotionally Stable and (O) Objective than the "non-romantic" group indicating the "romantic" group was more "generally neurotic". The "non-romantic" group had significantly higher scores on "personal relations" and "friendliness" than the "romantic" group indicating that it was more "socially adaptable". When we look at the breakdown into male and female groups and compare the "romantic" with the "non-romantic" we can note on page 30 that the males have

only one trait (T) Thoughtfulness on which there is a significant difference. Therefore no combinational implications are present. The female "romantic" group compared with the "non-romantic" group is significantly less (E) Emotionally Stable and (O) Objective than the "non-romantic" group and therefore according to the Temperament map may be considered more "generally neurotic" than the "non-romantic" females.

SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THE TREATMENT OF THE DATA

In so far as the GZTS measures personality adjustment and the RAT measures romantic attitude, the following summary can be given.

A. The sampling compared with the norms for the GZTS.

- I. The results of this study indicate that the total group of students sampled have a "better" overall adjustment than the population on which the GZTS was standardized.
 - a. More specifically we find that the entire sample is significantly more "restrained" or "serious" than the GZTS sample.
 - b. The Marriage Class sample is significantly more sociable than the GZTS sample.
 - c. The present sample is more emotionally stable and more objective than the norms. According to the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Map a combination of these two traits indicate that this sample seems to be better "integrated" and less "generally neurotic".
 - d. The sample is significantly more friendly and has significantly better personal relations than could be expected from the GZTS norm. Combined, these two traits, using the Temperament map, indicate that this sample is more "socially adaptable" than the GZTS norms.
- II. The results of this study indicate that the male and female students sampled have a "better" adjustment on some of the personality traits than the population on which the GZTS was standardized.
 - a. More specifically we find that the males are significantly

more "friendly" and have significantly better "personal relations" than the GZTS norms. The combination of these two traits using the Temperament map means that the males in our sample seem to be more "socially adaptable" than the GZTS norms.

- b. This sample of males is significantly more "emotionally stable" than the GZTS norms.
- c. Females in the college sample are significantly more "emotionally stable" and "objective" than the GZTS norms. Taken together, according to the indications on the Temperament map, this means they appear to be better "integrated" and less "generally neurotic".
- d. The student sample of females is significantly more "friendly" and has significantly better "personal relations" than the GZTS norms. Combined, these two trait using the Temperament map indicate that these females are more "socially adaptable" than the GZTS sample of females.
- e. The trait "impulsiveness" is lower in the present sample of females than in the GZTS norms. The sample is significantly more "restrained".
- f. The college group of females is also significantly less "active" than the GZTS norms.

B. Conclusions concerning comparison of "romantic" with "non-romantic" groups.

I. As a whole the "non-romantic" group appears to manifest somewhat better adjustment than the "romantic".

- a. The "non-romantic" group is more "emotionally stable" and more "objective" than the "romantic". This combination of

traits according to the Temperament map indicates that the "romantic" group is more "generally neurotic" than the "non-romantic" group.

- b. The "non-romantic" group have better "social relations" and are more "friendly" than the "romantic" group. Taken together using the Temperament map this shows that the "non-romantic" group appears to be more "socially adaptable" while the "romantic" group seems to be more "aggressive".
 - c. "Thoughtfulness" or "reflectiveness" are characteristically more descriptive of the "non-romantic" while the "romantic" group are more "extraverted".
- II. The "non-romantic" males are more "thoughtful" and "reflective" while the "romantic" are more "extraverted".
- III. We found that "romantic" females are less "emotionally stable" and less "objective" than the "non-romantic" and therefore more "generally neurotic" than the "non-romantic" females.
- C. Analyses of variance reveal no significant differences in degrees of "romantic attitude" as among different classifications of: students (fresh., soph., jr., sr.), residence during childhood or adolescence, differing degrees of church attendance (seldom or never, less than once a month), and marital status (married, single, divorced, or separated).

IMPLICATIONS

It can be seen in this study that there are several points which in future studies might be altered in order to shed new light on this subject of "romantic attitudes". Were this study to be repeated a sample larger and more representative of the general population might be selected. This author could envisage a possible future study which directly measured "romantic attitude" as we have done here, and compare the results of the happily married, unhappily married, divorced and non-divorced couples to see whether they differed in "romantic attitudes". Terman's study indicates that "unhappily married women" are more "neurotic" than "happily married women" and the Burgess study indicates that women make the "major adjustment" in marriage. This study indicates that "romantic" women are somewhat more "neurotic" than "non-romantic" women. A possible speculation keeping these three factors in mind, is that the hypotheses of Burgess (14) and Landis (12) that "romantic complex" is related to, and possibly a causal factor in, the high divorce rate may be partially supported by the evidence in future studies.

Probably one of the most obvious implications for the Marriage and Family Relationships teacher as far as the results of this study are concerned is that the students who elect the Marriage course at Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College are a select group in that they appear to be better adjusted on the whole than the population on which the GZTS was standardized. If this is true and also if Terman's findings concerning the tendency for more "happily married couples" to be less "neurotic" than the "unhappily married couples",

the course in marriage is being taught to a group less in need of help with personality adjustment. Therefore it might be suggested that much of the teaching emphasis in the Marriage Course be placed on interaction with the opposite sex and on marriage adjustment with less on personality adjustment.

REFERENCES

1. Becker, Howard, and Reuben Hill, Family, Marriage and Parenthood. New York: D. C. Heath & Co., 1948.
2. Blood, Robert O., "Romance and Premarital Intercourse--Incompatibles". Marriage and Family Living. 1952, 11, 105-108.
3. Burgess, E. W., and L. S. Cottrell, Predicting Success or Failure in Marriage. Prentice-Hall, 1939.
4. Burgess, Ernest W., "The Romantic Impulse and Family Disorganization". Survey Graphic. 1926, 57, 290-294.
5. Elliot, M. A. and F. E. Merrill, "The Romantic Falacy". Social Disorganization. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.
6. Folsom, Joseph K., The Family and Democratic Society. Wiley, 1943.
7. Garret, Henry E., Statistics in Psychology and Education. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., Inc., 1953.
8. Gross, Llewlyn, Construction of a Belief Pattern Scale for Measuring Attitudes Toward Romanticism. Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Minnesota, 1939.
9. Guilford, J. P., and Wayne S. Zimmerman, The Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, Manual of Instructions and Interpretations. Beverly Hills, California: Sheridan Supply Co., 1949.
10. Kolb, William L., "Family Sociology, Marriage Education and the Romantic Complex: A Critique". Social Forces. 29, 65-72.
11. Landis, Judson T., "An Evaluation of Marriage Education!" Marriage and Family Living. 10, 81-84.
12. Landis, Paul H., "Control of the Romantic Impulse through Education". School and Society. 44, 212-215.
13. Long, John A., and Peter Sandiford, The Validation of Test Items. Bulletin 3, 1935, University of Toronto, Department of Educational Research.
14. Mowrer, Ernest R., Family Disorganization. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1927.
15. Perry, P. C., "A Correlational Study of Inventories of Introversiion-Extraversion". Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Ottawa.

16. Terman, L. M., Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness.
McGraw-Hill, 1938.
17. Truxal, Andrew G., and Francis E. Merrill, "The Family and Romantic Love". Readings in Marriage and the Family. by Landis and Landis, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

APPENDIX A

A SCALE FOR MEASURING ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TOWARD
COURTSHIP AND MARRIAGE

DIRECTIONS:

(1) You are requested to check (✓) from the following list those statements which you accept as expressing your own personal way of thinking and feeling. Opinions differ and your own view is as good as that of anybody else. If you feel in a certain way check (✓) the statements which express that feeling and leave other spaces blank.

(2) If there are statements which you accept and feel strongly about then check them twice (✓✓).

- ___ 1. It is important to choose a handsome person with an attractive figure for a sweetheart.
- ___ 2. We should some day have a science of social behavior.
- ___ 3. Personal charm is one of the first things to be looked for in a sweetheart.
- ___ 4. True love should be suppressed in cases where its existence conflicts with the prevailing standards of morality.
- ___ 5. It should be admitted that the ultimate outcome of a love affair depends on other things than fate.
- ___ 6. The best kind of woman to fall in love with is one sweetly feminine in nature.
- ___ 7. Lovers should be so completely absorbed in one another as to be totally blind to outside attractions from the opposite sex.
- ___ 8. To say that children of lovers are altogether different from what they would be otherwise is nonsense.
- ___ 9. Those who dream of love come closer to earthly paradise than other mortals.
- ___ 10. To the thoughtful person love is no more mysterious than many things usually taken for granted.
- ___ 11. Lovers should be young to fully experience the initial excitement of true love.
- ___ 12. It is questionable whether there is any love strong enough to overcome the passing of time.
- ___ 13. It is essential that true lovers see only the good in each other.

- ___ 14. Most of us could sincerely love any one of several people equally well.
- ___ 15. A lover without jealousy is hardly to be desired.
- ___ 16. We should accept the fact that real love may be experienced by the same individual more than once during his life.
- ___ 17. The impetuous person makes the best kind of sweetheart.
- ___ 18. The value of love is not necessarily increased through suffering for it.
- ___ 19. Undiminished hope is an invaluable aid to love.
- ___ 20. There are other things in life equal in value to true love.
- ___ 21. It is best that lovers discover one another under novel circumstances.
- ___ 22. Divorce is justified only after married persons have failed entirely in their attempt to get along with one another.
- ___ 23. One should feel excited all over to be really in love.
- ___ 24. Lovers ought to expect a certain amount of disillusionment after marriage.
- ___ 25. Every woman has a right to expect her sweetheart to be courteous and attentive at all times.
- ___ 26. When couples have been married several years repeated demonstrations of affection should be unnecessary.
- ___ 27. Lovers should freely confess everything of personal significance to one another.
- ___ 28. Married people should realize that successful wedded life depends to a great extent upon their ability to adjust to one another.
- ___ 29. Love's intoxicating periods of happiness justify its moments of misery.
- ___ 30. To be happy one should find a mate from about the same social class as the one to which one belongs.
- ___ 31. Popular love songs express better than most of us could what it feels like to be in love.
- ___ 32. Couples contemplating marriage should give serious thought to wide differences in educational background.
- ___ 33. It is not good for sweethearts to see each other too often.

- ___ 34. Economic security should be carefully considered before selecting a marriage partner.
- ___ 35. The heavier the stone in the path of love the greater the ultimate reward.
- ___ 36. One should never forget, when married, his obligation to the parents who nurtured him.
- ___ 37. If lovers want to do things differently from other people, that's their business.
- ___ 38. Most honeymoons are hardly natural enough situations for the initiation of wedded life.
- ___ 39. No remembrance of endearing love is too trivial to be forgotten.
- ___ 40. One should not marry against the serious advice of one's parents.
- ___ 41. Lovers owe it to each other to marry against their parents' objections when necessary.
- ___ 42. Trivial objects are often imbued by lovers with more importance than they should be.
- ___ 43. A special trip after the wedding ceremony is a good way to begin married life.
- ___ 44. Lovers should fulfill the expectations of society in the way they conduct themselves.
- ___ 45. One should sever parental family connections when they interfere with freedom in married life.
- ___ 46. A love free of obstacles can be just as attractive as any other.
- ___ 47. The income or amount of money a person has at marriage should be of little importance to the one who loves him.
- ___ 48. It is ridiculous to say that absence makes the heart grow fonder.
- ___ 49. Similarity in educational experience need not be considered by those thinking of marrying.
- ___ 50. Most popular love songs poorly express the sentiment of real love.
- ___ 51. A person should marry whomever he loves regardless of social position.
- ___ 52. Severe fluctuations of emotion characteristic of many of those in love should be held in check.

- ___ 53. As long as they at least love each other two people should have no trouble getting along together in marriage.
- ___ 54. There are some important things it were better lovers did not tell one another.
- ___ 55. Married partners should respond to each other much as lovers do during courtship.
- ___ 56. A girl should not expect her sweetheart to be chivalrous on all occasions.
- ___ 57. Married partners should not admit to themselves any disillusionment of one another.
- ___ 58. One should seek more substantial forms of love than that kind associated with a feeling of excitement.
- ___ 59. Failure in love justifies divorce.
- ___ 60. One cannot properly evaluate the success of a love affair originating under unusual circumstances.
- ___ 61. Of all the blessings of mankind, the greatest is true love.
- ___ 62. Lovers should not be too optimistic about their chances for success in love.
- ___ 63. Love is more precious to him who has suffered for it.
- ___ 64. Impulsiveness in a lover is undesirable.
- ___ 65. True love is so wonderful that each of us cannot hope to experience it more than once.
- ___ 66. Jealousy over a rival in love is uncalled for.
- ___ 67. We should be happy in the thought that there is some where in the world one person especially made for each of us.
- ___ 68. One should be as objective as is possible in evaluating the qualities of one's sweetheart.
- ___ 69. To be truly in love is to forever in love.
- ___ 70. It must be admitted that people of all ages are equally susceptible to true love when it appears.
- ___ 71. Every honest person must admit that love is strange and incomprehensible.
- ___ 72. Much valuable time is wasted in thinking about romantic love.
- ___ 73. A child born of the union of true lovers is a real gift to the world.

- ___ 74. Lovers should expect each other to have some interest in the more appealing personalities of the opposite sex.
- ___ 75. It should be obvious that fate plays some part in the destinies of true lovers.
- ___ 76. The sweet feminine lady cannot compare with the capable and sympathetic woman for a sweetheart.
- ___ 77. Each has a right to privately love whom he may no matter what the circumstances.
- ___ 78. An average amount of personal charm is all that should be asked for in love.
- ___ 79. We can never hope to predict accurately the course of social events.
- ___ 80. There are many things more important in love than physical attraction.

APPENDIX B

Characteristics of the Romantic Culture Pattern

Gross classified the following ten characteristics under

"Characteristics of Lovers".

1. Physical attraction. (With the discovery of true love considerable value is placed upon what is usually thought of as robust health strength and agility in the male or bewitching beauty, daintiness and delicacy of figure in the female. These refer more to body structure than to personality function.)
2. Personal charm. (Lovers should look for the indefinable something called personal charm in each other, an elusive quality having the adductive powers of a lodestone. A fascinating personality is believed to augment a smoldering love. Any girl who has "it" is a past master in the art of intrigue and inveiglement.)
3. Masculinity and femininity. (The lover has all the attributes of a complete man; he is aggressive, resolute, virile, lusty, lion hearted. The sweetheart is a womanly woman, a clinging vine patient and enduring in the face of imminent danger. This is in contrast to the companionate shares the man's responsibility for mutual welfare.)
4. Complete involvement and exclusiveness. (Lovers are so completely absorbed in their singular attachment that an outside entanglement is unthinkable. They are so thoroughly wrapped up in the object of their love as to be entirely free of all doubts concerning the genuineness and self sufficiency of their affection. Any admission of ambivalent feelings would be tantamount to a denial of true love.)
5. Day dreaming. (The capricious exercise of the imagination with some inclination for myth making is salutary to the realization of true love. Any indulgence in reverie or inattentiveness toward the everyday world is sympathetically overlooked.)
6. Youthfulness. (Lovers should be young and of about the same age to fully experience the first fires of true love. Other things being equal the youthful are quicker to discover true love.)
7. Innocence and credulity. (A certain amount of self deception in evaluating the qualities of one's sweetheart and a willingness to believe in the best is expected. Lovers are regarded as having special talent for doing whatever they do no matter how trivial. In some cases they may be set so far apart from the others of the same sex as to be regarded as divinely perfect)

8. Feeling of envy and resentment by the lover and his (or her) rival for affection. (The lover whose pride is hurt feels indignant over any attention gained by his rival. The latter is in turn anxious and apprehensive over the former's good fortune. Thus jealousy is encouraged as an intensifier of love and is believed to vary directly with its seriousness. Disappointment in love may or should lead to irreparable life long frustration on the part of the unsuccessful rival.)
9. Emotionality. (Lovers are impulsive and generally unrestrained by intellectual considerations. Such impetuosity follows from an inspired search for true love and subsides after its certain discovery. Desire or feeling rather than reason is throughout life the proper guide to human behavior.)
10. Undying hope and faith. (An optimism in one's ability to succeed in love and a faith in fate to remove unsurmountable obstacles is essential to the full realization of true love.)

Gross then classified the next ten characteristics under "Characteristics of the Courtship Process".

11. Novel setting and circumstances of first meeting. (Such a situation as a cabin party, full moon, airplane ride or enchanting music favor the ultimate outcome of a love affair. The sweetheart's attributes are accentuated by identification with the natural environment. This association may partially explain the Romanticist's feeling for nature.)
12. Cardiac-respiratory love. (Emphasis upon excited love, thrills and palpitations of the heart and occasional kissing rather than upon the tender affections generally associated with a gentle and tranquil temperament.)
13. Chivalry. (A love is expected to be solicitous, attentive, courteous and ever mindful of his lady love. This is contrary to the view that women should be independent of masculine control in so far as they are able.)
14. Confessions of hopes and fears. (These follow upon the recognition of mutual love and a feeling of common destiny. The opposing view holds that one should refrain from mentioning certain personally significant feelings because of their relative inutility. It generally favors over frankness but believes that some things are just as well left unsaid.)
15. Swings of emotional exhaltation and depression. (These are manifested in the feeling of bouyancy and lightheartedness when lovers are in accord and the feeling of dejection and desperation when they have quarreled or are for any reason at variance with one another. The intoxicated moments of happiness are worth, beyond all doubt, the dismal periods of despondency. Moreover, "love's anger is fuel to love.")

16. Characteristic gestures and words emotionally loaded including stereotyped facial expressions, promises and vows. (These are perhaps best reflected by moving pictures, popular songs and literature in: "a glance of the eye," "an understanding smile." "Sweetheart, darling," "I dream of you," "Love like ours will never die." The Romanticist believes present day symbolic expressions of romantic love should be encouraged.)
17. Unavailability of one's sweetheart. (A certain amount of inaccessibility is regarded as an incitement to love; such occasional absences spur the lovers on to renewed expressions of emotion. The opposing view holds that lovers should be willing to see one another as often as time and energy permit.)
18. Complicating factors as an expression of the belief that love grows with obstacles. (Seemingly unsurmountable barriers in the way of a successful union of the lovers are always popping up, frequently in the form of paradoxes. Courtship is consequently circuitous and the lover is compelled to win his sweetheart in an indirect or roundabout way.)
19. General disregard for custom and convention. (Formalism and disciplinary measures are sacrificed for bold experience; propriety in manners and dress are of little importance to lovers.)
20. Importance of trivial objects and dates. (Little things done together in days gone by, small pieces of jewelery, love letters, posies and trinkets of all kinds are reminders of past love experiences and inducements to further demonstration of affection.)

The third group of ten characteristics Gross classified under "Marriage and its Relation to other Institutions".

21. Parental authority and marital selection. (Free choice of mate according to sentiment and personal preference in defiance of parental wishes is encouraged. Elopement frequently occurs to avoid the hostile interference of the families.)
22. Honeymoon. (The honeymoon is regarded as the climax of romantic love. It is in part an extension of the belief that exciting and unusual circumstances favor true love. The contrary view holds that the get-acquainted process achieves best results under the orderly everyday conditions of life.)
23. Family irresponsibility. (Duties and obligations to the larger family unit are denied. Filial precedent is overridden; privileges offered in exchange for family obedience are scorned. Independence in married life is to be prized over parental guidance and protection. This implies a willingness on the part of the lovers to sever long estab-

lished social contacts.)

24. Economic status. (The amount of money or property brought into or maintained by each party in the marriage union is a matter of little importance. The extreme romanticist, believing he can live on love, despises material comforts.)
25. Educational status. (Similarities in educational background are of slight importance in selecting a marriage partner particularly when differences are in favor of the male.)
26. Cultural status. (Differences in custom, tradition, nationality, rank or class, religion and general cultural equipment, not economic or educational are of small importance in selecting a marriage partner.)
27. Unimportance of the adjustment process. (In so far as happiness in marriage is predetermined by love rather than the process of habit building, depending as it does upon the compatibility of interests and objectives, the latter is relatively unimportant.)
28. Demand for constant and unequivocal demonstration of affection. (This is a demand for continuance of romantic love in marriage. Even after years of wedded life love is not to be implicitly assumed or taken for granted.)
29. Refusal to accept disillusionment. (No one should admit to himself a change of perspective after marriage in spite of the discovery of certain "imperfections" in the spouse necessitated by the singular emphasis upon love in the light of individual differences. This is contrary to the view that disillusionment should be recognized as such when it occurs.)
30. Divorce. (A failure in love rather than an inability to adjust to one's habits to another is interpreted as mistaken choice of mate and the proper justification for divorce --- if one is to be free to look elsewhere for true love.)

The final ten characteristics Gross classified under "Philosophical Implications".

31. True love is of supreme value. (Life is defined in terms of love. "When true love exists nothing need be added; when it does not exist no substitute will take its place.")
32. Suffering and sacrifice enhance the value of love by magnifying its worth. (The intensity of love can be gauged by the depth of suffering and the enormity of sacrifice a person is willing to undergo.)
33. True love may occur but once. (Each person is capable of experiencing true love but once; when true love is realized

all other loves are regarded as infatuations or incomprehensible blunders.)

34. One definite mate alone capable of establishing the conjunction of true love. (There is but one person, not many, to whom the one true love may become attached.)
35. True love is imperishable and eternal. (True lovers will feel the same toward each other in later years as they did during the period of their courtship.)
36. Mysticism. (Love is a strange, incomprehensible, neither one thing nor another. There is a mystical communion between fated mates, an intuitive or mediate experience, not within the range of ordinary mortals that tells each of love--a love recognized at first sight.)
37. True love has some mystical affect upon posterity. (A child conceived in the union of true lovers has a destiny not in common with his less fortunate contemporaries.)
38. Love relations are essentially fatalistic. (Though humans have some freedom in love their ultimate destiny is fore-ordained by a capricious being or spirit having the power of miraculous resolution of difficulties and of retribution to a wrong doer.)
39. True love is beyond good and evil, right and wrong. (Love, in itself, is a good thing. Each has a right to love whom he may no matter what the circumstance. Though there is no ethical standard to which love in the abstract must conform this does not exclude the lover from having certain virtues such as honesty popularly associated with love in its pure and simple form. That the consummation of love should be subject to some ethical standard is not denied.)
40. Indeterminism. (Events or behavior having implications with reference to love cannot be calculated or predicted in the sense that a scientific law governing social phenomena is possible. This is contrary to the belief that relatively constant relationships pertain between conditions, motives, and actions.)

APPENDIX C

Description of Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey Traits

Positive qualities characteristic of General Activity are drive, energy, and quickness of action. These positive qualities embrace rapid pace of activities, energy, vitality, continuous activity, productivity, efficiency, a liking for speed, enthusiasm, and liveliness; as contrasted with negative qualities embracing slow and deliberate pace, fatigability, pausing for rest, low productivity, inefficiency, taking one's time, slowness of action, impassivity, and sluggishness. If a high score on the G (General Activity) scale is coupled with the right kind of qualities, it is a good indication; if, however, it is coupled with the wrong traits, it may be bad. This quality tends to exaggerate the appearance of other traits. If, for example, the T (Thoughtfulness) scale, indicative of reflective thinking, is high, a high G score would indicate that the individual's thoughtfulness and planning would be effective in action; rather than becoming useless and futile philosophizing. If one were inclined to be domineering, however, a high G status would indicate that his tyrannical manner would be more obvious and overt. A low G score may intensify a low S (Sociability), low A (Ascendance), or high F (Friendliness) status. Moreover, clinically, a low G score may indicate a hypothyroid condition, anemia, or other physical conditions; this is an especially important consideration to be noted in the case of young people. On the other hand, a high G score may indicate manic behavior, in which random action and wasted effort is evident.

On the R (Restraint) scale positive qualities are characteristic of a serious-minded, deliberate, persistent, self-controlled individual; while the negative qualities characterize a happy-go-lucky, carefree, impulsive, excitement-loving person. Such an individual is not suited to hold positions of responsibility. At the other extreme, the over-serious, over-restrained person might also be ill suited for a position of great responsibility. A high R status accompanied by a high G score would indicate internal conflict and danger of poor mental health; if accompanied by a low G status it would mean very low output. Restraint on this survey is opposite the former Guilford trait of rathymia.

A high A (Ascendance) rating denotes the qualities of self-assertion, leadership, loquacity, persuasion, conspicuousness, and bluffing; a low score, on the other hand, denotes habits of submissiveness, following, reticence and avoidance of conspicuousness. It is important that a very high A score be balanced by favorable T, R, M, and F scores; if not, such an individual may tend to "ride roughshod over others."

The high and low S (Sociability) scores indicate the contrast between people, who have many friends, readily establish rapport, and are at least in social groups; and those who are shy, reserved individuals, having few friends, and avoiding social contacts. People with

high S scores tend to seek the limelight; those with low S scores tend to avoid the limelight. This trait of Sociability was called "social extraversion" on the Guilford-Martin series.

E (Emotional Stability) is the opposite of a combination of cycloid disposition and depressive tendencies as classified on the earlier Guilford tests. A high E score indicates optimism, cheerfulness, composure, and evenness of moods. An extremely high E score, coupled with a low G status, may be indicative of a phlegmatic or lazy person. A very low E score denotes neurotic tendencies or poor mental health. An individual with such tendencies would be moody, gloomy, pessimistic, and excitable. He might harbor feelings of guilt, loneliness, and worry; and would, perhaps, daydream excessively.

Objectivity (O), as noted above, correlates fairly high with Emotional Stability. A high O score means that the individual is "thickskinned", less egocentric, and more impersonal in his attitude toward his own capabilities and liabilities than a person standing at the opposite end of the scale. A low O score means hypersensitivity, suspiciousness, and egoism, with a tendency for the individual to have ideas of reference and to get into trouble. One could, however, be too objective for the most effective adjustment as well as too subjective. An extremely high score might indicate a person so insensitive to himself, that he could not sympathize with others or appreciate their sensitiveness. A high T score would help to balance a high Objectivity rating. An individual with a low O score might either suffer in silence or find himself frequently in trouble, depending on his status on A, G, and F traits.

A high F score means a healthy realistic approach to the frustrations involved in living with others; it might mean pacifism, or it might indicate a very normal desire to please others and to be liked. A low score means some form of hostility. It might be indicative of a fighting attitude, and, if kept under control, it could be a favorable quality. Many people, scoring low on the F scale, like to dominate for the satisfaction or compensatory value derived therefrom. Such persons, in positions of authority, would probably stimulate friction and low moral among those under their supervision.

Thoughtfulness (T), formerly called thinking introversion, indicates an individual with the positive qualities of reflectiveness, meditateness, self observance, philosophical inclination, mental poise, observance of the behavior of others, and interested in thinking. On the other hand, a person scoring on the negative side of the scale exhibits mental disconcertedness and interest in overt activity. Such an extraverted individual usually is so busy interacting with his social environment that he has little time for learning to observe himself or others; as a result, he will probably be lacking in tact and subtlety.

Personal Relations (P) was designated as cooperativeness on the Guilford-Martin series. This trait seems to be the core of "getting along with people". A high score denotes not only tolerance and understanding of other people, but also confidence and faith in the

in the existing social institutions. Some characteristics of persons making a low P score are self-pity, suspiciousness, faultfinding, hypercriticalness of other people, and criticalness of social institutions. Consequently, such an individual is unlikely to "get along with others".

On the positive side of the Masculinity scale, a high score exhibits both interests and behavior that are characteristic of men. If the score is extremely high, it may indicate an unsympathetic and callous individual; or it may, on the other hand, designate a person who, consciously or unconsciously, is seeking to compensate for feminine tendency or feeling of weakness or inferiority. A low M score indicates femininity of interests and behavior and would include emotional expressiveness, romantic interests, fearfulness, disgust, and an interest in feminine activities and vocations. Women scoring high on M "may have had masculinizing experiences through long association with the opposite sex or they may be rebelling against the female role".*

*Campbell, Beatrice J., A Study of Critical Ability in Art at the College Level as Related to Interests and Personality Patterns. Unpublished M. S. thesis, Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1952.

APPENDIX D

INFORMATION SHEET

Name _____

- ___ 1. Sex: (a) male (b) female.
- ___ 2. Marital Status: (a) single (b) married (c) separated
(d) divorced.
- ___ 3. College classification: (a) freshman (b) sophomore (c) junior
(d) senior (e) graduate.
- ___ 4. Residence during childhood: (a) rural (less than 1,000)
(b) town (1,000 to 5,000) (c) city¹ (5,000 to 50,000)
(d) city² (over 50,000).
- ___ 5. Residence during "teens": (a) rural (less than 1,000)
(b) town (1,000 to 5,000) (c) city¹ (5,000 to 50,000)
(d) city² (over 50,000).
- ___ 6. Church attendance: (a) seldom or never (b) less than once a
month (c) one to three times a month (d) four or more times
a month.

VITA

Warren William McClintock
candidate for the degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: THE RELATION OF ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TO PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND CERTAIN BACKGROUND FACTORS

Major: Family Relations and Child Development

Biographical and Other Items:

Born: October 22, 1933 at Bartlesville, Oklahoma

Undergraduate Study: Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1951-52.
Northeastern State College, 1952-53.
Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1953-54.

Graduate Study: Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1954-56.

Experiences: Graduate Assistant, Family Relations and Child Development 1954-55; Instructor, Family Relations and Child Development, 1955-56.

Member of Psi Chi National Honorary Society in Psychology, Phi Kappa Phi National Honor Society, Pi Gamma Mu National Social Science Honor Society, National Council on Family Relations, Southern Association on Children Under Six.

Date of Final Examination: July 1956.

THESIS TITLE: THE RELATION OF ROMANTIC ATTITUDES TO
PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AND CERTAIN
BACKGROUND FACTORS

AUTHOR: Warren William McClintock

THESIS ADVISOR: Hazel L. Ingersoll

The content and form have been checked and approved by the author and thesis advisor. The Graduate School Office assumes no responsibility for errors either in form or content. The copies are sent to the bindery just as they are approved by the author and faculty advisor.

TYPIST: Ann R. McClintock