

124
12/16/85
12/16/85

DISSERTATION

An Exploratory Study
of
The Relationship between Various Aspects
Of the Premarital Sexual Relationship
and
Marital Satisfaction,
Sexual Satisfaction in Marriage,
and
Marital Fidelity

by

Tina M. Baker

Dissertation Committee

Beth Raymond, Ph.D., Sponsor
Paul Cambeilh, Ph.D.
Charles Dill, Ph.D., Orals Chair
Vincent Guarnaccia, Ph.D.
Sandra Schnell, Ph.D., Reader

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Hofstra University
December 16, 1985

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my sponsor, Dr. Beth Raymond, and the members of my committee, Dr. Vincent Guarnaccia and Dr. Paul Cambeilh for their comments and constructive criticisms over the past few years. To Dr. Michael Barnes who assisted in early statistical analysis, and Dr. Charles Dill, who continued when Dr. Barnes could not, and who volunteered to be my orals chair, a special thanks. To Dr. Sandra Schnall, my outside reader and work supervisor for the past year, I owe more than I can ever repay. Without her guidance and patient persistence, this project may never have seen culmination.

To my grandmother, retired special education teacher Rhea Craven, who allowed me to accompany her class many summers on trips as a child, I probably owe much of my dedication to the helping profession. To my parents, James and Nancy Giacoletti who instilled in me the belief that I could accomplish whatever I set my mind to and then supported me regardless of the path I chose, my deepest love and appreciation. Lastly, to my dear husband Stephen Baker, who continues to amaze me with his encouragement, patience, and technical assistance with word processing and the dissertation format which enabled me to complete this project within time constraints, all my love and thanks. A special note to all those family and friends who have engaged in the behaviors discussed within the context of this study - it was my curiosity regarding the effect these behaviors had on your lives that led me to initiate this investigation at all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....vii

CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION.....1

Review of Relevant Research6

Quantity of Premarital Relationships

 Number of Relationships.....7

Quality of Sexual Relationships Premaritally

 Length of time relationships lasted.....10

 Type of Relationships - exclusivity,
 and live-in or dating.....11

 Premarital Sexual Satisfaction.....12

 Premarital Relationship Satisfaction.....17

 Gender.....20

The Problem.....21

Hypothesis.....23

Exploratory Questions.....24

CHAPTER II METHOD.....26

Subjects.....26

 Age, Sex, and Race.....27

 Occupation.....27

 Income.....28

 Religiousness and Which
 Religion.....28

 Age Married and Length
 of Marriage.....29

 Number of Children.....29

 Number of Children by Age.....30

 Educational Level.....30

 Geographical Information.....30

	Materials.....	31
	Biographical Cover Sheet.....	32
	Dependent Variables.....	32
	Independent Variables.....	36
	Premarital Sexual Intercourse Relationship Questions.....	36
	Procedure.....	38
CHAPTER III	RESULTS.....	41
	Premarital Sexual Satisfaction.....	45
	Number of Partners.....	43
	Length of Premarital Relationship.....	54
	Dating Others.....	56
	Number Lived With.....	56
	Premarital Relationship Satisfaction.....	59
	Sex (gender).....	62
	Summary.....	62
	Openended Questions.....	65
CHAPTER IV	DISCUSSION.....	71
	"Overall" types finding.....	71
	"Across" types findings.....	75
	In Love Relationships.....	79
	Fidelity.....	83
	Unexpected Findings.....	87
	Lack of confirmation of hypothesis "overall".....	92
	General Discussion of Problems and Suggestions for the Future.....	94
	Conclusions.....	99
	REFERENCES.....	100

APPENDIX AA	The Autonomy Theory of Heterosexual Permissiveness.....	105
APPENDIX A	Age, Sex, Race.....	108
APPENDIX B	Socioeconomic Status as Determined by Occupational Classification.....	109
APPENDIX C	Occupational Categories.....	111
APPENDIX D	Income Levels.....	112
APPENDIX E	Religion.....	113
APPENDIX F	Marriage.....	114
APPENDIX G	Number of Children.....	115
APPENDIX H	Number of Children by Age.....	116
APPENDIX I	Educational Level.....	117
APPENDIX J	Geographical Information.....	118
APPENDIX K	Informational Form.....	119
APPENDIX L	Biographical Cover Sheet.....	120
APPENDIX M	Marital Satisfaction Scale.....	121
APPENDIX N	Marital Sexual Satisfaction Index.....	122
APPENDIX O	Marital Fidelity Indicator Question, Premarital Intercourse Indicator Question, and Age at First Sexual Intercourse Question.....	123
APPENDIX P	Premarital Sexual Satisfaction Index.....	124
APPENDIX Q	Premarital Relationship Satisfaction Index.....	125
APPENDIX R	Openended Questions.....	126
APPENDIX S	Screening Form.....	127
APPENDIX T	Means and Standard Deviations.....	128

List of Tables

1	Combinations of Types of Premarital Relationships Reported.....	43
2	Premarital Sexual Satisfaction with Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	46
3	Subjects Reporting Only One Sexual Intercourse Partner by Type of Relationship.....	49
4	Comparison of Premarital Intercourse and No Premarital Intercourse Samples on the Dependent Variables.....	50
5	Number of Extramarital Sexual Contacts.....	52
6	Number of Premarital Sexual Intercourse Partners with Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	53
7	Length of Premarital Intercourse Relationship With Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage....	55
8	Exclusivity of Premarital Intercourse Relationship With Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	57
9	Number of Premarital live-in partners with Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	58
10	Premarital Sexual Intercourse Relationship Satisfaction with Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	61
11	Sex (gender) With Marital Relationship Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage.....	63

Abstract

An Exploratory Study of The Relationship between Various Aspects of the Premarital Sexual Relationship and Marital Satisfaction, Sexual Satisfaction in Marriage, and Marital Fidelity

by

Tina M. Baker

Hofstra University

Research has found absence of premarital sexual experience positively correlated with marital adjustment (Davis , 1929; Terman, 1938; Reevy, 1959; Shope and Broderick, 1967). Others raised doubt of this conclusion (Locke, 1951; Burgess and Wallin, 1953; Kinsey et. al, 1953; Ard, 1974).

Bell and Balter (1973) found 81% of married women under 26 had premarital intercourse. Since a majority engage in this, it is appropriate to consider premarital intercourse relationship variables to identify marital correlates.

In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection premarital intercourse relationships were examined. Questions were explored concerning premarital independent variables: number of relationships, length of relationships, number of live-in partners, relationship exclusivity, sexual satisfaction, relationship satisfaction, and gender. Dependent variables were: relationship satisfaction, sexual

satisfaction, and fidelity, in marriage.

This questionnaire study consisted of the Marital Satisfaction Scale (Roach et. al, 1981) and other original items.

Subjects were 286 volunteers from Long Island MacArthur airport, 209 of which reported premarital intercourse relationships and 77 who did not, all under age 41, in first marriages.

Pearson correlation and t-test were used. The hypothesis was confirmed for only In Love premarital relationships with marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction being positively related to premarital sexual satisfaction.

Groups with and without premarital intercourse were not significantly different on marital satisfaction or marital sexual satisfaction. For subjects having premarital intercourse relationships higher marital satisfaction was related to higher number of live-in partners and higher relationship and sexual satisfaction for In Love type. Also for only this type, higher marital sexual satisfaction was related to higher premarital sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction.

Having no or few premarital intercourse partners was associated with higher likelihood of fidelity. Other premarital factors associated with higher fidelity were longer In Love relationships and higher number of In Love live-in relationships. Lower relationship satisfaction with premarital Strong Affection type also led to higher fidelity.

Women were found to have higher likelihood of fidelity.

Summarizing, In Love premarital intercourse relationships seem to relate positively to marriage. More independent variables were related to fidelity than the other dependent variables.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

In the last twenty years or so, there has been a major change towards increasing acceptance and less open disapproval of premarital coital behavior. Bell and Balter (1973) in their study of married women in the early 1970's, found 81% of women age 25 and under, 79% of women age 26-30, and 56% of women age 31-40 had premarital intercourse. Mellan and Nedoma (1970) in their study in Czechoslovakia of both men and women, found 96% admitted prematrimonial sexual intercourse. Therefore, people engaging in these behaviors probably experience less guilt due to societal disapproval than years ago. The difference is that people are more open, vocal, and desirous of examining alternatives intelligently. Ira Reiss puts it this way:

Today people seem to have more of a shopper's attitude toward their sexual lives. They know they will experiment with different kinds of sexual relationships, but they also know that they need not continue any kind of sexuality that they find not to their liking. They thereby reduce the stigma of any one type of sexual encounter and increase the importance of experimenting in order to find which sexual life style suits them best. (Reiss, 1972, p. 29)

Taking this new morality into account, it is plausible to wonder what effect, if any, premarital sexual intercourse has since over 80% of subjects from earlier studies were reported to engage in it. The incidence and effects of premarital sexual intercourse have been examined since as early as 1929, when Davis found in her study of 2200 women that an absence of premarital sexual experience for both

partners was positively correlated with marital adjustment. Later research supported her claim (Terman, 1938; Reevy, 1959; Shope and Broderick, 1967). There is an exception to this rule, which was first suggested in 1938 by Terman, and was later supported by both Locke (1951) and Burgess and Wallen (1953). They found that if the premarital intercourse was restricted to only the future spouse, it then has no association with marital success (Locke, 1951), or may even strengthen the relationship (Burgess and Wallen, 1953).

Although these other researchers have attempted to show a positive relationship between premarital intercourse and marital satisfaction, the research shows none have as yet really been successful. Ard (1974) in a twenty year follow-up of a study begun in 1935, concluded that the findings show no evidence to support the hypothesis that increasing degrees of premarital intimacy will have increasingly detrimental effects upon later marriage. He comes as close to a positive endorsement as is available in the literature.

It must be noted that most of these conclusions are based on research with women who grew up in a very different society from today's, and address the question of mere absence or presence of premarital sexual intercourse in a person's history. Today it would be more relevant to consider what it is about the context in which premarital sexual intercourse takes place, and the entire premarital history to help delineate those aspects that correlate with later marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and

fidelity in marriage. That was the purpose of this study.

The publication of the Kinsey reports (1948, 1953) provided the major impetus for research on premarital sexual intercourse. In the late 1960's a few noteworthy attempts were made to blend theory and research in the study of premarital sexual intercourse. After a thorough and comprehensive review of the research reports on premarital sexual intercourse published during the decade of the 1960's, Cannon and Long (1971) surmised that with the notable exceptions of Reiss (1967), Mirande (1968), and Christensen (1969), little attempt has been made to base research on theoretical orientations. Davidson and Leslie (1977) summarized the more current state of the situation with the conclusion that although the popularity of premarital sexual intercourse as an acceptable research topic continues to grow, the research literature still abounds with reports of data which fail to specify a conceptual frame of reference.

Given this lack of theory, what is it that the three exceptions have to offer to the field of premarital sexuality?

Mirande (1968) formulated from general Reference Group Theory, a Reference Group Theory of Premarital Sexual Behavior that is based on the premise that the sexual behavior of people tends to be consistent with the standards and behavior of their peer referent. Mirande adds that female sexual behavior is more subject to influence by social factors. This theory focuses on the effect of society, specifically peers, on sexual standards and behavior.

Christensen (1969) formulated The Theory of Relative

Consequences after he had conducted research involving premarital pregnancy and its consequences in three diverse cultural settings. The culmination of these studies resulted in his assertion that the consequences of premarital sex (PMS) that occurred would be relatively highest in most restrictive cultures, since that is where the norm violation would be the greatest. Again, this theory emphasizes comparison between cultures. Although Christensen speaks of cultural norms here, he asserts that these could be substituted for personal values in the theory. Christensen concluded that the mere presence or absence of PMS cannot be interpreted for its effect on aspects of later marriage without also considering the culture or the individual's own values about the behavior also.

Most applicable of these three contributions to premarital theory to the present study is Reiss and Miller's (1974;1979) Autonomy Theory of Heterosexual Permissiveness. This theory consists of thirty-six propositions. (See Appendix AA) These propositions do not address the issue of relationship of premarital sex to later marriage. However, Reiss and Miller characterize premarital sexual relations as varying on a continuum from body-centered and unaffectionate, to person-centered and affectionate. They note that America has four sexual standards that should be kept in mind when studying premarital intercourse, which regulate both types of coitus. These are 1) Abstinence, the formal, traditional standard; 2) The Double Standard, which considers females to be generally less interested in sex, especially when the

sexual activity is not with someone they love; 3) Permissive standard without affection, which requires only physical attraction; and lastly, 4) Permissive standard with affection, which requires stable, affectionate relations as a prerequisite to coitus. Reiss and Miller (1979) define the term autonomy in their theory to mean self-rule. They utilize this term as a central concept around which their theory revolves. The general theory in essence states that the greater the autonomy in making sexual decisions, the higher will be sexual permissiveness. The concept of premarital sexual permissiveness refers to the degree of acceptance of various levels of physical intimacy in premarital heterosexual relationships (Reiss, 1964). It is noteworthy that this degree of acceptance is an attitude, not necessarily a behavior, although it has been shown that behavior closely follows attitude throughout attitude research. According to Reiss and Miller (1979) further testing of these propositions should include a determination of the effects of different types of dating, and a look at the quality versus the quantity of dating.

Since it is attitudes that Reiss and Miller are discussing in their theory, and attitudes that are usually being measured, at least in part, when relationships are investigated, it may be beneficial at this time to discuss two attitudinal theories that may be partially responsible for individual responses of satisfaction. Festinger's (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance should be considered when examining an individual's responses concerning relationships.

The theory states that if an individual is induced to engage in behavior that is inconsistent with his beliefs or attitudes, he will experience the discomfort of "cognitive dissonance" which will motivate him to seek a resolution of that inconsistency. One way he can do this is to convince himself that he actually holds the beliefs or attitudes implied by his behavior. Bem and Allen's (1974) self-perception theory predicts that attitudes should follow behavior. The origins of an individual's self-knowledge predicts that one might also infer his own internal states by observing his own overt behavior. Both Festinger's and Bem's theories should be kept in mind when dealing with expressions of satisfaction.

Review Of Relevant Research

Research in the area of premarital sexual intercourse has mainly focused on whether a person has engaged in it or not. Further explorations of the topic are not as common, and most often when an investigation did consider more, it was but one or two aspects of the premarital relationship. Numerous literature searches did not reveal any relevant research for several aspects. These too, were considered and are included in the present study, which was exploratory in nature both for this reason and because of the newness of conceptualizing PMS as a complex setting of variables in different types of relationships.

Quantity Of Premarital Relationships

Number of Relationships

The number of relationships a person had that included sexual intercourse before marriage might in some way contribute to the effect the sexual intercourse has on marriage. Bell and Balter (1973) reported that in their sample of married women in the early 1970's, 50% had premarital intercourse with one partner, 36% with two to five partners, and 13% with six or more partners. The average number of different partners for their sample was 3.3, with the range being from one to one hundred partners. Mellan and Nedoma (1970) in their study of 293 young married couples in Czechoslovakia found forty percent of men and sixty percent of women shared premarital sex with only their present partner. They do not specify the exact number of partners for the other 60% of the men and 40% of the women.

In examining the issue of number, as early as 1938, Terman concluded that PMS did not necessarily have a negative effect. He reported that the mean happiness score of each spouse was highest, and strange to say, about equal for the category "none other" and "six others or more". The means for the intervening categories were reliably lower for each spouse. His data suggested that the wife who had had premarital intercourse with numerous men may also be a better than average risk for marital happiness, but he reminded the

reader that the number of wives in this category of his sample was too small to afford a reliable basis for generalizing. He offered as an explanation for this phenomenon the theory that wives in the category "six others or more" were probably women of exceptional attractiveness and of more than average sex drive, qualities which would enable a woman to get the man she wanted and to hold him, thus insuring the happiness of both. In looking at his male sample, Terman (1938) continued along this same line by claiming that the man who before marriage has been extremely promiscuous is as good a marriage risk as the man who has been only moderately so.

Mellan and Nedoma (1970) contradict Terman's results by concluding from their study that intensive collecting of premarital experience did not have any positive effect on later marital satisfaction. Traditional opinion about marital stability of men who led overactive sexual lives when single could not be confirmed by them. They explained that there appeared to be a marked tendency to introduce previous style of life into marital relations.

Markowski et al. (1978) suggested that it seemed plausible that a greater variety of sexual experience, whatever its cause, might have some effect on the marital relationship. For example, if sex becomes less satisfying in a marriage and the relationship cannot be as easily dissolved as a dating or living together relationship, the former sexually experienced person may be more likely to find new sexual partners, engage in extramarital affairs, swinging, or

group sex experiences. In fact, Athanasiou and Sarkin (1974) found that a measure of number of premarital partners showed positive associations with 1) rating one's marriage as less happy than average 2) the number of extramarital partners and 3) the intention to participate in mate-swapping activities. In a study of never married college students in 1978, Bukstel et. al found a positive correlation between past and current premarital sexual behavior and projected extramarital sexual behavior. The reported number of premarital sexual intercourse partners and the perception of greater premarital sexual involvement relative to others of the same age were the variables most highly related to projected extramarital sexual behavior. Bukstel et. al reported that the number of premarital sexual partners was more strongly related to projected extramarital sexual behavior than any other variable. The results then suggest that individuals who seek a variety of premarital sexual partners are more likely to project that they will seek a variety of sexual partners after marriage.

It seems then that any positive correlation found with number of premarital partners and marriage was with a small sample and many years ago. The finding of a negative correlation between the number of partners in PMS and later marital satisfaction and marital fidelity seems to be the prevalent one for the time being. No relationship with marital sexual satisfaction was found in the literature.

Quality Of Sexual Relationships Premaritally

Length of time relationships lasted

A review of the literature did not reveal any research that specifically examined the length of time that premarital relationships (that included sexual intercourse) lasted. However, research in the past examined the length of premarital acquaintance and length of engagement when the relationship with future spouse was that investigated. Terman (1938) found that these factors were sufficiently correlated with the happiness score to be included in his prediction scales.

The measure of stability of the relationship (how many times the couple had sexual relations with each other after the first time) may be related to how long the relationship lasts. This variable was investigated for the relationship with one's first intercourse partner by Athanasiou and Sarkin (1974). They found this stability measure to be negatively related to marital happiness, the number of extramarital partners, and the intention to participate in mate swapping activities. It seems then, that the length of premarital sexual relationships and their effect on marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and marital fidelity has not been explored.

Type of relationship - exclusivity, and live-in or dating

Another aspect of relationships one has prior to marriage that include sexual intercourse, is whether a person is involved in more than one of these relationships at any given time. Also, whether this was a dating situation or a live-in situation may be important. For individuals living together, it has been found that they describe their relationship as exclusive and non-promiscuous, as over 90% of both sexes reported no dating outside the relationship (Croake et.al, 1974). There is no similar data available for dating couples. Exclusivity itself is not related to its effect on marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and marital fidelity in the current literature.

On the issue of whether living together has a more positive relationship than dating on marriage, Danzinger (1975) in a study of fifty living together couples concluded that living together provided a period of mutual socialization prior to marriage that is not in any way comparable to the traditional custom of "courtship". He claimed that it is easier to reconcile initial romantic expectations in this arrangement. In conclusion, Danzinger believed that the chances for a stable, permanent wedlock are enormously increased in people who had been in living together situations. Blaine (1975) claimed the issue is difficult to assess, because according to him, there have been no valid surveys made. However, based on twenty years experience as a college psychiatrist, he concluded that

living together before marriage usually has a salutary effect upon a marriage and increases the chances of long-term success. Lee (1975) suggested that living together contributes additional insights and reinforcement of affection and respect and can uncover intolerable problems. Peterman (1975) believed that what is learned in a living together situation may be a prerequisite to good mate selection and a smooth marital adjustment. We cannot demand a high level of heterosexual competence in the marital relationship, according to him, and yet deny access to such interpersonal artistry by holding on to inadequate modes of socialization. He continued that marriage should be the place where we orchestrate all that has been learned in earlier heterosexual experiences. At present, he concluded, it is often where we are first introduced to some of the basic fundamentals.

To summarize the issue of the benefit of living together relationships, on the basis of scanty research and mainly opinion of authors, it seems that being involved in a living together relationship is a positive experience for an individual to marriage. Caution is advocated however, because this may very well be speaking only of those relationships that later evolved into marriage.

Premarital Sexual Satisfaction

The aspect of the reaction and/or feelings an individual has about the sexual involvement of a relationship before

marriage has been queried by several authors. Christensen and Gregg (1970) have suggested that the consequences of premarital sex acts are to some extent relative to the alignment or misalignment of values and behavior, being most negative where the disjuncture is the greatest. The negative accompaniment of premarital coitus, according to them, appears to be greatest where the sex norms are restrictive, and where value-behavior discrepancy is the greatest. So, therefore an individual may feel guilty because of their premarital sex behavior either because they feel society looks down on it, or because having PMS is in conflict with their own values.

In light of greater acceptance of PMS behavior this may not be that prevalent today. Burgess and Wallin (1953) in their study of engaged couples, asked people to indicate their reactions associated with their sexual relationship. The data is presented in percentages here in table form, but please note that some subjects chose more than one response so the totals add up to more than 100% .

<u>Feeling</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
1. Feel I am doing right because		
a. Get relief from physical tension	60.8	44.9
b. Going to be married	33.8	27.5
c. Our private affair	21.6	20.3
d. Frequent among engaged couples	4.5	4.4
e. For other reasons	20.3	18.8
2. Fear social disapproval	23.0	21.7
3. Fear pregnancy	20.3	26.1
4. Feel a sense of guilt	4.1	15.9
5. Other reactions	12.2	14.5

As noted above, even before 1953, less than a quarter of the respondents who indulged in sexual intercourse before marriage feared social disapproval, and only a small percentage of males, and a seventh of the females felt a sense of guilt about it. Perhaps this does not play such a large role as has been previously thought. One must keep in mind however, that this data was for engaged couples.

D'Augelli and Cross (1975) found that sex guilt was significantly negatively related to the amount of sexual experience in their subjects. Less guilt was associated with increasing liberality of sexual philosophy. Ehrmann (1954) found that women experienced less guilt about their sexual activity when they regarded the relationship as important. Contrary to this, he found that men seemed to experience more guilt the more the relationship meant to them. It appears then, that in that era, if sex guilt was present, it operated in different ways for men and women, and that it related to the type of relationship involved.

There are individuals who, when asked, said they had no regrets, or were actually glad they had premarital sex. Kinsey in his 1953 study of females found two-thirds of his non-virginal females to have no regrets about their premarital sexual behavior. In his 1948 study of men Kinsey reported that a very high proportion of those having premarital intercourse did not regret having such experience, nor did they feel the premarital intercourse had caused any trouble in their subsequent marital adjustments.

There is also an interaction between reaction to

premarital sexual relationships and number of premarital partners. Athanasiou and Sarkin (1974) reported that for people who were somewhat glad or very glad about having had premarital sex, it was possible to predict that their marriage would be rated as less happy the greater the number of premarital partners. However, if the respondents were regretful of their premarital sex, the relationship between the number of partners and marital happiness was near zero. It seems that it is the interaction between how a person feels about his premarital sexual relationship, and the actual number of such relationships that has an affect on later marital happiness.

The related issue of satisfaction with the sexual aspect of the relationship, and what effect it may later have, has most often been approached by equating achievement of orgasm with satisfaction. Terman (1938), Burgess and Wallin (1953), and Kanin and Howard (1953) have shown that the orgasmic capacity of a woman is positively related to her premarital sexual experience. Kinsey (1953) took this one step further to show this is true particularly for a woman's experience with premarital orgasm. Bell and Bell (1972) compared the percent of women who had orgasm experience in both premarital and marital coitus.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF PREMARITAL TO MARITAL COITUS TO ORGASM

Marital Coitus to Orgasm

	<u>All or most of the time</u>	<u>Sometimes and once in a while</u>	<u>Never or don't know</u>
Premarital			
Coitus to			
Orgasm			
All the time	77%	21%	2%
Most of the time and sometimes	69%	28%	3%
Never	44%	36%	20%

It seems that although for some women a gain is made after marriage by the "never" group, they do not quite seem to catch up to the advantage the other groups have.

Even though sexual satisfaction has often been measured in terms of frequency of intercourse or orgasm, Perlman and Abramson (1982) report that this relationship to sexual satisfaction is weak or non-existent. They investigated nine variables as potential correlates of sexual satisfaction, among them previous sexual experience. They found the single most important correlate of sexual satisfaction was the person's evaluation of how pleasurable the sex was. In a study by Wallin and Clark (1964), enjoyment ratings by the wives and their frequency of orgasm are substantially

correlated, but further analysis of the data revealed that there are women who infrequently have orgasm who rate their enjoyment high, and some who usually have orgasm and rate their enjoyment low. This is justification for regarding the enjoyment ratings as superior to orgasm frequency.

Terman (1938) remarked that it seems almost incredible that intercourse could be almost as frequent in the most unhappily mated couples as in the most happily mated, but such seems to be the case. He concluded that in the former group, sexual intercourse is to only a slight extent an expression of the sentiment of love or affection. He continued that it also bears little relation to the number of sexual complaints, since spouses with many complaints nevertheless have intercourse only a little less frequently than those with fewer complaints. Terman summarized that the really important factor in the individual marriage is not absolute frequency of sex, but the relationship between what is actually occurring, and the preferred activity. Therefore, in evaluating the sexual satisfaction in premarital relationships, one should look for not orgasm or frequency rates, but the person's enjoyment ratings and their preferred activity. The literature does not address the issue of sexual satisfaction in premarital relationships as related to the marital relationship in this way.

Premarital Relationship Satisfaction

The aspect of the amount of satisfaction with the

relationship, exclusive of the sexual aspect, has been examined most often, if at all, in terms of living together relationships. There seems to be no research in this area for dating relationships. Peterman et. al (1974) found that cohabitators rated the quality of their relationships significantly higher than non-cohabitators. It must be noted that quality of relationship may not be exactly the same as satisfaction with a relationship. Quality is a comparative concept that suggests a constant condition, whereas satisfaction is subjective, and since it is based on a person's evaluation of their relationship, may change over time. Whereas Peterman et. al found a difference between cohabitators and noncohabitators in quality of their relationship, Lyness et. al (1972) found no difference between a group of cohabitators and noncohabitators in their level of involvement in the relationship or in levels of trust and happiness. Although cohabiting males reported greater satisfaction than females with the sexual aspect of the relationship in Lyness's et. al study, that this was secondary to other variables in importance, such as need, respect, involvement, and trust is worth noting. It seems that no one has yet related premarital relationship satisfaction with marriage. Comparisons have been made then of living together and dating couples for the quality of their relationships and level of involvement, trust, and happiness. However, none of the research goes one step further to address the issue of what relationship the amount of satisfaction one has with the interpersonal aspect of

his/her premarital relationships has with marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and marital fidelity.

Gender

The aspect of whether it is a male or female experiencing the sexual relationship premaritally has most often been investigated to the extent of assuming the double standard and exploring feminine regret. This has been discussed in previous sections. Hunt (1969) reported on aspects of sexual behavior from prior to marriage to during marriage. He found that men have more premarital affairs and more partners, begin extramarital sex earlier than women, have more extramarital affairs, and are more interested in mate swapping, group sex and communal marriages than women. Mellan and Nedoma (1970) also found a marked difference between men and women. In their study, men admitted greater sexual activity, had higher tendency to change sexual partners, and were more liberal about having intercourse without previous acquaintance.

Other studies have focused on marital adjustment and different adjustment by gender. Renne (1970) in her study of 2480 couples in a survey of general health in Alameda County California, found a significant difference with wives (23%) more likely than husbands (18%) to be dissatisfied with their marriage. Kimmel and Van Der Veen (1974) suggested from

their factor analysis study of couples with the Locke Marital Adjustment Scale, that sexual congeniality is an important component of marital adjustment, but that it may be a more circumscribed aspect of the marital relationship for wives than for husbands. Degree of marital happiness is more highly loaded on the sexual congeniality factor for husbands. Taken together, these findings implied that marital satisfaction may be more related to sexual congeniality for husbands and to agreement and compatibility for wives. It seems then, that gender discriminates between the components that contribute to marital satisfaction.

The Problem

It seemed then that premarital sexual intercourse itself had been investigated as to its incidence, and in many reports the effect of its mere presence or absence in a person's premarital sexual history had been correlated with marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, or even marital fidelity. Yet, much of this research was dated and may not have told the whole story by today's standards. The problem then, was not to merely report the occurrence or lack of occurrence of the single behavior, since the occurrence of PMS is so prevalent and more accepted today. The problem was to investigate the variables that are present in the premarital sexual relationship in order to determine the effects of these variables on various aspects of the marital relationship.

It seemed that although some of these aspects had been previously examined, they had not all been investigated together. The goal then, was to investigate many aspects of a premarital sexual relationship to determine what effect if any, they might have on the dependent variables of marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage. To get a fuller evaluation of the marriage, all three of these aspects of the marital relationship were chosen. It was recognized that even though they each may contribute to the others in their own unique way, satisfaction in one area does not necessarily equal it in another. Athanasiou et. al (1970) found that some respondents rated their marriages as "happy" or even "very happy", and still their enjoyment of sex was below average. Expanding on this notion, it seems feasible that an individual could also be satisfied with the sexual aspect of his marriage, but still participate in extramarital sexual activity.

The independent variables to be explored included premarital sexual satisfaction, number of premarital sexual intercourse partners, length of time premarital sexual intercourse relationships lasted, exclusivity of the premarital sexual intercourse relationship, number of premarital sexual intercourse partners lived with, relationship satisfaction premaritally, and gender differences. In light of Reiss and Miller's theory (1974;1979) previously discussed that viewed sexual relations as varying on a continuum from body-centered and

unaffectionate, to person-centered and affectionate, as well as their conceptualization of The Double Standard that considers females to be less interested in sex unless they were in love, it was decided that the independent variables should be investigated across three levels or types of premarital sexual intercourse relationships in order to get an clearer delineation of the effects of PMS. It was also considered that recall of details and impressions of these premarital relationships might have been easier for subjects, and more accurate if conceptualized in types rather than asking subjects to pool all their premarital experience together in order to provide a single response representing the sum of their experience. These types of premarital sexual intercourse relationships investigated were In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection in order to extend over the continuum suggested by Reiss and Miller.

Since the present study was basically exploratory in nature, correlations were determined.

Hypothesis

The more sexual satisfaction an individual had with his/her premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s) by type(s) of relationship(s) - In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection, the higher the level of marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage.

Exploratory Questions

1. What was the relationship between the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?
2. What was the relationship between the length of time a premarital sexual intercourse relationship lasted by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?
3. What was the relationship between whether a premarital sexual intercourse relationship was exclusive by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?
4. What was the relationship between the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners with whom an individual lived by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?
5. What was the relationship between relationship satisfaction premaritally by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?
6. What role did sex (gender) play in relation to marital

satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?

Chapter II

METHOD

Subjects

Subjects were 286 volunteers who were among 3,021 persons approached at Long Island MacArthur Airport during December 1984, and January and February 1985, between 6 am and 8 am and 4 pm and 7 pm (rush hour for the airport). Of the 3,021 persons who were approached 1,000 fit the qualifications of the study. These were that subjects must be no more than forty years of age at that time and currently in their first marriage. Of the 1,000 who accepted the questionnaire, 122 completed it and returned it in person, and 256 returned it by mail. Of those returned, 43 (11.33%) only circled a number for their response for questions 37-41, rather than writing one for each applicable category, and therefore these questionnaires could not be included in the analysis. Also, 47 (12.79%) had other numerous and varied omissions or errors that caused them to also be deleted from the analysis. Of the remaining 481 analyzable questionnaires, 289 subjects had zero, remarkable, normal, intensive, or extensive (with which the independent variable was concerned) and 7 had none. However, these six groups were compared for similarities and differences on the dependent variables.

Subjects provided biographical information on age, sex (gender), race, occupation, family annual gross income,

whether or not religious and which religion, number of years married, age married, number of children and their ages, and education level. Each will be discussed in order, with more detailed information regarding subjects of both the group of 209 and the group of 77 available in the appendices. This information was utilized for descriptive purposes only. While it was not considered to be within the scope of this study to analyze this information with the exception of sex (gender), it may be reserved for use in future investigation.

Age, Sex, and Race

Subjects in the group with premarital intercourse (N=209) ranged in age from 21 to just turned 41 with a mean of 33.29, included more males (N=153) than females (N=56), and were predominantly white. The group without premarital intercourse (N=77) ranged in age from 17 to just turned 41 with a mean of 34.42, also included more males (N=50) than females, (N=27), and was predominantly white. (See Appendix A)

Occupation

Warner's Scale of Occupational Status (1960) was used to rate the subjects. (See Appendix B) All nine categories were represented in the premarital intercourse group with 85.2% falling within the first three categories of professional, managerial, and clerical. Only seven

categories were represented in the group with no premarital intercourse yet 80.6% fell into the same categories of professional, managerial, or clerical as the premarital intercourse group. (See Appendix C)

Income

Family annual gross income for the group with premarital intercourse ranged from \$10,000 to \$184,999 with a mean income of \$56,000 and a median income of \$49,500. The range for the group with no premarital experience began much lower, as one person indicated gross family income of \$4,999 or less. The range for this group also ended at a lower income level (\$130,000 to \$139,999) with a mean of \$50,250 and a median income of \$47,250. (See Appendix D)

Religiousness and Which Religion

In both groups, the majority of subjects said that they were religious. Eight people in the group with premarital intercourse and one person in the group with no premarital intercourse did not respond to this question. All three major religions (Protestant, Catholic, Jewish) were represented in both groups. Of those people in both groups who said that they were religious, approximately 50% indicated that they were Catholic. Other religions were present in small numbers as well. Some people in each group did not consider themselves any particular religion. It

should be noted that all but one of these were the same people who identified themselves as not being religious.

(See Appendix E)

Age Married and Length of Marriage

The age at which subjects married ranged from 16-37 with a mean age of 24 in the sample with premarital intercourse. The sample with no premarital intercourse married at ages ranging from 16-28 with a mean age of 21.58. Those responding to the survey were married anywhere from less than one year to twenty-two years in both samples. The mean for the sample with premarital intercourse was 9.18 years, and 12.68 years for the sample without premarital intercourse. For the sample with premarital intercourse, the largest percentage for any one year was 11.5% for those married one year or less. In the sample with no premarital intercourse, those married one year or less comprised only 2.6% of the total. (See Appendix F)

Number of Children

Fifty-five persons, over one quarter of the respondents (26.3%), in the premarital intercourse group did not have any children. A smaller percentage (16.9%) in the group with no premarital intercourse had no children. The number of children ranged from 1 to 7 with a mean of 1.47 children for the group with premarital intercourse, and 1 to 4 with a mean

of 1.83 children in the no premarital intercourse group.

(See Appendix G)

Number of Children by Age

Among those who did have children, age categories ranged from under five to over twenty-one. No one in either group had more than three children in any age range. (See Appendix H)

Educational Level

Both samples for the most part were highly educated ones. The mean educational category reported in both samples was "bachelor's degree". In the group with premarital intercourse, the lowest level attained was high school graduate, and ranged to those with Ph.D.'s, M.D.'s, J.D.'s, etc. In the group with no premarital intercourse, while the upper end of the range was identical to the premarital intercourse group, people at the lower end indicated the category of "only some high school". (See Appendix I)

Geographical Information

Since the study was anonymous, no indication of what part of the country a person lived in was part of the questionnaire. However, subjects had the option of submitting their name and address if they desired to be

informed of the study results once they became available. One hundred and fifteen such requests were received, either in person, submitted through the mail separately, or enclosed when the questionnaire was returned by mail. The addresses of the respondents encompass fourteen of the fifty United States. Other respondents mentioned to the examiner during the screening process that they were from outside the United States, for example Canada and Great Britain. Although this group is not to be perceived as a representative sample from each of the aforementioned regions, it was thought to be more representative than a sample from a single region, or a college population. (See Appendix J)

Materials

A form which described the study and served to imply informed consent was distributed to persons who fit study characteristics. The lower portion of the form provided space for names and addresses of those persons interested in receiving study results. (See Appendix K)

A questionnaire packet was given to those giving their consent after reading the informational form. This packet consisted of a biographical sheet, Marital Satisfaction Scale, marital sexual satisfaction index, marital fidelity question, premarital intercourse indicator question, age at first intercourse question, a page of questions regarding premarital relationships for several areas including sexual satisfaction, a page of questions regarding premarital

(intercourse) relationship satisfaction, and a last page with space for write in responses regarding the relationship of both pre- and extramarital sexual experience to marriage, as well as space to comment on the questionnaire or topic in general.

Biographical Cover Sheet

Biographical data collected consisted of subject age at last birthday, sex of the individual, race, occupation, family gross income, whether the individual considered himself/herself a religious person and if so which religion, the number of years an individual was married, the age at which he/she married, the number of children as well as the number in age groups, and the highest level of education attained. (See Appendix L) Again, no analysis were performed using this data with the exception of sex (gender).

Dependent Variables

Dependent variables in the study were marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage (as assessed by number of extramarital contacts).

1. Marital Satisfaction Scale

The Marital Satisfaction Scale (MSS-Form C) by Roach, Frazier, and Bowden (1981) was used as a measure of overall

marital relationship satisfaction in this study. It is a short, twenty-four item scale of statements with which the individual indicates agreement or disagreement. Responses range from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Roach et. al (1981) define marital satisfaction as an attitude of greater or lesser favorability toward one's own marital relationship at a given point in time. This view recognizes that the attitude one has toward his or her own marriage, like any perception, is subject to change over time. This view is that which was also taken in this study, and is in distinct contrast to that employed in previous measures of marital satisfaction which have actually dealt with marital adjustment or success, or have attempted to determine the quality of the dyadic relationship.

It should be emphasized that none of the items from which the marital satisfaction scores are derived refer to sexual gratification or to any aspect of the sexual relationship. (See Appendix M)

The MSS-Form C was first named the Marital Satisfaction Inventory (MSI), and was designed for use in evaluating the effectiveness of marital interventions. Frazier (1976) studied the basic characteristics of the MSI. He found that all items were significantly correlated with the total score at or beyond the .01 level of confidence. Chronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency similar to KR20, was +.969. Concurrent validity, based on correlation with scores on the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (Locke & Wallace, 1959) was +.78. A sub-sample responded a second time to the MSI

and to the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (Crowne and Marlowe, 1964). The correlation coefficient for the test reliability was $+0.76$. The correlation between MSI scores and Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale scores was $+0.33$. This result was not significant and suggests a low degree of contamination of the MSI with social desirability. Frazier also found no sex bias. Bowden (1977) studied the validity of the MSI using a satisfied group of 15 couples and a dissatisfied group of 15 couples in marital therapy. The mean for the satisfied group was significantly different from the mean for the dissatisfied group. To measure discriminant validity, Bowden also correlated MSI scores for this sample with scores on the Marriage Problem Checklist (MPC), an instrument designed to identify marital problems (Roach, 1977). The correlation coefficient for the MSI and MPC scores was -0.73 , indicating that satisfied couples reported significantly fewer problems than dissatisfied couples. Revision of the original inventory was undertaken with the result being the MSS-Form C. Scoring is achieved via a five point Likert-type scale, with a mean of 100.08 and a standard deviation of 16.36 for a sample of 463 subjects. Chronbach's alpha, a measure of internal consistency, was $+0.956$. Validity and test-retest reliability is currently under study, but must be presumed, according to Roach, from evidence pertaining to the parent instrument, the MSI.

2. Marital Sexual Satisfaction Index

Questions formulated by the author assessed an individual's sexual satisfaction with his/her marriage. The questions addressed many variables of a sexual relationship without asking specifically for descriptions of the sexual acts practiced or their frequencies. Questions were asked in terms of the individual's preferences regarding frequency of sexual activity, length of time typical sexual interaction lasted, and type of activity, and also asked for an evaluation of the extent the spouse was considerate of an individual's needs and desires, as well as a global estimate of sexual satisfaction. The goal then, was to address the enjoyment rating of the subject. Response choices, like the MSS, were in a Likert scale format and ranged from 1-5. (See Appendix N)

3. Marital Fidelity

One question comprised the fidelity indicator which asked "How many times have you had sexual relations with someone other than your spouse since your marriage?" The response choices were "none", "once or twice", "three to ten times", "eleven to twenty times", and "more than twenty times". The question was designed to assess the frequency of this behavior and did not attend to the number of extramarital partners per se nor the context in which the extramarital sex took place. (See Appendix O)

Independent Variables

Independent variables for the study were number of premarital sexual intercourse relationships, typical length of time these relationships lasted, number of premarital live-in sexual partners, exclusivity of typical premarital sexual intercourse relationship, sexual satisfaction in the typical premarital relationship, relationship satisfaction with the typical premarital relationship, and gender. Three types of premarital sexual intercourse relationships were examined. These were In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection type of relationships, all mutually exclusive. Variables were evaluated for each type of relationship indicated.

Premarital Sexual Intercourse Relationship Questions

All 286 subjects responded to the question "Did you have sexual intercourse before your marriage?" (See Appendix O) If they answered "no", which 77 did, they were instructed not to answer the remaining questions with the exception of the last page of the questionnaire. If they answered "yes", which 209 did, they then answered the question "At what age did you first have sexual intercourse?" (See Appendix O)

The next page of the questionnaire addressed premarital sexual intercourse relationships, and was answered by the premarital intercourse group. Responses were given according to the type of relationship which were classified as "in

love", "with strong affection", and "with little affection". Subjects were asked to provide answers for each question for the typical or average relationship for each type of premarital sexual intercourse relationship above. Questions included the number of different sexual intercourse relationship partners, the period of time in years, months, or days the average sexual relationship lasted, the number of live-in relationships, whether an individual dated others while involved in the average relationship, and the questions from the marital sexual satisfaction index to be applied to premarital relationships indicating sexual satisfaction in each type of relationship. (See Appendix T)

The following page consisted of questions that compose the Marital Satisfaction Scale, this time to be applied to premarital relationships (that included sexual intercourse) to indicate relationship satisfaction with the typical or average relationship for each type of relationship indicated above. (See Appendix Q)

The final page of the questionnaire invited subjective evaluations in the form of openended questions. The questions were "What effect, if any, do you feel your premarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage?" as well as "What effect, if any, do you feel your extramarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage? Would you please share some of the reasons why you did (or did not) have extramarital sexual liasons?" The final part of the questionnaire was "Please share any other comments or feelings you may have about the

questionnaire, or any of the topics included in it at this time." (See Appendix R)

Procedure

The manager of Long Island MacArthur airport was contacted, and permission was received to conduct the survey and distribute questionnaires at any time the airport was open to the public. The survey took place in the public lobby area, as well as the area in which passengers await their flight departures (the "Screening Area"). Access to these areas was possible as the management alerted security personnel that the experimenter was permitted to pass freely throughout the airport, and a temporary airport ID badge was issued. After flight schedules were received and reviewed, it was decided to concentrate subject screening and distribution of questionnaires during the airport's busiest times, those being "rush hours" of 6 am to 8 am, and 4 pm to 8 pm Monday through Friday. Data collection took place during the months of December 1984, and January and February 1985.

The experimenter dressed in appropriate professional attire, wore a Hofstra University picture ID badge, and the airport ID badge. A clipboard was carried with the survey sheet of initial screening questions, and a few questionnaires tucked into a side pocket. Persons who appeared to be within the age range (and did not appear to be

husband and wife) were approached. Screening of potential subjects utilized a form including the year of birth, gender, marital status, whether previously married, questionnaire number (if one was distributed), and indicator of how a questionnaire was returned.

There was also a space on the form to indicate the day and date, time, and location of subject screening, as well as page number of the form. (See Appendix S). The experimenter said "Hello, I'm from Hofstra University, and I'm here at the airport doing research for my doctoral dissertation. You can help me out by telling me what year you were born." If the person complied and the age was within the appropriate range, it was also noted on the form if they were a male or female and then they were asked "Are you single or married?" If they responded "married", they were asked if it was a first marriage for them. If it was a first marriage, potential subjects were given the informational sheet to read while the examiner waited for them to finish. While waiting the experimenter readied the questionnaire, and if the person said "O.K." or in some other manner indicated that he/she had read the form and was willing to go further, a questionnaire was provided. When it was presented, subjects were cautioned not to be overwhelmed by the apparent length as some questions might not apply to them. Attention was also drawn to the stamped, preaddressed envelope that was stapled to the back of the packet, and they were assured that if they did not have the time to complete it on site that returning it by mail was just as acceptable. Pencils were provided to those

who did not have a writing implement with them. If they asked, subjects were assured that there would be no follow up of the study. However, if they should wish to learn of the results, it was possible to either return the lower portion of the informational sheet to the experimenter in person, or they could enclose it with their questionnaire when they returned it as these would be separated immediately upon receipt.

As previously noted, 3,021 persons were officially screened. Many others were not because they obviously did not fit subject characteristics, most notably age. Of these 3,021 persons, at least 1,000 fit the subject characteristics at the time of the screening, and accepted the questionnaire. Additionally, some others fit subject characteristics, but declined to participate either at the informational sheet stage or upon receiving the questionnaire.

As questionnaires were received, they were separated into those subjects with and without premarital sexual intercourse experience. Any requests for results received were immediately separated from the questionnaire and were kept together for future reference when the results became available.

Chapter III

RESULTS

The problem investigated was to determine what effects variables that are present in premarital sexual intercourse relationships have on marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage. It was hypothesized that the more satisfaction an individual had with the type(s) of his/her premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s), the higher the level of marital satisfaction, and marital sexual satisfaction, and the higher the likelihood of fidelity on the individual's part in marriage. Exploratory questions regarding the relationship between six other independent variables to marital relationship and sexual satisfaction, as well as fidelity were posed. These variables were: number of relationships, typical length relationships lasted, number of live-in partners, exclusivity of typical relationships, sexual satisfaction with the typical relationship, overall satisfaction with the typical relationship, and sex (gender). Three types of premarital intercourse relationships were examined. These were: those in which people considered themselves (1) to be In Love (IL); (2) to feel Strong Affection (SA) for that partner; (3) to feel only Little Affection (LA) for that partner. It should be noted that since it was types of relationships that were being investigated, it was possible for the same subject to have

more than one category of relationship. For example, a person may have had both In Love and Strong Affection premarital intercourse relationships. Other combinations of relationship types were also reported. (See Table 1) While the total premarital sexual intercourse relationship sample was 209, there were 179 reports of In Love relationships, 141 reports of Strong Affection relationships, and 125 reports of Little Affection relationships. Age at first intercourse ranged from 12-28 with a mean age of 17.9. There was a second group of subjects (N=77) with no premarital intercourse experience.

Although it was originally intended to analyze results using canonical correlation and multiple regression as well as interactions between the independent variables, this proved to be statistically unworkable due to different group sizes and the overlap between persons in types of relationship categories. The size of the groups with only one type of partner was too small to consider statistically. Tests of significance of the means of both independent and dependent variables also could not be performed for the same reasons. A t-test was undertaken to determine if there were differences in marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, or fidelity between the group with premarital experience (N=209) and the group with none (N=77). Measures of central tendency were also obtained for the variables. For the group with premarital sexual intercourse relationships, results were also analyzed by pearson correlation. Since variance (as opposed to the more

Table 1

Combinations of Types of Premarital Relationships Reported
(for N=209)

	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
In Love only	46	22.0
Strong Affection only	10	5.0
Little Affection only	9	4.0
In Love and Strong Affection	27	13.0
In Love and Little Affection	13	6.0
Strong Affection and Little Affection	11	5.0
In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection	93	44.0

frequently referred to level of significance, p) is not sensitive to sample size, due to the large size of the sample under study (209), the variance was selected as a more accurate appraisal of importance of independent variables. Additionally, variance offers the benefit of a more stringent criterion in an attempt to avoid Type I error. According to Cohen and Cohen (1983), percentage of variance accounted for is classified in categories considered to be small (one percent), medium (nine percent), and large (twenty-five percent). For this study a minimum criterion for the correlation coefficient of $\pm .16$ was used to assess practical significance, since this falls between small and medium, accounting for approximately three or more percent of the variance. Independent variables were considered to be "overall" important, if two or more correlation coefficients were at or above the accepted level ($\pm .16$) within relationship types (In Love, Strong Affection, Little Affection - down the vertical axis of the Pearson Correlation tables). The type of relationship category itself (In Love, Strong Affection, Little Affection) was considered to be "across" important (i.e. "across" types) for each of the independent variables (with the exception of sex (gender) which the three types of premarital relationships would not apply to), if correlation coefficients were at or above the accepted level ($\pm .16$) for two or more of the dependent variables (marital satisfaction-MSSTOT, marital sexual satisfaction-MSSSTOT, or fidelity in marriage-NOEMAFF, across the horizontal axis).

Premarital Sexual Satisfaction

The means for sexual satisfaction with the average or typical premarital sexual intercourse relationship were 17.44 with a range of 10-21 for the In Love category, 16.08 with a range of 7-21 for the Strong Affection category, and 14.42, with a range of 5-21 for the Little Affection category. Scores could possibly range from five to twenty-one (least to most satisfied). (See Appendix T)

It was hypothesized that the more satisfied a person was with the sexual aspect of his/her type(s) of premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s), the higher the level of his/her marital relationship satisfaction. (See Table 2) Looking at the effect of premarital sexual satisfaction for all types of relationships, there was no "overall" relationship to marital satisfaction (MSSTOT). However, looking at "across" types of premarital relationships, for those people who had In Love (IL) relationships, the higher their sexual satisfaction with those relationships, the higher their marital relationship satisfaction ($N=179, r=.17, p=.02$). For the other two types of premarital relationships, Strong Affection (SA) and Little Affection (LA), no significant relationships were found to marital relationship satisfaction.

It was also proposed that the more satisfied a person was with the sexual aspect of his/her type(s) of premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s), the higher his/her marital sexual satisfaction (MSSSTCT). (See Table 2) This

Table 2

Premarital Sexual Satisfaction with Marital Satisfaction,
Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage

Pearson
Correlations

	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Premarital Sexual Satisfaction			
In Love	.17*	.23*	-.05
(N=179)	p=.02	p=.002	p=.54
Strong Affection	.06	.08	.08
(N=141)	p=.47	p=.36	p=.33
Little Affection	.05	.03	.08
(N=125)	p=.59	p=.75	p=.37

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

* r = or > $\pm .16$

hypothesis was also not supported. That is, no "overall" relationship was found for all types of premarital relationships with MSSSTOT. However, as previously found for marital satisfaction, those people who reported premarital sexual satisfaction for their In Love relationships also reported higher marital sexual satisfaction ($N=179, r=.23, p=.002$). No relationship was found between Strong Affection or Little Affection premarital sexual satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction.

While it was hypothesized that higher satisfaction with the sexual aspect of type(s) of premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s) would increase the likelihood of fidelity (NOEMAFF) on the individual's part in marriage, no relationship was found either for all types of premarital relationships "overall", nor "across" any individual type of premarital relationship. (See Table 2)

In conclusion, the hypothesis that the more sexual satisfaction a person had with their premarital intercourse relationships, the higher the level of marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage, for the most part was not confirmed. A positive relationship was found for marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction for the group that reported being sexually satisfied with their premarital In Love relationships.

Number Of Partners

The means for number of premarital sexual intercourse partners were for the In Love category 1.82 (range 1-10), the Strong Affection category 3.62 (range 1-20), and the Little Affection category 7.82 (range 1-200). (See Appendix T) Thirty-six people reported only one premarital intercourse partner prior to marriage, of which 33 were in the In Love category, 3 were in the Strong Affection category, and none were in the Little Affection category. (See Table 3)

In seeking the answer to Question 1, "What is the relationship between the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners by type of relationship to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?", the group of individuals who had premarital sexual intercourse relationships was compared to those that did not. (See Table 4) A significant effect was found for only one of the three dependent variables through t-test comparison. Those people who reported having premarital sexual intercourse relationships (N=209) reported having significantly more extramarital sexual intercourse ($t=3.42, p=.001, d.f.=284$) than the group that had no premarital sexual intercourse relationships (N=77).

When examining the number of extramarital sexual intercourse contacts, data were available for both groups. For the group with no premarital intercourse, only twelve subjects reported having had extramarital sexual intercourse contacts. In the group with premarital intercourse,

Table 3

Subjects Reporting Only One Sexual Intercourse Partner
by
Type of Relationship

	N	%
In Love Relationship Only	33	16.0
Strong Affection Relationship Only	3	1.0
<hr/>		
Total	36 [*]	17.0

Note: Total reflects number of subjects from the premarital intercourse sample (N=209), who had only one partner. No one reported only one relationship of the Little Affection type.

* This includes 16 females (29% of females) and 17 males (11% of males) in the In Love category and 3 males (2% of males) in the Strong Affection category.

Table 4

Comparison of Premarital Intercourse
and No Premarital Intercourse Samples
on the Dependent Variables

Variable Name**	Mean	t value	p
MSSTOT			
Group 1	98.40	-.80	.425
Group 2	100.43		
MSSSTOT			
Group 1	16.44	-.58	.566
Group 2	16.70		
NOEMAFF			
Group 1	1.83	3.42	.001*
Group 2	1.27		

two-tailed test, df= 284

* p<.001

Group 1 (N= 209) Had premarital intercourse

Group 2 (N= 77) No premarital intercourse

** Variable names

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

seventy-four had extramarital sexual intercourse contacts. (See Table 5) Of the twelve who had no premarital intercourse but had extramarital sexual intercourse contacts, only one person (8%) had more than twenty. In the group with premarital intercourse experience, a higher percentage (N=22, 30%) reported more than twenty extramarital sexual intercourse contacts.

When looking only at those people who reported having premarital sexual intercourse, no important relationships were found "overall" or "across" the types, of number of partners with either marital satisfaction or marital sexual satisfaction. (See Table 6) However, there was an "overall" relationship between number of premarital sexual intercourse partners and number of extramarital sexual intercourse contacts. The more In Love number of partners (N=179, $r=.23$, $p=.002$) and/or Strong Affection number of partners (N=141, $r=.21$, $p=.01$) premaritally the greater number of extramarital sexual intercourse contacts. No relationship was found for Little Affection number of partners for this variable.

In summary, the only consistent relationship found between the number of sexual intercourse partners premaritally was with the number of extramarital sexual contacts (i.e. fidelity). For both the In Love and Strong Affection groups, the greater the number of premarital partners, the greater the number of extramarital sexual contacts. This was not found for the Little Affection group.

Table 5

Number of Extramarital Sexual Contacts

	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse *	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
No extramarital intercourse	135	64.6	64	83.1
Extramarital intercourse	74	35.4	12	15.6

* One subject (1.2%) did not answer this question

Table 6

Number of Premarital Sexual Intercourse Partners
 With Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction,
 and Fidelity in Marriage

	Pearson Correlations		
	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Number of Partners			
In Love	.07	-.04	.23*
(N=179)	<u>p</u> =.34	<u>p</u> =.62	<u>p</u> =.002
Strong Affection	-.02	-.15	.21*
(N=141)	<u>p</u> =.85	<u>p</u> =.08	<u>p</u> =.01
Little Affection	.01	-.02	.03
(N=125)	<u>p</u> =.96	<u>p</u> =.80	<u>p</u> =.75

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

* $r = \text{or} > \pm .16$

Length Of Premarital Relationship

The mean length of a premarital sexual intercourse relationship (in days) for the In Love category was 841.20 with a range of 30-3650, for the Strong Affection category 250.51 with a range of 5-1095, and for the Little Affection category 52.78 with a range of 1-730. (See Appendix T)

When investigating Question 2, "What is the relationship between the length of time a premarital sexual intercourse relationship lasted by type of relationship to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?" (See Table 7), no relationship was found "overall" or "across" types of premarital relationships with either marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, or fidelity. However, when examining fidelity more closely, the longer the typical In Love relationship lasted, the fewer the number of extramarital sexual contacts reported ($N=179, r=-.16, p=.04$).

In conclusion, for all types of premarital relationships, no "overall" relationship was found with any of the dependent variables, nor was any found across Strong Affection or Little Affection. For only one type (In Love), did the length of the premarital relationship have a significant relationship with one dependent variable (fidelity).

Table 7

Length of Premarital Intercourse Relationship With
Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction,
and Fidelity in Marriage

Length of Relationship	Pearson Correlations		
	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
In Love (N=179)	-.10 p=.20	-.02 p=.84	-.16* p=.04
Strong Affection (N=141)	.08 p=.37	-.01 p=.89	-.05 p=.54
Little Affection (N=125)	.03 p=.74	-.04 p=.67	-.12 p=.20

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

* $r = \text{or} > \pm .16$

Dating Others

When examining Question 3, "What is the relationship between whether a premarital sexual intercourse relationship is exclusive by type of relationship to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?", no significant relationships were found. (See Table 8)

Number Lived With

When the means were examined for the number of live-in premarital sexual relationships, in each case the mean was less than one. The In Love category mean was .44 as 63 subjects (36%) had one to three live-in relationships. The Strong Affection category mean was .12, with 13 persons (9%) who reported one to two. No one in the sample indicated live-in relationships with someone whom they had only Little Affection. (See Appendix T)

When studying Question 4, "What is the relationship between the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners with whom an individual lived by type of relationship, to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?", individuals who reported more relationships in which they lived with someone with whom they were in an In Love relationship, indicated higher marital satisfaction ($N=179, r=.17, p=.03$). (See Table 9) No significant relationship was found for Strong Affection. Again, it should be noted that no individuals reported living

Table 8

Exclusivity of Premarital Intercourse Relationship
 With Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction,
 and Fidelity in Marriage

	Pearson Correlations		
	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Exclusivity			
In Love	-.04	.11	-.05
(N= 179)	<u>p</u> =.63	<u>p</u> =.13	<u>p</u> =.47
Strong Affection	-.10	-.07	-.12
(N= 141)	<u>p</u> =.22	<u>p</u> =.42	<u>p</u> =.17
Little Affection	-.12	-.12	-.15
(N= 125)	<u>p</u> =.19	<u>p</u> =.18	<u>p</u> =.10

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

Table 9

Number of Premarital live-in partners With
Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction,
and Fidelity in Marriage

	Pearson Correlations		
	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Number lived with			
In Love	.17*	.15	-.19*
(N=179)	p=.03	p=.04	p=.01
Strong Affection	-.12	-.14	.11
(N=141)	p=.14	p=.09	p=.19

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.

Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

* r= or > \pm .16

No subjects reported living with someone in a Little Affection relationship.

with someone in a Little Affection relationship. Therefore, no "overall" conclusion could be drawn according to the previously stated criterion of two or more correlation coefficients of $\pm .16$ or greater for number lived with. No significant relationships were found for marital sexual satisfaction on this variable. "Across" types of premarital live-in relationships, only In Love had a relationship with number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e. fidelity. The more In Love live-in relationships an individual reported, the fewer extramarital sexual contacts ($N=179, r=-.19, p=.01$).

In conclusion, the effect of live-in relationships seemed to depend on the type of relationship. For the In Love category only, the greater number of live-in situations, the higher the marital satisfaction, and the fewer the number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e. the higher the likelihood of fidelity in marriage.

Premarital Relationship Satisfaction

The means for premarital relationship (that included sexual intercourse) satisfaction were, for the In Love category 91.96 with a range of 38-120, for the Strong Affection category 58.82 with a range of 30-84, and for the Little Affection category 78.10 with a range of 45-118. Possible range of scores was twenty-four (lowest satisfaction) to one hundred and twenty (highest satisfaction). (See Appendix T)

When investigating Question 5, "What is the

relationship between relationship satisfaction premaritally by type of relationship to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?", no "overall" importance was noted. Again, an "overall" relationship was considered to be important if two or more correlation coefficients were at or above the accepted level ($\pm .16$) within relationship types (In Love, Strong Affection, Little Affection - down the vertical axis of the Pearson Correlation tables). When examining premarital relationships across types, In Love premarital relationship satisfaction revealed an important tendency. The more satisfied people were with their In Love premarital relationships the more satisfied they were with their marriage ($N=179, r=.21, p=.005$) and the more sexually satisfied they were in their marriage ($N=179, r=.25, p=.001$). The more satisfied a person was with his/her Strong Affection relationships, the greater the number of extramarital sexual contacts reported or lower the likelihood of fidelity. ($N=141, r=.18, p=.03$).

In conclusion, relationship satisfaction premaritally appears to be related to higher marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction for those people who report higher satisfaction with their premarital In Love relationships only. Higher Strong Affection relationship satisfaction was related to a greater number of extramarital sexual contacts or lower likelihood of fidelity. (See Table 10)

Table 10

Premarital Sexual Intercourse Relationship Satisfaction
With Marital Satisfaction, Marital Sexual Satisfaction,
and Fidelity in Marriage

	Pearson Correlations		
	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Premarital Relationship Satisfaction			
In Love	.21*	.25*	-.08
(N=179)	p=.005	p=.001	p=.28
Strong Affection	.06	.01	.18*
(N=141)	p=.49	p=.93	p=.03
Little Affection	-.08	-.10	.08
(N=125)	p=.39	p=.26	p=.36

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NCEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note: all tests are two-tailed

* $r = \text{or} > \pm .16$

Sex (gender)

There were more men (N=153) than women (N=56) in the sample. (See Appendix A)

Finally, when considering Question 6, "What role does sex (gender) of the individual play in relation to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage?", no significant relationship was found for marital satisfaction or marital sexual satisfaction. When sex (gender) was related to the number of extramarital sexual contacts (i.e. fidelity), men were more likely to have reported extramarital sexual contacts (N=282, $r=-.19$, $p=.001$) than women. (See Table 11)

Summary

Of the hypothesis and the six questions posed, three were important to marital satisfaction, all involving only In Love relationships. These were Premarital Sexual Satisfaction, Premarital Relationship Satisfaction, and the number of live-in premarital partners. The higher these three were, the higher the marital satisfaction. For marital sexual satisfaction, only two variables were found to be significantly related, also only for In Love premarital relationships. These were, once again, Premarital Sexual Satisfaction and Premarital Relationship Satisfaction.

A greater number of variables within the premarital intercourse relationship were related to fidelity (i.e. the

Table 11

Sex (gender) With Marital Relationship Satisfaction,
Marital Sexual Satisfaction, and Fidelity in Marriage

Pearson
Correlations

	MSSTOT	MSSSTOT	NOEMAFF
Sex(gender)	.02	.12	-.19*
(N=282)	p=.68	p=.04	p=.001

MSSTOT= Marital Satisfaction Scale Total Score

MSSSTOT= Marital Sexual Satisfaction Total Score

NOEMAFF= Number of extramarital sexual contacts i.e.
Fidelity

Note:all tests are two-tailed

* r = or > \pm .16

Coded: 1=male, 2=female

number of extramarital sexual intercourse contacts). These applied not only to In Love premarital relationships, but also Strong Affection relationships. These independent variables were number of partners, length of relationship, number lived with, Premarital Relationship Satisfaction, and sex (gender). Examining the number of partners resulted in a significant effect of having no partners as opposed to at least one premarital intercourse partner. Subjects with no premarital intercourse partners had increased likelihood of fidelity. When investigating further the relationship between the various types of premarital intercourse relationships, both the more In Love and Strong Affection intercourse partners premaritally, the more extramarital sexual intercourse contacts or the lower the likelihood of fidelity in marriage. Also related to lower likelihood of fidelity was higher Strong Affection Premarital Relationship Satisfaction. Finally, men also had a lower likelihood of fidelity. Increased likelihood of fidelity was related to longer length of the relationship and higher number of live-in partners, both only for In Love relationships.

The strongest relationship was for the In Love category. An "overall" importance for the hypothesis involving premarital sexual satisfaction was found to marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction, but only for In Love relationships. This was not confirmed for fidelity.

Openended Questions

In answer to the openended questions (See Appendix R) people wrote many comments, with only twenty-one response forms left blank for these questions. Responses were lengthy, and frequently both sides of a page were written on. Many varied comments were offered to the first of these questions, "What effect, if any, do you feel your premarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage?" From the group with no premarital sexual intercourse experience (N=77), the most common answer (N=15) was that the lack of premarital experience had no effect. The next most popular response (N=10) was that they felt the lack of experience improved their subsequent marriages, because they grew together sexually. Other comments (N=3) offered included that without premarital experience there were no jealousies, no comparisons. Another frequent response (N=5) suggests curiosity of what sexual intercourse with someone other than their spouse would be like, "Sometimes I feel as though I've missed out on the 'life in the fast lane'". Interestingly, very few people (N=2) suggested religion prevented them from engaging in premarital sex. Ten people from the no premarital sex sample did not offer any comments.

For those people who had some premarital sexual intercourse experience (N=209), at least one quarter of the sample reported little to no effect on their subsequent marriage. The next most frequent comment (N=24) for this

group was that in general it had a positive effect on their marriages. Those individuals that elaborated on this further, noted that it helped them to better know what they wanted in a marital partner (N=17), "the princess has to kiss a lot of frogs before she can find the prince." It should also be considered that as one individual put it "I realize that I looked for different things in boyfriends and husbands. I wanted my boyfriends to be entertaining and outgoing and funloving. But, I wanted my husband to be stable and predictable." Many others (N=11) felt they "got it out of my system" prior to marriage and further commented that the need for extramarital sexual contact was lessened. Others expressed that it gave them confidence (N=7), more experience (N=9), and in general made them better lovers (N=9).

In general, there were fewer negative evaluations of having premarital sexual intercourse. The most common response (N=7) was that they expected more sexual interaction in marriage based on their premarital experience. Others (N=7) expressed guilt feelings, especially if their spouse believed that they were virgins prior to marriage. Still others (N=2) did not think they had enough experience or that their partners had had enough. Also, even when people listed several reasons why their premarital experience had a positive effect, they made summary comments that indicated otherwise, such as "I grew up (sexually) at a time when people did a lot of crazy things. I had one night stands, but don't regret it. I just wish I felt then (at 16 or 17) how I feel now, but now I am mature. I never contracted any

diseases and I used the Pill so I was smarter than most", or as one man put it, "The fact of premarital relationships doesn't make them O.K. Sex and love are still for the marriage commitment. Unfortunately I realized this too late. Only marriage and a full commitment to each other makes the relationship worthwhile. So also does communication!" Eleven people from the premarital sex sample gave no comments.

In response to the question "What effect, if any, do you feel your extramarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage? Would you please share some of the reasons why you did (or did not) have extramarital sexual liaisons?" Some (N=7) in the group with no premarital experience who did not have extramarital sexual contacts offered that they were satisfied with what they had, or gave moral reasons (N=7). As one woman put it "sex is like good black earth - great in the garden, but just plain dirt anywhere else". Commitment was also frequently (N=8) offered as a reason, as was trust (N=2), respect (N=3), "didn't want to hurt my spouse" (N=2), or "didn't want to ruin my marriage" (N=3). Again, religion was only offered as a reason for two of the responses.

The group with no premarital experience who had extramarital sexual contacts were few and gave responses such as to compensate for the lack of premarital sex (N=2). Other single responses ranged from "I was drunk", "I was stupid", "Out of spite because my wife had an affair", or "I couldn't get what I wanted at home".

The group with premarital sexual intercourse experience, who did not have extramarital contacts, expressed most frequently (N=17) that they had no need or no desire for any as one man put it "why have hamburger when there is steak at home?" The next most common response (N=11) was that the individual did not want to "hurt my partner". Another comment frequently offered (N=9) was "marriage is based on mutual trust" or in general a commitment to marriage. A few others (N=3) responded that they did not engage in extramarital sexual activities because they had no time to, or that it would complicate their life too much.

For this group with premarital experience who reported some extramarital sexual contacts, many (N=14) commented that they did not feel it had affected their marriage. Others (N=4) explained that they had this experience because they had higher sex drives than their partners, or because they were dissatisfied (N=2) with their partners, or bored (N=5), and that this activity seemed to have enabled them to cope and remain in the marriage. Some (N=5) reported that this experience strengthened their marriage, at times enabling them to better appreciate their spouses as one man explained "I now realize that life without my wife and daughter would not be full or pleasant." A few individuals (N=4) offered that they felt this type of behavior was normal, with one offering no further explanation than "Variety is the spice of life and no single situation will satisfy all needs for all times. The risk in most instances was worth it." One individual offered this insight, "The male ego, for some

reason, doesn't allow some of these people to openly admit monogamy is their preferred choice of emotional relationship." Some (N=2) reported that they did it because of curiosity or lack of premarital experience (N=2). Very few (N=2) believed that they were in love with the extramarital partner. Other individuals (N=8) expressed regret or sorrow, or felt guilty afterwards. Some excuses offered (rather than explanations) were "I was away from home" (N=8), "It was not planned" (N=6), "I was drunk" (N=2), or "I was just curious" (N=1).

In answer to the final request of "Please share any other comments or feelings you may have about the questionnaire, or any of the topics included in it at this time" comments ranged from, it was difficult to recall exactly after many years, or that it was not something they had given much thought to previously, or that they had not shared these thoughts with anyone before. Several offered other aspects of marriage they felt should be further considered. Others found the response choices of Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Strongly Agree too confining or confusing on relationship satisfaction questions. Still others noted that it was difficult to blend all relationships into the "average" relationship for each type of category in order to respond to questions. In general, most subjects expressed that they found the questionnaire interesting, enjoyed completing it, and hoped that it would help someone.

Chapter IV

DISCUSSION

The problem investigated was to determine what effects variables that were present in premarital sexual intercourse relationships had on marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage. Two samples were used, one with premarital intercourse experience (N=209), and one without (N=77). The sample with premarital intercourse was divided into types of premarital relationships (In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection).

The major hypothesis, that the more satisfaction that an individual had with his/her premarital sexual intercourse relationships, the higher the level of marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and higher the likelihood of fidelity in marriage, was not confirmed "overall". Again, "overall" importance was noted if two or more correlation coefficients were at or above the accepted level.

"Overall" types finding

When interpreting the results of the statistical analysis of the other questions posed regarding the six additional independent variables, only one showed an "overall" importance. This was the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners.

Bell and Balter (1973) indicated that the average number of premarital sexual intercourse partners (for their sample)

was 3.3 with a range of 1-100. In the present study, the mean number of partners for the In Love category was 1.82, for the Strong Affection category 3.62, and 7.82 for the Little Affection category. The range for the entire sample was from 1-200. While Bell and Balter examined total number of premarital intercourse partners irrespective of categories considered in the present study, a comparison with the data for the present study revealed that those premarital relationships involving a greater amount of affection averaged less partners, and those relationships with less affection averaged more partners than Bell and Balter's mean. It should be noted that the mean number of partners in the Strong Affection category was most similar to their mean number of partners.

Rationale for investigating this question stemmed from the common belief regarding the number of premarital intercourse partners. That is, having a number of such partners serves to decrease the likelihood of extramarital partners because the individual has "gotten it out of his/her system". Mellan and Nedoma (1970) only discussed this in reference to men, yet could not confirm this belief. In light of Terman's (1938) findings that the mean happiness score of each spouse was equally highest for both no premarital intercourse partners and six or more partners, and that his study was conducted long ago with a small sample, it seemed important to investigate this question regardless of gender, for a larger sample who had been of dating age since the 1960's at the onset of the sexual revolution. Although

prevalent literature indicated a negative correlation between the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners and marital satisfaction and fidelity (Athanasidou and Sarkin, 1974; Bukstel et. al, 1978; Mellan and Nedoma, 1970), no data has been found for the relationship between number of partners and marital sexual satisfaction. An additional factor studied in the present research dealt with differing types of relationships (In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection). This appears to be a new approach to the issue of number of premarital sexual partners and may have a differential relationship to marriage, since it was possible that the type of premarital sexual partners one had might relate differently to marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity.

It was found in this study that number of partners was negatively related to fidelity for both the In Love and the Strong Affection types of premarital relationships. Significant Pearson correlation results suggested that the more partners of both types an individual had prior to marriage, the more partners they had extramaritally (i.e. lower fidelity). Supporting this finding was the t-test comparison between the group with premarital intercourse and the group without this experience. Athanasidou and Sarkin (1974) further support this with their finding that respondents who report extensive premarital sexual experience report extensive extramarital activities. One possible explanation for this conclusion is that once a person has had many different partners and thus a wide variety of

experiences, it is difficult to settle for just one person. Perhaps the comment, "variety is the spice of life" some people offered who responded to the openended questions adds validation to this explanation. Another possibility is that perhaps as people become dissatisfied at some point with their marital partner, they may reminisce of their past partners, and either seek them out, or pursue new partners in an attempt to recapture the good feelings. Peele and Brodsky's (1975) interpretation of addiction theory to sex and love relationships may apply here. They assert that a sexual or love relationship is perfectly suited for the addictive purpose since it is both reassuring and consuming, and must also be patterned, predictable, and isolated. According to them, someone who is dissatisfied with himself or his situation can discover in such a relationship the most encompassing substitute for self-contentment and the effort required to attain it. They continue, that when a person goes to another with the aim of filling a void in himself, the relationship quickly becomes the center of his or her life. It offers him a solace that contrasts sharply with what he finds everywhere else, so he returns to it more and more, until he needs it to get through each day of his otherwise stressful and unpleasant existence. When a constant exposure to something is necessary in order to make life bearable, an addiction has been brought about, however romantic the trappings. The ever-present danger of withdrawal creates an ever-present craving. Markowski et. al (1978) suggest that it seems plausible that a greater variety

of sexual experience may have some relationship to marriage. They explain, for example, if sex becomes less satisfying in a marriage and the relationship cannot be as easily dissolved as a dating relationship, the former sexually experienced person may be more likely to find new sexual partners, and engage in extramarital affairs.

While no positive relationships were found for number of premarital sexual intercourse partners on any of the three dependent variables, no negative correlations were found with marital satisfaction as found in the prior studies cited previously. In addition, no relationships between number of partners and marital sexual satisfaction were found. Previous findings were confirmed for fidelity and a difference between types of premarital relationships was found.

"Across" types findings

Trends for three variables were found "across" types of premarital relationships. These were premarital relationship satisfaction, premarital sexual satisfaction, and number of live-in premarital sexual intercourse partners all for the In Love type only.

Review of the literature revealed no studies that related premarital relationship satisfaction to marriage. The absence of research in this area provided the rationale for exploring questions regarding the effects of premarital relationship satisfaction on marital satisfaction, marital

sexual satisfaction, and fidelity. The results from this exploratory study would hopefully provide the basis for future research with this variable.

As mentioned in the introduction, measures of orgasm capacity and frequency of intercourse have been used to measure sexual satisfaction. As also previously noted, these are not adequate measures of sexual satisfaction. Instead, the factors that contributed to both the Marital and Premarital Sexual Satisfaction Indexes were suggested by others (Terman, 1933; Perlman and Abramson, 1982) as being a more accurate reflection of sexual satisfaction. It was hypothesized that a positive relationship would also be found between this method of evaluating premarital sexual satisfaction and the dependent variables.

For the third variable, number of live-in premarital sexual intercourse partners, on the basis of one study (Danzinger, 1975) and the opinions of several others (Blaine, 1975; Peterman, 1975; Lee, 1975) it was expected that a positive relationship would be found with marriage. It was considered possible that the type of premarital sexual intercourse relationship (In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection) would relate differently to marriage. Those offering opinions above commented only on general relationships to marriage and did not seem to consider relationships to premarital live-in situations other than those probably leading to marriage. Additionally, it is probable that marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity may relate differently and simply

looking at marriage as a whole does not identify where the important relationships to live-in status may be.

In the present study, In Love premarital relationship satisfaction and sexual satisfaction were both positively related to marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction. In this case, the higher premarital relationship and sexual satisfaction with the In Love type, the higher both marital relationship and marital sexual satisfaction. This is in the hypothesized direction regarding premarital sexual satisfaction. It is interesting to note that both relationship and sexual satisfaction premaritally applied to each - marital relationship satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction. Perhaps a person's general feelings about a relationship play a significant role in contributing to his/her perception of the sexual aspect as well. This could also be reversed, in that the degree of satisfaction with sex in a relationship influences an individual's interpretation of his/her general satisfaction with the relationship. Udry (1968 as cited in Victor, 1980) claimed that sexual dissatisfaction in marriage is more likely to reduce a husband's level of overall marital satisfaction than that of a wife. On the other hand according to him, a wife's sexual responsiveness is much more dependent upon her overall marital satisfaction than is that of a husband. This distinction, Udry maintains, is a consequence of the different meanings which men and women attribute to sex and marriage. While Udry's comments deal with gender differences, his gender distinction illustrates

possible ways in which marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction overlap.

The third variable that was significantly related "across" type of relationship, was the number of In Love partners a person lived with premaritally. This variable was positively related to marital satisfaction, yet negatively related to the number of extramarital contacts, i.e. fidelity. In other words, the more partners a person lived with while in an In Love relationship before marriage, the higher his/her marital satisfaction and the lower the number of extramarital contacts (or the higher the likelihood of fidelity). The higher number of live-in partners In Love increased the likelihood of fidelity. It should be noted that no subject reported more than three live-in partners.

It is plausible that live-in situations provide an opportunity for partners to get to know one another well, perhaps better than one could in a dating relationship. This interpretation is consistent with Danzinger's (1975) conclusion that live-in and dating relationships provide different experiences. Realities of day to day living, such as the definition of who was responsible for what household chores, decisions about expenditures, and in general a wider variety of examples of behavior may enable people to make a better informed decision of a mate in the future. Peterman (1975) supports this, as he explained what is learned in a living together situation may be a prerequisite to good mate selection and a smoother marital adjustment. It is also feasible that if people marry someone they had lived with

prior to marriage, fewer adjustments might be necessary within the marriage, which may contribute to the finding of higher marital satisfaction. In addition to getting to know what one desires in a partner, a benefit of experiencing the cooperative nature of relationships can lead to a better understanding of marriage itself and an easier adjustment.

Perhaps the relationship between higher number of In Love live-in partners and higher likelihood of fidelity might evolve from the fact that most of these premarital relationships may have been monogamous. This suggestion is in agreement with Croake et. al (1974) who found that over 90% of those living together prior to marriage reported these relationships to be monogamous. If so, this early acceptance of a commitment to one person may then carry over with less difficulty to marriage.

In Love Relationships

Even though only one "overall" trend towards importance was found, many significant relationships were found for In Love type of premarital relationships. In fact, of the ten significant relationships found, eight of them were for In Love relationships. Higher In Love premarital sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction as well as the greater number of In Love partners lived with premaritally, resulted in higher marital satisfaction. Also, the higher the In Love sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction premaritally, the higher the marital sexual satisfaction. The greater number of premarital In Love partners, the fewer

number of premarital live-in In Love partners, and the shorter the length of the In Love relationship premaritally, the lower the likelihood of fidelity or the higher the number of extramarital contacts. Since the last three of these independent variables were related to fidelity, they will be discussed in more detail later.

One possible reason that so many significant relationships were found for the In Love type of premarital relationship may have been that the subject married one of the people represented in his/her In Love category. If this were the case, answers to both marital and premarital questions would have been for the same partner. The actual data on this question was not sought in this study, although a few persons had noted in the openended comment section that they had indeed married their premarital partner. However, upon closer inspection, in this study only thirty-six (17%) of those with premarital intercourse relationships (N=209) had only one partner. Of these thirty-six, thirty-three were within an In Love relationship (13% of the In Love reports). This represents 11% of the men (N=17), and 29% of the women (N=16). This percentage for women is much smaller than reported by Hunt (1974), who found in his study among 18 to 24 year olds who were already married in 1972, that one half of single women in their 20's had premarital intercourse with only one partner, usually their prospective husband. Bell and Balter (1973) reported the same percentage (50%) for married women irrespective of age. Therefore, while it had seemed plausible that subjects had married their only

premarital intercourse partner, this appears unlikely given the low number of people who had only one premarital intercourse partner in the present study. The possibility still exists however, that subjects may have had only one In Love partner (and may have perhaps married that person), yet also had premarital partners in either or both of the other two types of relationships.

A second possible explanation for the number of findings related to the In Love type of relationship, involves an individual's definition of what constitutes love resulting in an overinclusion of relationships in this category. Perhaps a person first became involved in a premarital sexual intercourse relationship and then defined that relationship as love. This could be explained in terms of cognitive dissonance theory (Festinger, 1957). If an individual is induced to engage in behavior that is inconsistent with his/her beliefs or attitudes, he/she will experience the discomfort of "cognitive dissonance" which will motivate him/her to seek a resolution of that inconsistency. One way he/she can do this is to convince himself/herself that he/she is in love. Kleinman's (1978) evaluation that many young women today are caught in a double bind of pressures supports this explanation. According to him, women think all their female friends are sexually experienced, yet they worry about their reputation and about transgressing moral standards. They resolve the dilemma by seeking first intercourse in a love relationship. Then they define themselves as a loving person and the emphasis shifts from sex to love. Therefore,

it seemed plausible that some subjects included in this study may have overestimated the number of relationships In Love. Upon further inspection of the data though, the average number of In Love premarital sexual intercourse relationships reported was only 1.82. This low number would seem to suggest that overestimation was not prevalent.

A third possibility for the number of significant In Love relationships found within this study as compared to the lack of findings for both Strong Affection and Little Affection premarital sexual relationships, is that only the In Love intercourse relationships a person had prior to marriage were important to later marriage. Tripp (1975) supported this contention with his conclusion that "early sexual experience by itself carries little weight. What counts is the context in which it occurs. Whenever sexual activity of any kind is merely casual, artificial, or is seen by the partners as a kind of play, it is not inclined to arouse much emotion. Without emotion neither a person's partner nor what they do together is likely to become imbued with much importance" (Tripp, 1975, p. 39).

Therefore, since it appears that it is the In Love intercourse relationship itself that is relevant, it becomes necessary to evaluate this type of relationship to determine what it is about in that makes it so important to marriage. It can be concluded from the results of the present study that the higher the number of In Love live-in premarital partners, and sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction with In Love premarital relationships, the

higher the marital satisfaction reported by subjects in this study. Also, the higher sexual and relationship satisfaction with In Love premarital relationships, the higher the marital sexual satisfaction. Therefore, if people are able to maintain In Love relationships, they are more likely to be able to transfer these things they have learned to their marriages. As Peterman (1975) suggests, marriage should be the place where we orchestrate all that has been learned in earlier heterosexual experiences. To the contrary, he believes, in many cases marriage is often where people are first introduced to some of the basic fundamentals of relationships. According to Erikson's (1963) psychosocial theory of development, an individual must first have passed the stages of development through identity versus role confusion and have resolved "crises" at each level before reaching the next stage - intimacy versus isolation (Stage Six). Once an individual has been involved in an intimate relationship and has been able to identify and understand the intimate feelings of another, then the person might be more capable of extending this capacity for intimacy to marriage.

Fidelity

A larger number of independent variables studied were related to the likelihood of fidelity than to either of the other two dependent variables. These premarital independent variables were: number of intercourse partners, relationship satisfaction, sex (gender), length of relationship, and

number of live-in intercourse partners.

The rationale for studying number of partners, relationship satisfaction, and the number of live-in partners, has been previously discussed in prior sections of this chapter.

The rationale for investigating sex (gender), is based on prior studies (Hunt, 1969; Mellan and Nedoma, 1970) that have found men are more likely to engage in extramarital affairs than women. Similar results were expected in the present study.

No prior research was found that specifically related length of premarital relationships that included intercourse, with the dependent variables. Since this was an exploratory question, no hypothesis were made.

In general, a higher amount of both In Love and Strong Affection number of partners, as well as higher Strong Affection relationship satisfaction, and male for the gender question, were related to a lower likelihood of fidelity (or a higher number of extramarital contacts). A higher likelihood of fidelity (lower number of extramarital contacts) was found with longer length of the In Love relationship, and the more In Love live-in partners.

As previously discussed under "Overall" type finding, the greater the number of premarital partners in In Love and Strong Affection premarital intercourse partners, the higher the number of extramarital sexual contacts (the lower the likelihood of fidelity). Therefore, the fewer the number of partners, the higher the likelihood of fidelity. As

mentioned above, Athansiou and Sarkin (1974) reported that married individuals who had extramarital involvement, remembered having had considerable premarital sexual experience. Again, as previously discussed, Peele and Brodsky's (1975) adaptation of addiction theory to sex and love relationships was utilized to explain this finding. Further elaboration of this result is derived from the openended comments of the group with no premarital sexual experience. Comments suggested that at least partially, a person's faithfulness was based on the fact he/she did not know what he/she was missing. Perhaps then, higher fidelity was based on the same values (i.e. morals, religion, commitment) that prevented them from engaging in premarital intercourse in the first place.

The second and final relationship found within Strong Affection types was with premarital relationship satisfaction. In this case, the higher the satisfaction with Strong Affection relationships, the higher the number of extramarital sexual contacts (or the lower the likelihood of fidelity). Perhaps a lesser degree of commitment to a premarital Strong Affection relationship, and/or lower expectations from that relationship may lead to greater numbers of sexual contacts with a partner other than one's spouse after marriage. It should be noted that the only two significant relationships for Strong Affection types of premarital relationships were with the fidelity dependent variable.

As suggested by some men in the openended comments, they

might have been more likely to have had extramarital sexual contacts because they were traveling more. (It should be kept in mind that this study was conducted at an airport). Men also may seek liaisons to boost their ego, as the male macho image is a positive one, as in the "Office Romeo". Simon and Gagnon (1969) claimed that it is difficult for lower-class males to receive homosocial (from male friends) validation from marital sexual activity (unless, of course, it culminates in conception). This is not the case for extramarital activity for which there is abundant homosocial validation. Perhaps his claim is not exclusive to lower class males, as the sample from this study was not predominately lower class. Gagnon et. al's (1970) conclusion that at lower levels of dating involvement, males who are committed less to the dating experience find that sexual success enhances their feelings of personal popularity, and that among females, sexual involvement does little for a sense of personal popularity, may apply also to extramarital sexual activity or the lack of it. Most probably, women in the business world want to be known for their business acumen, not "sleeping their way to the top". Men may have less inhibition to seeking these relationships through business than women. Lastly, women were likely to suggest in response to openended questions they were so busy that they had no time or energy for extramarital affairs.

Two other variables were related to fidelity, such that the longer the length of the In Love relationship, and the more live-in In Love partners, the fewer extramarital

contacts or the higher the likelihood of fidelity. Perhaps if an individual sustained a premarital In Love relationship for a longer period of time, it may partially be due to the degree of willingness of the person to compromise or look for solutions to difficulties rather than ending the relationship. The willingness to compromise and seek solutions to problems may be heightened when two people live together. This adaptability may transfer to marriage, in that the individual might not easily seek out other partners, but rather may work to solve marital difficulties. Again, effect of length of relationship and number of live-in partners may also have been influenced by the possibility of marriage to the partner described in that type of relationship. Finally, as previously discussed, the effect of living together in an In Love relationship on fidelity may possibly be influenced by the degree of commitment to one's partner in that type of relationship.

While no direct relationship was found between dating others and the dependent variables, it may prove interesting for future research to examine the interaction between exclusivity (dating others) and the number of live-in premarital partners.

Unexpected Findings

It was found that higher number of In Love intercourse partners prior to marriage was related to a lower likelihood of fidelity, but interestingly, increasing numbers of In Love

live-in partners had the opposite relationship. While this may seem contradictory at first, emphasis on the difference between these two categories, of whether or not the relationships were live-in, clarifies this. As discussed in previous sections, it may be the commitment involved in a live-in situation that results in a different relationship with fidelity as opposed to number of partners in a dating relationship.

This study has confirmed previous findings regarding the positive relationship between number of premarital sexual intercourse partners and increased extramarital sexual contacts (lower likelihood of fidelity) (Markowski, et. al 1978; Anthanasiou and Sarkin, 1974; Bukstel et. al, 1978). It is somewhat surprising however, that In Love relationships accounted for more of the variance and in fact that more of them were positively significantly related than Strong Affection and Little Affection to fidelity. Little Affection type of relationships had seemed more likely to have had a significant relationship with fidelity, where in fact this did not occur. Perhaps Tripp's (1975) conclusion that relationships without emotion have little long term lasting effects again explains this phenomenon. Markowski et. al (1978) offer the possibility that whatever the type of premarital experience, once the marriage is seen as less sexually satisfying, and not as easily dissolved as premarital relationships, an individual may seek extramarital sex. It might further be expected that this concept may also apply to marital relationship dissatisfaction, in that an

individual may seek out extramarital relationships, not necessarily for the sex, but for the interpersonal involvement. Some individuals volunteered in response to the openended questions that their extramarital contacts were within a love relationship, but this was not directly assessed for all subjects. Future studies might be directed toward a closer examination of this question.

It was also interesting that both premarital relationship and sexual satisfaction had significant relationships to both marital satisfaction and sexual satisfaction in marriage. Again, it seems that these two are not mutually exclusive even though on the questionnaire neither asked questions in the other's area. Some common overlap must exist within an individual's evaluations. Again, Udry's (1968) finding of an interrelationship of sexual and marital satisfaction that is somewhat different for wives and husbands needs to be considered further.

It was interesting that gender was not significantly related to either marital satisfaction or marital sexual satisfaction for the present study while different marital adjustment by gender has been found in previous studies. Renne (1970) found wives more likely to be dissatisfied with their marriage than husbands. Kimmel and Van Der Veen (1974) suggested that overall marital satisfaction may be more related to sexual congeniality for husbands and to agreement and compatibility for wives. Since, for the most part, this sample was highly educated and professional, the traditional role of women and men may not apply. Approximately

seventy-five percent of the women with premarital intercourse relationships classified themselves in an occupation other than housewife. Since these women are working outside of the home, they may have similar opportunities as men for extramarital involvement. At the same time, they also are likely to experience as much or more work related stress which may have an influence on their marriage. As many men commented in response to the openended questions, they may be beginning to interpret the marital relationship in a broader sense, with less emphasis on sex, and more on relationship satisfaction. These factors may have contributed to the lack of a gender difference in marital satisfaction and sexual satisfaction within marriage. It should be recalled that a gender difference did exist with regard to fidelity.

One would think that whether a person dated others (i.e. exclusivity) while involved in the typical premarital sexual intercourse relationship would have had an effect in the least on the number of extramarital contacts, conceiving of this question as it might pertain to commitment. If an individual will date others when involved in an In Love premarital sexual intercourse relationship, for example, this presupposes a lower level of commitment to a relationship. This lower relationship commitment might possibly carry over into marriage and increase the likelihood of extramarital sexual contacts. Also, the question may have been interpreted two ways, either for just dating someone, or dating someone within a sexual relationship. These differing interpretations may have had some effect on the results. It

should be remembered that since the data is retrospective, individuals may not have been able to accurately recall these relationships, perhaps because they were not very significant to them over time.

As earlier discussed, it was interesting that only two independent variables were significant in Strong Affection relationships, and these were with only the number of extramarital contacts (i.e. fidelity). Also, no significant results were found for Little Affection relationships. Again, the idea that individuals had different expectations for these relationships than they did for In Love may be applicable. The very difference between these emotions may make carryover implausible, as again, Tripp's (1975) conclusion that it is the context in which the sexual experience takes place that counts.

That marital relationship satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction were not different for the sample with premarital sexual intercourse experience and the sample without premarital intercourse experience was unexpected. It would have been predicted from numerous studies (Davis, 1929; Terman, 1938; Reevy, 1959; Shope and Broderick, 1967) that the absence of premarital intercourse relationships would be correlated with marital adjustment (i.e., marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and marital fidelity). A significant difference between the two samples was found only for marital fidelity. This difference was in the expected direction. That is, the group without premarital sexual intercourse experience had significantly

fewer extramarital sexual contacts. When considering the other two dependent variables (marital relationship satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction) and how they are affected by the premarital relationship period, similarities and differences between the two samples need to be considered. One difference that is inherent in the two samples is the presence or absence of sexual intercourse experience premaritally. However, it is equally as likely that the group with no premarital intercourse experience had the same three types of relationships (i.e. In Love, Strong Affection, and Little Affection) although they may not have involved intercourse. This does not preclude the presence of sexual activity up to but not including the act of sexual intercourse. Since all that was asked of subjects was a report of premarital relationships including sexual intercourse, this cannot be assessed. However, if this was the case, then there may be more similarities between the two samples than are readily apparent. The major difference between them then, did result in a significant finding.

Lack of confirmation of hypothesis "overall"

The hypothesis "the more sexual satisfaction an individual had with his/her premarital sexual intercourse relationship(s) by type(s) of relationship(s), the higher the level of marital satisfaction, marital sexual satisfaction, and fidelity in marriage" was not confirmed "overall". Once again, a tendency towards "overall" importance was noted if

two or more correlation coefficients were at or above the accepted level ($\pm .16$) within premarital relationship types (In Love, Strong Affection, Little Affection - down the vertical axis of the Pearson Correlation tables). While the hypothesis was not confirmed "overall", it was confirmed "across" the In Love type of relationship. Being sexually satisfied with premarital In Love relationships did lead to greater marital relationship satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction. It did not lead, however, to a greater likelihood of fidelity. No significance regarding the hypothesis was found for fidelity.

That In Love types of premarital relationship sexual satisfaction was related to marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction while neither Strong Affection or Little Affection relationships proved to be significant, may be due to differences in an individual's commitment and expectations, as previously noted. Tripp's (1975) conclusion regarding the context of the sexual intercourse experience may serve as a partial explanation for lack of "overall" confirmation. This view would indicate that it is the In Love sexual intercourse relationships that a person has prior to marriage that have the greatest effect on marital relationship and sexual satisfaction. If this is the case, then it is not surprising that the other types of sexual satisfaction were not significantly related to these two dependent variables.

As far as no significant relationships to fidelity for even the In Love type of relationship on sexual satisfaction,

factors aside from premarital sexual intercourse satisfaction are related to fidelity. These factors have been previously discussed in the section on fidelity. Peele and Brodsky's (1975) interpretation of addiction theory as applied to number of premarital sexual intercourse partners and the finding of this study that more premarital sexual intercourse partners was related to lower fidelity seem to be more important than the sexual satisfaction with these premarital intercourse relationships. The more likely people were to have a number of premarital sexual intercourse partners, the more likely they were to have extramarital contacts no matter whether the relationship was categorized as In Love or Strong Affection.

General Discussion of Problems and Suggestions for the Future

It should be re-emphasized that this study was exploratory and correlational in nature. Therefore, it is important that the reader not draw cause and effect conclusions based upon this study.

The sample under study may not have been representative of the population at large. Specifically, there were almost three times as many men as women. This means that results may be more applicable to males than to females. Also, since the data was collected at an airport, subjects might be different in education level and income than the general population. According to 1983 Census data, the median income for the United States was \$24,500, and the median years of

school completed was 12.6. Future research should seek a more representative sample to aid in generalizability of results.

It must be considered that 1,000 individuals accepted the questionnaire, yet only 378 were completed and returned. It should be noted that according to Kaats and Davis (1971), volunteers for survey investigations of sex attitudes are likely to hold more liberal views on sexual matters than are non-volunteers. Issues to consider as having an influence on the return rate include the length of the questionnaire, and the topic which could be considered of a personal nature.

Since information from a person's premarital history was retrospective, as Anthansiou and Sarkin (1974) state, it is not clear therefore whether the attitudes expressed by the respondents are indicative of their premarital behavior, postmarital recall of premarital behavior, or both. Other difficulties with the individual completion of questionnaires included the possibility of inaccurate recall or a general difficulty with estimating the average or typical response, as well as number of partners. It would be beneficial to conduct a longitudinal study to aid in accuracy of data. An additional consideration to aid accuracy should be to investigate relationships in another way than examining the "average" or "typical" one. It had been considered prior to data collection to gather information on each relationship individuals had, but this was thought to be too wieldy. In light of the mean number of partners reported by subjects in the present study, this may not have been as difficult as

anticipated.

In addition to the three categories of premarital relationships that were investigated, it is considered necessary to add a fourth category. That is, the one premarital relationship that resulted in marriage. This should be done as an attempt to clarify the relationship between the In Love category and the dependent variables. Further clarification also seems needed regarding the question of whether a person dated others while involved in a premarital intercourse relationship. As previously discussed, the question of dating others should be phrased to include sexual intercourse. Perhaps some relationship between dating others and the dependent variables would emerge if this were made clear. Interactions between the independent (premarital) and the dependent (marital) variables also need to be investigated as well as a consideration of the length of the premarital period and stage of marriage as they relate to the variables. Once again, it is important to note the overlap of subjects between premarital relationship types which made it impossible to look at interactions in this study. It may be interesting to investigate extramarital contacts in more detail as this may result in different relationships of fidelity with the independent variables. Some subjects seemed to feel the study was too sex oriented, and that other issues such as companionship, commitment, financial issues, and children should also be considered in a study on marriage.

Questions 37-41 (Appendix G), which comprised the premarital sexual satisfaction subsection, led to many errors as subjects fell back into the answer set from the previous presentation of these questions for marital sexual satisfaction, when they circled a response rather than providing an answer for each type of relationship. Similarly, subjects frequently gave only one response per question rather than for each type of relationship not only on questions 37-41, but also 42-65 (Appendix H), which comprised the premarital relationship subsection of the questionnaire.

As a result of this exploratory study, several hypotheses for future investigation may be posed. The present study investigated situational variables, yet it is acknowledged that personality variables may also play a role and should be included in the future. It is hypothesized that it is an interaction between both situational and personality variables that maximally relate to marriage. People may bring certain qualities to a situation, such as the ability to make a commitment or to be involved in intimate relationships. A second hypothesis involves the exploration of differences between the groups with and without premarital sexual intercourse relationships. As alluded to earlier, this hypothesized that these groups differ only in regard to the intercourse involved in their premarital relationships. It is probable that the no premarital intercourse group had the same three types of premarital relationships. In order to investigate this,

similar premarital data for both groups need to be gathered to further compare them. It was considered that a lack of significant findings for Strong Affection and Little Affection may have been due to the expectations a person had regarding those relationships. It is hypothesized that expectations for premarital relationship types differ along a continuum from Little Affection to In Love (i.e. lower expectations to higher expectations). Therefore, what goes into the evaluation process may result in high levels of satisfaction for differing types of relationships. If this is not considered findings may be thought to be unexpected, such as the positive relationship between Strong Affection relationship satisfaction and number of extramarital contacts. The finding of the higher the number of live-in In Love relationships the more marital satisfaction and higher fidelity may be misleading as most subjects had only one live-in partner and none had more than three. Therefore, the difference may be between having and not having had a live-in partner. The hypothesis of presence of live-in premarital sexual intercourse relationships leading to a positive relationship to marriage should clarify the issue. Based upon the number of premarital sexual intercourse partners that was positively related to the number of extramarital contacts, it is conceivable that if people date others (i.e. including sexual intercourse) while involved in another premarital sexual intercourse relationship, that they may also be more likely to engage in a greater number of extramarital sexual intercourse contacts.

Conclusions

There were no significant differences in marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction between the samples with and without premarital sexual intercourse relationships.

If an individual has premarital sexual intercourse relationships, what is important to marital satisfaction and marital sexual satisfaction is not the number of partners that an individual had prior to marriage, but the degree of satisfaction that an individual had with his/her premarital In Love relationships. The happier (more satisfied) a person was when involved in a premarital In Love relationship, the more likely he/she is to be happy (and sexually satisfied) in marriage. It may be concluded from the multitude of In Love significant relationship findings, that it seems to be the In Love type that is important to later satisfaction in marriage.

Increased likelihood of fidelity is related to fewer number of premarital sexual intercourse partners, longer In Love relationships, more live-in In Love premarital sexual intercourse relationships, and lower Strong Affection relationship satisfaction. Finally, it was also concluded that women were more likely to be faithful in marriage than men.

REFERENCES

- Ard, B.N. Premarital sexual experience: a longitudinal study. Journal of Sex Research, 1974, 10(1), 32-39.
- Athanasidou, R. & Sarkin, R. Premarital Sexual Behavior and Postmarital Adjustment. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 1974, 3(3), 207-225.
- Athanasidou, R., Shaver, P., and Tavris, C. Sex. Psychology Today, 1970, 4, July, 37-52.
- Bell, R. R. & Balter, S. Premarital sexual experiences of married women. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1973, 7(11), 111-123.
- Bell, R. R. & Bell, P. L. Sexual Satisfaction among married women. Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1972, 6(12), 136-144.
- Bem, D.J. & Allen, A. On predicting some of the people some of the time: the search for cross-situational consistencies in behavior. Psychological Review, 1974, 81(6), 506-520.
- Blaine, G. B. Does living together before marriage make for better marriage? Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1975, 9(1), 32-45.
- Bowden, S. R. An assessment of the validity of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 33, 4671A (University Microfilms No. 7732141,74)
- Bukstel, L. H., Roedeer, G. D., Kilmann, P. R., Laughlin, J., & Sotile, W. M. Premarital sexual behavior and projected extramarital sexual behavior in unmarried college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, May, 337-340.
- Burgess, E. W. & Wallin, P. Engagement and Marriage. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1953.
- Cannon, K. & Long, R. Premarital Sexual Behavior in the Sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33, 36-49.
- Christensen, H. T. Normative Theory Derived from Cross-Cultural Family Research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1969, 31, 209-222.
- Christensen, H. T. & Gregg, C. F. Changing sex norms in America and Scandinavia. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 616-627.

- Cohen, J. & Cohen, P. Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences. 2nd ed. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum, 1983.
- Croake, J. W., Keller, J. F., & Catlin, N. Unmarried living together: It's not all gravy. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt, 1974.
- Crowne, D. & Marlowe, D. The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964,.
- Danzinger, C. Does living together before marriage make for a better marriage? Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1975, 9(1), 32-45.
- D'Augelli, J. F. & Cross, H. J. Relationship of sex guilt and moral reasoning to premarital sex in college women and in couples. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43(1), 40-47.
- Davidson, J. K. Sr., & Leslie, G. R. Premarital Sexual Intercourse: An Application of Axiomatic Theory Construction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, February, 15-25.
- Davis, K. B. Factors in the Sex Life of Twenty-two Hundred Women. New York: Harper and Bros., 1929.
- Ehrmann, W. W. Non-conformance of male and female reports on premarital coitus. Social Problems, 1954, 1(4), 155-159.
- Erikson, E. H. Childhood and Society, 2nd ed. New York: Norton, 1963.
- Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Frazier, L. P. An evaluation of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 5062A. (University Microfilms NO. 77-02620,61).
- Gagnon, J. H., Simon, W., & Berger, A. J. Some aspects of sexual adjustment in early and later adolescence. The Psychology of Adolescence. Eds, Zubin, J. & Freedman, A. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1970, 275-298.
- Hunt, M. Sexual Behavior in the 1970's. New York: Dell, 1974.
- Hunt, M. The Affair. New York: World Publishing company, 1969.
- Lee, R. V. Does living together before marriage make for a better marriage? Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1975, 9(1), 32-45.

- Locke, H. J. Predicting Adjustment in Marriage: A comparison of a divorced and a happily married group. New York: Henry Holt, 1951.
- Locke, H. J. & Wallace, K. M. Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21, 251-155.
- Lyness, J. L., Lipitz, M. E., & Davis, K. E. Living together: An alternative to marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34, 305-311.
- Kaats, G. R. & Davis, K. E. Effects of volunteer biases in studies of sexual behavior and attitudes. Journal of Sex Research, 1971, 7(1), 26-34.
- Kanin, E. J. & Howard, D. H. Postmarital consequences of premarital sex adjustments. American Sociological Review, 1958, 22(5), 556-562.
- Kimmel, D. & Van Der Veen, F. Factors of marital adjustment in Locke's Marital Adjustment Test. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, February, 57-63.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W., & Martin, C. Sexual Behavior in the Human Male. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1948.
- Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W., Martin, C., & Gebhard, P. Sexual Behavior in the Human Female. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, 1953.
- Kleinman, S. Female premarital sexual careers. Center for Youth Development and Research. Quarterly Focus, Winter 1978.
- Markowski, E. M., Croake, J. W., & Keller, J. F. Sexual history and present sexual behavior of cohabiting and married couples. The Journal of Sex Research, 1978, 14(1), 27-39.
- Mellan, J. & Nedoma, K. Predmanzelska pohlovni aktivita ve mestech (Premarital sexual activity occurring in towns). Ceskoslevenska Psychiatrie, 1970, 66(6), 348-351.
- Mirande, A. M. Reference Group Theory and Adolescent Sexual Behavior. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1958, 30, 572-577.
- Peele, S. & Brodsky, A. Love and Addiction. New York: Taplinger, 1975.
- Perlman, S. D. & Abramson, P. R. Sexual satisfaction among married and cohabiting individuals. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1982, 50(3), 458-460.

- Peterman, D. J. Does living together before marriage make for a better marriage? Medical Aspects of Human Sexuality, 1975, 9(1), 32-45.
- Peterman, D. J., Redley, C. A., & Anderson, S. M. A comparison of cohabiting and noncohabiting college students. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 344-354.
- Reevy, W. R. Premarital petting behavior and marital happiness prediction. Marriage and Family Living, 1959, 21(4), 334-338.
- Reiss, I. L. The Scaling of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 188-198.
- Reiss, I. L. The Social Context of Premarital Sexual Permissiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Reiss, I. L. Readings on the Family System. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1972.
- Reiss, I. L. & Miller, B. C. A theoretical analysis of heterosexual permissiveness. Technical Report No. 2, Family Study Center, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 1974.
- Reiss, I. L. & Miller, B. C. Heterosexual Permissiveness: A Theoretical Analysis. Chapter 4 in Burr, W., Hill, R., Nye, I., and Reiss, I.L., eds. Contemporary Theories About the Family. New York: Free Press, 1979.
- Renne, K. S. Correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32(1), 54-67.
- Roach, A. J. Marriage Problem Checklist. Pp. 62 in Bowden S. R. An assessment of the validity of the Marital Satisfaction Inventory. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 38, 4671A. (University Microfilms No. 7732141,74).
- Roach, A. J., Frazier, L. P., & Bowden S. R. The Marital Satisfaction Scale: Development of a measure for intervention research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1981, 43, 537-546.
- Shope, D. F. & Broderick, C. B. Level of sexual experience and predicted adjustment in marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29(3), 424-427.
- Simon, W. & Gagnon, J. H. On Psychosexual Development. Handbook of socialization theory and research. Ed. by Goslin, D. A. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Terman, L. M. Psychological Factors in Marital Happiness.
New York: McGraw-Hill, 1938.

Tripp, C. A. The Homosexual Matrix. New York: McGraw-Hill,
1975.

U. S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the
United States: 1985 (105th edition), Washington,
D. C., 1984.

Victor, J. S. Human Sexuality: A Social Psychological
Approach, London: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Wallin, P. & Clark, A. L. Religiosity, sexual gratification,
and marital satisfaction in the middle years of marriage.
Social Forces, 1964, 42, 303-309.

Appendix AA
The Autonomy Theory of Heterosexual Permissiveness
Propositions

- *1'. The favorableness of one's sexual orientation influences in a positive direction one's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 2'. The traditional level of heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community influences in a negative direction the strength of the relation of the favorableness of one's sexual orientation to one's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 3'. The favorableness of one's love orientation influences in a positive direction one's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 4'. The traditional level of heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community influences in a negative direction the strength of the relation of the favorableness of one's love orientation to heterosexual permissiveness.
- 5'. The traditional level of heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community influences in a positive direction the amount of autonomy in one's dyadic heterosexual interaction.
- 6'. The degree of institutional support for heterosexual permissiveness in one's community influences in a positive direction the strength of the relation of the favorableness of sexual orientation to heterosexual permissiveness.
- 7'. The degree of institutional support for heterosexual permissiveness in one's community influences in a positive direction the strength of the relation of the favorableness of one's love orientation to heterosexual permissiveness.
- 8'. Social class is not significantly related to one's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 9'. The degree of institutional support for the heterosexual permissiveness in one's community influences the non-significant relationship between one's social class and one's heterosexual permissiveness so that those from a community with a low degree of institutional support for heterosexual permissiveness will play a negative relationship and those from a community with a high degree of support for heterosexual permissiveness will display a positive relationship of social class and heterosexual permissiveness.
- 10'. The degree of institutional support for heterosexual

support for heterosexual permissiveness in one's community influences in a positive direction the degree of autonomy in one's dyadic heterosexual interaction.

- 11'. The degree of institutional support for heterosexual permissiveness in one's community influences in a negative direction the degree of sexual non-equalitarianism of self.
12. The priority of marriage and family roles influences in a positive direction the strength of the relationship between the favorableness of one's love orientation and individual premarital sexual permissiveness.
13. The priority of marriage and family roles influences in a negative direction individual premarital sexual permissiveness.
- 14'. The priority of marriage and family roles influences in a positive direction the perceived importance of parental heterosexual permissiveness.
- 15'. Sexual non-equalitarianism of self influences in a positive direction the perceived importance of parental heterosexual permissiveness.
- 16'. Perceived parental acceptance of non-sexual pleasure influences in a positive direction the autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction.
- 17'. The perceived importance of peers' heterosexual permissiveness influences in a positive direction the individual's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 18'. The perceived importance of parental heterosexual permissiveness influences in a negative direction one's own heterosexual permissiveness.
- 19'. The perceived importance of peers' heterosexual permissiveness influences in a negative direction the perceived importance of parental heterosexual permissiveness.
- 20'. Responsibility for other family members influences in a negative direction the autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction.
- 21'. Participation in dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a positive direction the individual's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 22'. Participation in dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a positive direction the perceived importance of peers's heterosexual permissiveness.
- 23'. Autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a positive direction one's participation

in dyadic heterosexual interaction.

- 24'. Autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a positive direction the perceived importance of peers' heterosexual permissiveness.
- 25'. Autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a negative direction the perceived importance of parental heterosexual permissiveness.
- 26'. Autonomy of one's dyadic heterosexual interaction influences in a negative direction the priority of marriage and family roles.
- 27'. One's heterosexual permissiveness influences in a positive direction the heterosexual permissiveness norms in one's community.
- 28'. Heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community influence in a positive direction heterosexual behavior in that community.
- 29'. The level of heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community influences in a negative direction the amount of heterosexual behavior deviating from such norms.
- 30'. The amount of heterosexual behavior deviating from norms influences in a positive direction the amount of negative consequences of such heterosexual behavior.
- 31'. The level of heterosexual permissiveness of norms in a community influences in a negative direction the extent of differences in heterosexual permissiveness norms between males and females.
- 32'. The amount of negative consequences of heterosexual behavior influences in a negative direction the institutional acceptance of heterosexual permissiveness norms in a community.
- 33. Priority of marriage and family roles influences in a positive direction marital sexual permissiveness.
- 34. Priority of marriage and family roles influences in a negative direction extramarital sexual permissiveness.
- 35. Marital satisfaction influences in a negative direction extramarital sexual permissiveness.
- 36. Marital satisfaction influences in a positive direction marital sexual permissiveness.

*A (') next to the proposition number indicates that the original variable, "premarital sexual permissiveness" has been changed to "heterosexual permissiveness".

Appendix A
Age, Sex, and Race

	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Age				
16-20	0	0	1	1.3
21-25	11	5.3	4	5.2
26-30	51	24.4	8	10.4
31-35	67	32.0	27	35.0
36-41	80	38.8	37	42.9
Sex				
male	153	73.2	50	64.9
female	56	26.8	27	35.1
Race				
White	204	97.6	75	97.4
Black	2	1.0	0	0
Hispanic	1	.5	2	2.4
Asian	1	.5	0	0
Other	1	.5	0	0

Appendix B
Socioeconomic Status as Determined by
Occupational Classification

CODE

1. Professional, technical and kindred workers
Lawyers, judges, accountants, physicians, nurses (except practical nurses), medical technicians, pharmacists, veterinarians, teachers, librarians, (except library assistants), entertainers, artists, writers, religious, social and recreation workers, athletes. Personnel, public relations workers. Communication workers such as editors, reporters, radio operators, photographers, surveyors, professional engineers, draftsmen, architects, physical, social and natural scientists.
2. Managers, officials and proprietors (except farm)
Salaried or self-employed managers, officials, proprietors. Postmaster, buyer, purchasing agents, administrators, officials, inspectors, employed by government. Salaried agents, administrators of lodges societies, unions. Floor managers, credit officials, officers, pursers, engineers of ships. Flight engineers, pilots, captain in airforce.
3. Clerical, sales and kindred workers
Post office clerks, clerical workers in offices, such as receptionists, secretaries, office machine operator messengers, bookkeepers, cashiers, tellers, collectors, library assistants. Agents (except purchasing), ticket express, hucksters, auctioneers, supermarket checker outs.
4. Craftsmen, foremen and kindred workers
Skilled workers of raw or finished materials, carpenters, bakers, stone masons, tailors, shoemakers, gold and silversmiths, engravers, stage hands. Skilled workers on machinery, typesetters, machinists, mechanics, stationary. Foremen (except farmers), electricians, plumbers, repairmen, inspectors, graders and sealers (except government officials), decorators, window dressers, painters, plasterers, sheet workers.
5. Operatives and kindred workers
Semiskilled workers in manufacturing, apprentices of all kinds, assemblers, sewers, packers, metal polishers, milliners, produce clerks, auto attendants semiskilled checker examiners, vehicle drivers, parking attendants, delivery men, railroad brakemen. Laundry workers, butchers, mine operatives, laborers.

6. Service workers including private households
Chefs, cleaning women, baby sitters, bartenders, waiters, counter men, cooks, barbers, beauticians, hospital, building, institutional attendants, elevator operators, janitors, practical nurses, porters, ushers
Protective service workers: Firemen, policemen, sheriffs, watchmen, private detectives.
7. Housewife or welfare
8. Farm laborers and foremen and laborers
(except in mines--see group 5)

Farm laborers, unskilled workers (manufacturing). Many can be differentiated from operatives only by skills and training necessary for the job. Amount of physical labor not a criterion. Unskilled worker in nonmanufacturing jobs, fishermen, gardeners, long-shoremen, lumbermen, warehousemen.
9. Missing or unlisted

Appendix C

Occupational Categories

Occupational Category	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Professional	90	43.1	31	40.3
Managers	59	28.2	20	26.0
Clerical	29	13.9	11	14.3
Craftsmen	7	3.3	3	3.9
Operatives	2	1.0	1	1.3
Service	4	1.9	2	2.6
Farm Laborer	1	.5	0	0
Housewife/ Welfare	15	7.2	9	11.7
No Response	2	1.0	0	0

Appendix D

Income Levels

Family Annual Gross Income	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
\$4,999 and under	0	0	1	1.3
\$10,000- 19,999	4	1.9	1	1.3
\$20,000- 29,999	11	5.2	4	5.2
\$30,000- 39,999	35	16.7	16	20.8
\$40,000- 49,999	45	21.5	16	20.8
\$50,000- 59,999	35	14.4	14	18.2
\$60,000- 69,999	32	15.3	9	11.7
\$70,000- 79,999	13	6.2	7	9.1
\$80,000- 89,999	12	5.8	3	3.9
\$90,000- 99,999	15	2.4	1	1.3
\$100,000-104,999	12	5.7	2	2.6
\$130,000-134,999	0	0	1	1.3
\$140,000-144,999	3	1.4	0	0
\$150,000-154,000	2	1.0	0	0
\$170,000-174,000	1	.5	0	0
\$180,000-184,999	1	.5	0	0
No Response	0	0	2	2.6

Appendix E

Religion

	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
Religious	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Yes	123	58.9	60	77.9
No	78	37.3	16	20.8
No Response	8	3.8	1	1.3
Religion				
No Specific	79	37.8	16	22.1
Catholic	63	30.1	32	41.6
Protestant	25	11.9	7	9.1
Jewish	8	3.8	11	14.3
Baptist	5	2.4	0	0
Episcopalian	6	2.9	0	0
Greek Orthodox	3	1.4	0	0
Unorthodox	1	.5	0	0
Islam	1	.5	0	0
Christian Scientist	1	.5	0	0
Christian	9	4.3	4	5.2
Believe In God	0	0	1	1.3
Jehovah's Witness	0	0	1	1.3

Appendix F

Marriage

Age Married	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
16-19	13	6.2	10	13
20-24	119	57.0	60	77.9
25-29	58	27.7	7	9.1
30-34	15	7.2	0	0
35-37	4	1.9	0	0
Length of Marriage				
1-5 Years	68	32.5	11	14.3
6-19 Years	49	23.5	12	15.6
11-15 Years	61	29.2	26	25.9
16-20 Years	29	13.8	27	22.1
Over 20	2	1.0	1	1.3

Appendix G

Number of Children

Number of Children	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
0	55	26.3	13	16.9
1	47	22.5	9	11.7
2	75	35.9	37	48.1
3	20	9.6	14	18.2
4	9	4.3	4	5.2
5	1	.5	0	0
6	0	0	0	0
7	1	.5	0	0
No Response	1	.5	0	0

Appendix H

Number of Children by Age

	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Children under five				
0	115	55.0	52	67.5
1	66	31.6	20	26.0
2	24	11.5	4	5.2
3	3	1.4	1	1.3
No response	1	.5		
Ages five to ten				
0	140	67.0	42	54.4
1	48	23.0	19	24.7
2	16	7.7	16	20.8
3	4	1.9	0	0
No response	1	.5	0	0
Ages eleven to fifteen				
0	165	78.9	55	71.4
1	21	10.0	10	13.0
2	19	9.1	10	13.0
3	3	1.4	2	2.6
No response	1	.5	0	0
Ages sixteen to twenty				
0	194	92.3	63	81.8
1	7	3.3	9	11.7
2	7	3.3	5	6.5
No response	1	.5	0	0
Over twenty one				
0	206	98.6	73	94.8
1	2	1.0	4	5.2
2	0	0	0	0
No response	1	.5	0	0

Appendix I

Educational Level

Educational Level	Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=209)		No Premarital Intercourse Sample (N=77)	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Some high school	0	0	2	2.6
High school grad.	17	8.1	8	10.4
1-2 yrs. college	35	16.7	20	26.0
3-4 yrs. college	19	9.1	5	6.5
Bachelor's degree	40	19.1	12	15.6
Some graduate work	38	18.2	11	14.3
Master's degree	42	20.1	12	15.6
Ph.D., M.D., J.D.,	18	8.6	7	9.7
etc.				

Appendix J

Geographical Information

	<u>N</u>	<u>Σ</u>
Alabama	1	1.0
Florida	1	1.0
Georgia	2	2.0
Illinois	1	1.0
Long Island	75	65.0
Maryland	6	5.0
Massachusetts	12	10.0
New Hampshire	1	1.0
New York City area (Queens, Brooklyn)	3	3.0
New York State	4	3.0
Ohio	2	2.0
Oklahoma	1	1.0
Pennsylvania	1	1.0
Rhode Island	1	1.0
Texas	1	1.0
Virginia	4	3.0

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

HEMPSTEAD, LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK 11550

Psychological Evaluation and Research Center
Gallon Wing, Room 243

50th
Anniversary 1935-1985

I am a graduate student conducting research for my doctoral dissertation.

You are invited to participate anonymously in a study involving relationships and marriage by completing this questionnaire. The questionnaire itself has been considered quite interesting by others who have completed it, and may take as little as fifteen minutes to complete. It is necessary for you to be under 41 years of age, married now, and never married previously to participate in this study. The study has passed a rigorous set of standards, those set by my university in addition to the federal government's, which assures proper protection of your rights and your privacy. No names or addresses are to be put on any part of the questionnaire to assure anonymity.

Your participation is an important contribution to furthering the scientific understanding of the aspects of relationship life that people have some control over, and how they may affect future marriage. This is an opportunity to play a part in the improvement of marriage for perhaps your own sons and daughters, and future generations to come. As a result of completing this questionnaire you may come to think of your marriage in a way you may never have done before.

Please complete the questionnaire in complete honesty and then place it in the envelope attached and return it to the researcher. If this is not possible, drop it in any mailbox in the United States as the postage will then be paid upon receipt. Your consent to participate in the study is implied with the completing of the questionnaire. You are free to discontinue participation in this study at any time.

If you would like to be informed of the results as they become available - PRINT your name and address below. Then detach this page before placing the completed questionnaire in its envelope and return it separately to the researcher so that anonymity can be assured on the questionnaire.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation. It is much appreciated.

T.M. Baker
T.M. Baker, M.A.

To receive study results as they become available - PLEASE PRINT

NAME _____

STREET _____

CITY, STATE _____

ZIP CODE _____



HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

Appendix L

50th
Anniversary 1935-1985

HEMPSTEAD, LONG ISLAND, NEW YORK 11550
Psychological Evaluation and Research Center
Gallon Wing, Room 243
T.M. Baker, M.A.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
STUDY OF RELATIONSHIPS AND MARRIAGE

Background Biographical Information

*Please DO NOT put your name on any part of this questionnaire

1. Age at last birthday _____
2. Sex (Check one) Male _____ Female _____
3. Race: Hispanic _____ Black _____ Asian _____ White _____ Other _____
4. Occupation _____
5. Family gross income _____
6. Are you a religious person? _____ If so, which religion? _____
7. How many years have you been married? _____ At what age did you marry? _____
8. How many children do you have? _____ Which group(s) represents their ages:
 ___ under 5 ___ 5-10 ___ 11-15 ___ 16-20 ___ 21 or older
9. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
 - 8th grade or less _____
 - some high school _____
 - high school graduate _____
 - 1 or 2 years of college _____
 - 3 or 4 years of college _____
 - bachelor's degree _____
 - some graduate study _____
 - master's degree _____
 - Ph.D., M.D., J.D., etc. _____

Appendix M

The following statements concern your current feelings, beliefs, or attitudes toward your marriage. There are no right or wrong responses to these statements. The answer that best describes you, your spouse or your marital relationship as it is right now is the desired response. 121

KEY: SD - Strongly disagree (not true); D - Disagree (probably not true); N - Neutral (undecided, cannot say); A - Agree (probably true); SA - Strongly agree (true)

PLEASE CIRCLE

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. I regard my marriage as a success. | SD D N A SA |
| 2. I worry a lot about my marriage. | SD D N A SA |
| 3. If I were to start over again, I would marry someone other than my present spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 4. I feel competent and able to handle my marriage. | SD D N A SA |
| 5. My marriage is too confining to suit me. | SD D N A SA |
| 6. I feel that I am "in a rut" in my marriage. | SD D N A SA |
| 7. I know where I stand with my spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 8. My marriage has a bad effect on my health. | SD D N A SA |
| 9. I get discouraged trying to make my marriage work out. | SD D N A SA |
| 10. My marital situation is pleasant enough for me. | SD D N A SA |
| 11. My marriage gives me more real personal satisfaction than anything else I do. | SD D N A SA |
| 12. My marriage is becoming more and more difficult for me. | SD D N A SA |
| 13. I become badly flustered and jittery when my spouse does certain things. | SD D N A SA |
| 14. I get along well with my spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 15. I must look outside my marriage for those things that make my life worthwhile and interesting. | SD D N A SA |
| 16. The future of my marriage looks promising to me. | SD D N A SA |
| 17. I am really interested in my spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 18. Lately, I wish I had not married my present spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 19. My marriage helps me toward the goals I have set for myself. | SD D N A SA |
| 20. My spouse is willing to work at improving our relationship. | SD D N A SA |
| 21. My spouse lacks respect for me. | SD D N A SA |
| 22. I have definite difficulty confiding in my spouse. | SD D N A SA |
| 23. My spouse usually understands the way I feel. | SD D N A SA |
| 24. I am definitely satisfied with my marriage. | SD D N A SA |

Appendix N

Please circle the response that most reflects the way you feel right now.

25. In your marriage, do you and your spouse have sexual relations . . .

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| much more often than you would like | 1 |
| little more often than you would like | 2 |
| just as much as you would like | 3 |
| little less often than you would like | 4 |
| much less often than you would like | 5 |

26. In considering the actual period of time that a typical sexual interaction lasts for you and your spouse, do you feel that it lasts

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| a lot longer than you would like | 1 |
| a little longer than you would like | 2 |
| just the right length of time | 3 |
| a little shorter than you would like | 4 |
| a lot shorter than you would like | 5 |

27. Is the type of sexual activity you and your spouse engage in . . .

- | | |
|---|---|
| usually the kind you prefer <u>not</u> to engage in | 1 |
| sometimes the kind you prefer <u>not</u> to engage in | 2 |
| I have no preference of kind of sexual activity | 3 |
| sometimes the kind you prefer to engage in | 4 |
| usually the kind you prefer to engage in | 5 |

28. To what extent is your spouse considerate of your sexual needs and desires . . .

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| not at all | 1 |
| a little | 2 |
| an average amount | 3 |
| a lot | 4 |
| totally | 5 |

29. All in all, how satisfied are you with sex in your marriage?

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| very unsatisfied | 1 |
| somewhat unsatisfied | 2 |
| neutral | 3 |
| somewhat satisfied | 4 |
| very satisfied | 5 |

Appendix 0

30. How many times have you had sexual relations with someone other than your spouse since your marriage?

none	1
once or twice	2
three to ten times	3
eleven to twenty times	4
more than twenty times	5

31. Did you have sexual intercourse before your marriage?

Yes (continue to next question)

No (skip now to question 66)

32. At what age did you first have sexual intercourse? _____

Appendix P

The following questions pertain to Premarital relationships
Please answer each question for each type of relationship


If a number is corresponding to a choice, place the number
in the box as you answer the question for each type

	Type of Relationship		
	IN LOVE	WITH STRONG AFFECTION	WITH LITTLE AFFECTION
33. About how many different sexual relationship partners did you have for each type of relationship?			
34. What period of time in years, months, or days did the average sexual relationship in each category last?			
35. In how many relationships did you live together?			
36. Were you dating others at the same time you were involved in the average relationship?			
37. In the average relationship did you have sex much more often than you would like 1 a little more often than you would like 2 just as much as you would like 3 a little less often than you would like 4 much less often than you would like 5			
38. In the average relationship was the type of sex usually the kind you preferred <u>not</u> to engage in 1 often the kind you preferred <u>not</u> to engage in 2 you had no preference of type 3 often the kind you preferred to engage in 4 usually the kind you preferred to engage in 5			
39. In considering the actual period of time a typical <u>Sexual</u> interaction lasted for the average relationship, did you feel that it lasted a lot longer than you would have preferred 1 a little longer than you would have preferred 2 just the right length of time 3 a little shorter than you would have preferred 4 a lot shorter than you would have preferred 5			
40. To what extent did your partner in the average relationship express love or affection to you in sex? not at all 1 a little 2 an average amount 3 a lot 4 totally 5			
41. All in all, how satisfied were you with the sex in the average relationship in each category? Very Unsatisfied (1); Somewhat Unsatisfied (2); Neutral (3); Somewhat Satisfied (4); Very Satisfied (5)			

Appendix R

66. What effect, if any, do you feel your premarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage?
67. What effect, if any, do you feel your extramarital sexual experience or the lack of it has had on your marriage? Would you please share some of the reasons why you did (or did not) have extramarital sexual liaisons?
68. Please share any other comments or feelings you may have about the questionnaire, or any of the topics included in it at this time.

Again, thank you so much for sharing a bit of your life to further science.


T.M. Baker

Appendix T

Means and Standard Deviations

<u>Variables - Independent</u>	Means	s.d.
NUMBER OF PREMARITAL PARTNERS		
In Love	1.82	1.20
Strong Affection	3.62	3.55
Little Affection	7.82	18.73
LENGTH OF PREMARITAL RELATIONSHIP (in days)		
In Love	841.20	615.71
Strong Affection	250.51	247.59
Little Affection	52.78	105.42
NUMBER OF PREMARITAL PARTNERS LIVED WITH		
In Love	.44	.64
Strong Affection	.12	.40
Little Affection	.0	.0
WHETHER DATED OTHERS (1=yes;2=no)		
In Love	1.85	.30
Strong Affection	1.49	.50
Little Affection	1.30	.46
PREMARITAL SEXUAL SATISFACTION		
In Love	17.44	2.52
Strong Affection	16.08	2.48
Little Affection	14.42	2.74
PREMARITAL RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION		
In Love	91.96	15.82
Strong Affection	58.82	10.02
Little Affection	78.10	12.82
<u>Variables - Dependent</u>		
MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE TOTAL		
In Love	98.52	18.56
Strong Affection	98.71	17.83
Little Affection	98.49	17.77
MARITAL SEXUAL SATISFACTION TOTAL		
In Love	16.54	3.36
Strong Affection	16.62	3.26
Little Affection	16.46	3.27
NUMBER OF EXTRAMARITAL CONTACTS (FIDELITY)		
In Love	1.86	1.36
Strong Affection	1.95	1.41
Little Affection	1.99	1.39

Copyright © 1985 by the estate of Tina M. Baker. Some rights reserved.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 United States License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/us/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 171 Second Street, Suite 300, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

You are free:

- **to Share** — to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work
- **to Remix** — to make derivative works

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — you must attribute the work to the author (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the work).

For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work, e.g. by linking to the license at the address above.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.