

PERCEIVED MARITAL ADJUSTMENT OF WOMEN WITH
ADVANCED DEGREES AS RELATED TO THEIR
INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF THE
TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF NUTRITION, TEXTILES, AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

By
ADA AROCHO B.A., M.ED.

DENTON, TEXAS
DECEMBER 1980

DEDICATION

To Luis Arquelio, Jose Ivan, Fernando Antonio, and Jerry, your loving encouragement, help, support and dreams helped make this possible. To my parents, who always encouraged and helped me in my educational aspirations, a "thank you" from the bottom of my heart.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the opportunity to have had Anita Stafford as a member of my committee and would like to thank her for her friendship, encouragement and support.

I am especially grateful to David Marshall, who helped me analyze the data. I also appreciate and thank John W. McFarland, Carol Kershaw, Glenn Jennings, and Elaine Goldsmith, members of my committee.

I would also like to thank my friend Helen Leath, who graciously offered to edit my dissertation.

I would also like to thank Interamerican University whose financial support made this dissertation possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vii
Chapter	Page
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Statement of Purpose	6
Hypotheses	7
Significance of the Study	10
Definition of Terms	12
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Introduction	14
Marital Adjustment	18
Interpersonal Relations	31
3. METHODOLOGY	47
Description of the Subjects	47
Procedure	47
Instrumentation	48
Analysis of Data	50
4. RESULTS	52
Description of Subjects	52
Examination of the Hypotheses	80
5. SUMMARY	95
Discussion	95
Conclusions	102
Recommendations	103

APPENDIX	104
Letter to Respondents	105
FIRO-B	106
Demographic Data	110
Short-Marital Adjustment Scale	114
REFERENCES	117

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Characteristics of Female Graduate Students . . .	55
2.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Short-Marital Adjustment</u> Scale	60
3.	Marital Adjustment Data	63
4.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Expressed Inclusion</u> Scale	64
5.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Wanted Inclusion Scale</u> . . .	66
6.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Expressed Control Scale</u> . .	68
7.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Wanted Control Scale</u>	71
8.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Expressed Affection</u> Scale	73
9.	Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses to <u>The Wanted Affection Scale</u> . . .	75
10.	FIRO-B Data	77
11.	Summary of FIRO-B Scale Score Sums within Need Areas	78
12.	Correlations Between Expressed Inclusion and Marital Adjustment	81
13.	Correlations Between Wanted Inclusion and Marital Adjustment	82
14.	Correlations Between Expressed Control and Marital Adjustment	82
15.	Correlations Between Wanted Control and Marital Adjustment	83

16.	Correlations Between Expressed Affection and Marital Adjustment	84
17.	Correlations Between Wanted Affection and Marital Adjustment	85
18.	<u>Marital Adjustment Scale</u> and Respondents' Education	86
19.	<u>Marital Adjustment Scale</u> Scores and Respondents' Occupation	87
20.	Rank Biserial Correlations: <u>Marital Adjustment Scale Score</u> and Respondent's Combined Income	88
21.	<u>Marital Adjustment Scale</u> Scores and Combined Income	89
22.	<u>Wanted Control Scale</u> Scores and Respondents' Education	89
23.	<u>Wanted Inclusion Scale</u> Scores and Respondents' Education	90
24.	<u>Expressed Control Scale</u> Scores and Respondents' Occupation	91
25.	<u>Expressed Control Scale</u> Scores and Combined Income	92
26.	Correlations of Interpersonal Needs and Marital Adjustment with Educational Levels	93
27.	Correlations of Interpersonal Needs and Marital Adjustment with Levels of Combined Income	94
28.	Correlations of Interpersonal Needs and Marital Adjustment within Levels of Occupational Status	94

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Many have observed that the Twentieth Century is an era of transition for American culture. Traditional and conventional behavior patterns exist side by side. This duality of cultural behaviors permits contemporary Americans to create lifestyles which suit their particular circumstances and psychologies. Thus, there exists a greater degree of personal freedom than ever before. Certainly, good has come from this freedom: American women, for example, are now able to choose traditional or liberated roles in their relationships to family, education, and career. However, aspects of contemporary American society suggest that the transitional state of our culture may also create serious problems in adjustment for these women and their families. Recent years have seen an increase in divorce, runaway wives, wife abuse and family violence, and suicide among women. Psychologists, sociologists, family specialists, and counselors have begun to investigate factors which may be contributing to the problem which women have in adjusting to contemporary society; one area of investigation concerns marriage.

Historically Americans have tended to practice a traditional institutional marriage, one in which the man is the breadwinner and the woman is the housekeeper, child-bearer, and child-rearer. Thus, traditional role specifications, along with customs and mores, have been identified as factors which may be significant in marital success and happiness (Hicks & Platt, 1970). Marital happiness in an institutional marriage may be dependent upon the husband's having certain expected needs which the wife fulfills in her role as accomodator. Burr (1971) observed that differences in roles among spouses may explain a considerable amount of the variation in marital satisfaction,

Although the traditional view of women's "proper place," especially that of the wife's place, has been gradually changing throughout the Twentieth Century, the roles and expectations of modern women have been greatly expanded by the relatively recent women's rights movement. Today women are being educated far beyond the secondary school level and are joining the labor force at almost every level.

Arnott (1972b) emphasized that educated married women have the freedom to choose between the role which society has predetermined for them and the role or roles of their own choice; they usually choose that role which increases

the family income. Wives' employment may be one of the causes leading to the formation of egalitarian marriages (Brown, 1978). Modern educated women appear to be in better physical and emotional health with more positive attitudes toward life than women of earlier periods of history (Burke & Wier, 1976). Working wives appear to have happy marital relationships Burke and Weir (1976) observed; working wives feel that they are in agreement with their mates on such matters as sexual relations, recreation, friends, dealing with in-laws, and solving disagreements by mutual compromise. These women seem to communicate their feelings toward their mates more openly than wives of earlier generations had done.

The modern marriage between two gainfully employed adults who share household and child-rearing duties has been called a companionship marriage, one in which there are no sharply defined sex roles. The working wife tends to have an increased sense of self-worth (Birbaum, 1971). The additional income which she brings to the family increases her power in the family (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). She becomes an equal partner with her husband, sharing the decision making process in matters which pertain to finances, vacations, and child-rearing (Burke & Weir, 1976). The strict roles expected by our society and

culture place women in a difficult position, sometimes to the point of their experiencing role conflicts and frustrations. The fact that more women than men become mentally ill may be related to role conflicts and frustrations (Gove & Tudor, 1973).

Hicks and Platt (1970) note that marital adjustment relies on the expressive aspects of the relationship. A companionship marriage is frequently characterized by the open communication of feelings between the partners. For educated women, especially those who want to combine career with marriage, a companionship marriage may be ideal. It is more fulfilling and rewarding than the institutional marriage because it does not adhere to strict role specifications.

According to Burke and Weir (1976), the working wife experiences more meaningful values in her occupation than she does in the traditional housewife role. The work outside of the home provides her with the opportunity not only to have an additional income, but also to have accomplishments and creativity which are not available at home. She feels that the work accomplished is useful and looks at herself as a more competent human being. It appears that wives who work are actualizing their preferences for growth and fulfillment. Women who work may feel that they

are upgrading their status when they move into an area regarded by society as a man's world, thereby increasing their self-esteem (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Burke & Weir, 1976).

Variables in the companionship marriage expected to be significant to happiness are affection for spouse, sexual enjoyment, companionship, and communication. Marital happiness is a function of the expressive aspects of the relationship in a companionship marriage (Hicks & Platt, 1970). In a companionship marriage, these qualities may be desirable and necessary for marital adjustment to prevail with educated women. Therefore, it is not only appropriate to measure marital adjustment but necessary to correlate the interpersonal needs for inclusion, control, and affection. Maybe educated women cannot function in a companionship marriage unless they have positive interpersonal relationships.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study is stated in the following questions. What is the degree of marital adjustment that wives perceive? In what direction is their behavior oriented, is it what the wives express to others or what the wives want from others? Is marital

adjustment reflected in the way wives behave with others or want others to behave with them?

The problem is addressed in the following way. A correlational study was designed to determine from among selected variables the ones that may have some relationship. The demographic variables were correlated with The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores and The Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior Scale scores.

Statement of Purpose

The overall purpose of the study was to ascertain married female graduate students' perceptions of their marital adjustment and to relate these perceptions to their interpersonal needs. The specific purposes of the study were as follows:

To determine the women's perceptions of their marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959).

To determine the perceptions of women toward their interpersonal needs as measured by The Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior Scale (Schutz, 1978), specifically examining the factors of inclusion, control, and affection.

To determine whether any significant relationship exists between the women's interpersonal needs and marital adjustment according to the level of educational attainments, income, and occupational status.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses will be examined:

H₁ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed inclusion as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₂ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted inclusion as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₃ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₄ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The

Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted control as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₅ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed affection as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₆ There is no significant relationship between wives perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted affection as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₇ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of wives' education.

H₈ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of wives' occupational status.

H₉ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The

Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of combined income.

H₁₀ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' education and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted control as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₁₁ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' education and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted inclusion as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₁₂ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' occupational status and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₁₃ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of combined income and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B.

H₁₄ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of educational attainments.

H₁₅ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of combined income.

H₁₆ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of occupational status.

Significance of the Study

Marriage and family are important institutions because of their organization and function in society and because they permit the creation and maintenance of human beings. In addition, marriage and family are the central interest of most men and women (Gump, 1972; Kapur, 1974; Komarovsky, 1953).

Social changes exert a great influence on the lives of men and women who make up the institutions of marriage and family. The perceptions and attitudes which men and women have about marriage and family can serve as an indicator of the present status of these institutions as well as the change in status and role of women in marriage. The perception which a woman has of her marriage influences her attitudes toward it. Her attitudes will have an effect on the way she behaves, thus influencing her personal relationships with the spouse, family, and others.

The changing role of women can be attributed to the legal and socio-economic rights and privileges she has. Also, the entrance of women into vocations and occupations that used to be male dominated has helped women achieve a

new status and role in our society. Among the issues concerning the changing role of women there is one that needs particular attention, that is education and occupation (Kreps, 1978). The later part of the decade of the seventies revealed an increasing number of women entering college. At the present time, statistics show that women are just as likely as men to enter higher education. Not only is there an increase in the number of women entering undergraduate programs but there is also an increase in the number of women entering graduate schools.

The expectation is that women with advanced degrees will tend to have more stable marriages and fewer children than women with less education. Statistics, however, reveal that better educated women are more likely to be employed and are also more likely to be divorced (Kreps, 1978).

Kreps (1978) indicated the need to investigate the interrelationship between education, occupational status, and family lives of both men and women. These people will be shaping the new patterns of marriage in the future. It will be meaningful to study the present perceived marital adjustment of career-oriented women if we are to predict future trends in marital relationships and the possible directions of these trends. The increasing number of women

entering graduate schools pose the question of whether there is a relationship between marital adjustment and wives' educational attainments.

Definitions of Terms

For the purpose of this study the following terms were defined.

1. Marital adjustment is the state of accommodation in marital relationships. The relationship in which marital adjustment is good will be characterized by a tendency to deal with conflicts and solve problems and by an overall feeling of satisfaction with the spouse (Kapur, 1974).

2. Income is the value received by an individual measured in terms of money derived from a job.

3. Occupational status is the social and occupational prestige derived from a job which requires a college degree.

4. Advanced degree alludes to the education of women who have a bachelor's degree or courses beyond the bachelor's degree from an institution of higher education.

5. Educated women are those women who hold a bachelor's degree.

6. Interpersonal is defined in terms of the Schutz theory of interpersonal relationships. This term refers to the relations occurring between two or more persons.

7. Interpersonal need refers to what is required by the individual to establish and maintain a comfortable relation between himself and those who surround him in terms of acceptance, power, and love.

8. Control is one of the needs defined by Schutz (1978) as the urge of the individual to be in control of others or to be controlled by others.

9. Inclusion is characterized by the relations and interaction between individuals. It deals with acceptance or rejection between two or more persons.

10. Affection is a close relationship between two or more persons, it has to do with the feelings of love or hate.

11. FIRO-B stands for Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Marriage and work among educated women in the United States are of interest to sociologists, family specialists, counselors, and researchers. Women have been working with men for a long time, first in the fields when the economy depended primarily on agriculture, later in the so-called blue collar occupations. But engagement in the labor force by the educated middle- and upper-class women is a significant recent change. Also of significance is the recent trend for married educated middle- and upper-class women to become a part of the labor force. This evolution is mainly due to the socio-economic changes that have been taking place in American society during the past thirty years.

In the fifties, the Soviet Union launched the first artificial earth satellite, the Sputnik. America became perplexed because, in the middle of material prosperity and opulence, it found itself intellectually poor. Educators were blamed for America being second in scientific and technological advances. This event was the cause of concern in higher education. Words like "brainpower,"

"manpower," and "womanpower" were introduced in academic thinking. Even though enrollment in graduate schools was high, few men and even fewer women chose professional and technical fields.

During the decade of the fifties, the population was characterized by having more women with some college experience than in any previous decade (Astin, 1976). The majority of these women had married young and had had children soon, but fewer children had been produced than in previous generations of women. Once children were of school age, women were left alone in their homes. Perhaps modern women were more dissatisfied because, unlike women before World War II, their roles as wives and mothers had been simplified by labor-saving devices and because women had had an opportunity to work during W. W. II. Perhaps they had learned that homemaking wasn't that rewarding while working outside the home could be emotionally and financially rewarding. Some women tried to find personal satisfaction by seeking jobs outside of the home, only to find that their skills and education were obsolete. Marriage had been the main goal of many of those young women; the question then became how to adapt educational resources to meet the needs of those women who had chosen not to defer marriage until after they had finished college.

In 1950, the American Council on Education was formed; it laid the foundation for a radical movement for the education of women which later became known as continuing education (Astin, 1976). It was observed that women interested in higher education faced many more impediments than men on the road to career success. One of the objectives in studying continuing education was to try to ameliorate some of the inequities.

In a study of women in continuing education, Astin (1976) found that women whose husbands supported their educational aspirations had improved their marital relationships. Luckey (1966) found that the amount of education his respondents had was positively related to marital satisfaction. Even though the traditional attitude that the husband was the breadwinner persisted, some husbands were aware of the wives' aspirations and accepted a shared responsibility at home and with the family. An attitude that departed from traditional roles. Husbands approved of the wives' pursuit for self-fulfillment.

In the sixties, research related to marital adjustment and wives' employment revealed the significance of the husbands' instrumental role. Axelson (1960) stressed that there was poor marital adjustment when the wife worked; this finding may have been indicative of a threat to the

husband's perceived cultural role. Along the same direction, Nye (1961) reported that working mothers experienced more conflict in their marriages than did nonworking mothers. Gover (1963) indicated that nonworking wives were happier in their marriages than working wives. Blood and Wolfe (1960) suggested that there was marital satisfaction among working wives of low-income husbands and nonworking wives of high income husbands. Orden and Bradburn (1969) indicated that there was less marital satisfaction when the wife worked out of necessity than when she worked by choice or for personal satisfaction. There seemed to be little difference in the marital adjustment of wives who worked by choice and those who did not work.

Research in the decade of the sixties sheds little light on the question of whether working wives were the cause or the effect of marital adjustment or maladjustment since no consensus of opinion was obtained. The question remained unanswered (Axelson, 1963).

The only study in the sixties related to marital adjustment and interpersonal relationship came from Gurin, Veroff, and Feld (1960). Personal involvement and marital adjustment were positively related. They concluded that educated spouses tended to be happy in their marriages but

experienced more feelings of inadequacy than those less educated. Although Axelson (1963) investigated the interpersonal relationship of working couples, his concern was mainly with companionship.

In the decade of the sixties, there were more widening opportunities for women than in decades before. The President's Commission on the Status of Women was established by President Kennedy to abolish prejudices against women. Since then, there has been an increased interest in education, counseling, and training for women.

Even though researchers in sociology, counseling, psychology, and family specialists have been interested in the transition of women's roles, there is not one study that has investigated the relationship between marital adjustment and interpersonal relationships among wives with advanced degrees. Astin (1976) said that more research is needed dealing with women who are career-oriented and want to update their skills through education.

Marital Adjustment

How well modern husbands and wives are able to accommodate one another in dealing with conflicts and solving problems is of concern to those who examine the degrees of marital adjustment in contemporary marriages and

and family life. Factors such as a wife's pursuing her education or working may effect marital adjustment in many ways.

Wives Who Work

Traditionally, the wife had been viewed as a housekeeper, and work outside the home was seen as the cause of strain on the husband (Burke & Weir, 1976) and as the cause of marital troubles. It soon becomes apparent, however, that there is little consensus regarding the effect of wives' working on either husbands or families. The husband has traditionally been regarded as the head of the family, the authority in the house, the provider, and the one whose income and occupation determines the family's social position (Haug, 1973; Mahoney & Richardson, 1979). When the husband is no longer the only provider for the family, he may feel that his status and prestige in the family is decreasing (Axelson, 1970; Day, 1961; Garland, 1970; Hoffman, 1974; Kligler, 1954; Safilios-Rothschild, 1975) a factor that contributes to negative psychological effects on the husband. On the other hand, Orden and Bradburn (1969) and Arnott (1972a) agreed that the fact that the wife works does not have a negative effect on the marriage. The sense of freedom and independence which career women experience is not detrimental to the

husband's position in the family but can enrich the marital relationship.

Burke and Weir (1976) emphasized that husbands whose wives work experience greater stress than husbands whose wives are not working. Husbands of working wives appear to be having more difficulty in coping with the patterns of dual-working families. Working wives make a better adjustment than their husbands do to stressful situations. This may be explained as follows: when the woman goes to work, the husband loses part of his support system; the time the wife devotes to her husband is shorter, and there may be some needs unmet. The attention, comforts, and satisfactions the husband derives and what he expects from a wife when she functions like a servant, homemaker, and mother are interfered with as she struggles with her work and home responsibilities. Besides this, the husband finds himself assuming more work in the house, work that traditionally has been considered woman's work.

By encouraging wife's work or by accepting it, the husband is placed in the position of playing a supportive role for his wife's goals and aspirations. His position as the center of the house, his dominance and power are undermined. The husband is in a position where he sees himself losing part of the important services he receives

from the family, assuming a greater responsibility at home, and losing the status he enjoyed in the family. While the working wife gets more help with housework, her decision-making power increases in matters related to finances, vacations, and child-rearing. Birbaum (1971) reports that the typical married professional woman has a higher self-esteem and personal competence than the typical homemaker. Kaley (1971) stated that educated females felt good about their careers and marriages. We have a clear picture of a wife's sense of self-worth increased in her dual-work while her husband experienced a diminished sense of worth (Burke & Weir, 1976). The husband may feel his self-esteem threatened. Based on this discussion, it seems to be more difficult for husbands than for working wives to adjust to the dual-work role. It is possible that marital troubles arise when the wife goes to work and the husband is trying to make adjustments to a new life-style.

Husbands have been educated and socialized to perform a role in our society. Therefore, it is difficult for men to make the transition in crossing traditional sex roles when they find themselves doing chores that they have not been prepared to perform. It is more difficult for husbands than for working wives to adjust and be happy in a dual-work role (Burke & Weir, 1976). The husband is

performing some activities that in our culture have been looked upon as requiring less competence and skill, activities which have a lower status in a society where his prestige and success are associated with his intellectual abilities (Holmstrom, 1972).

Blood and Wolfe (1960) in their analysis concluded that marital relationships are affected by the wives' work. They stated that there is good marital adjustment among working wives of low-income husbands and nonworking wives of high-income husbands, while other wives experienced less marital adjustment.

Booth (1971), like Locke and Mackerprang (1949), and Locksley (1980), reported that the wife's employment had almost no effect on the marital adjustment viewed by the husband, that the wife's employment was not the cause of stress on the spouse, but that the husband experienced beneficial effects. Orden and Bradburn (1969) reported that there is a reduction in marital happiness and an increase in tension on the part of the husband when the wife was in the labor force out of need but that this reduction is not detrimental to the marriage.

For some women, the attainment of careers has meant struggle, resistance to cultural expectations, and a strong motivational force in order to fulfill their desires and

goals in life. While men are expected to have careers, for women to do so has been regarded as a privilege, not a right (Watley, 1969). For most men, careers or occupations play an important part in their lives whereas society for centuries has given women the primary role of wife and mother. An additional role (career) does not liberate women from the cultural expectations of wife and mother.

For the past thirty years, there has been an increasing demand for women who make careers of their occupations. Due to the expansion of the economy after World War II, there was an increase in demand for women workers. Since then, more than ever before women have pursued careers or have worked as professionals as soon as their children go to school. From 30% of the work force in 1940, the number of working women increased to 50% of the work force by 1970. In 1940, the trend of women over 35 years of age who had school-age children entering the labor market began. In 1950, another trend began that of the work participation of younger married women with preschool children (Oppenheimer, 1973). The presence and age of children is an influencing factor in determining the wife's labor force participation. Mothers tend to be in the labor force if their children are of school age (the youngest child is more than 6 years old (Weil, 1961; Arnott, 1972a)).

Duncan and Perrucci (1976) supported the hypothesis that the husband's occupation is an important determinant in mobility which accounts for the wife submitting to the husband's career demands. This fact may be a deterrent to her career advancement. This study accepts the hypothesis that the husband's occupation and not the wife's occupation is a decisive factor. Felson and Knoke (1974) agree that men and women pay more attention to the male than the female status when defining their own social status. Most women select less demanding occupations that will not be in conflict with their homemaking roles. Many women will not engage in prestigious professional careers if they feel there can be some conflict between the career demands and family responsibilities (Arnott, 1972a; Broschart, 1978).

These women are still assigned a status lower than men and they will only succeed if they lower their aspirations. There are some women who have faced the obstacles imposed by society and have been able to reach their professional goals. In order to enter high level professions, they must use strategies to deal with family demands, conflicts, and a career. After role conflicts have been experienced, some women remain single; others tend to divorce. Broschart (1978) calls this the strategy of

avoidance. Others marry but remain childless. The majority of married professional women with children will experience more role conflict than the single or married women without children, but it is not the presence or absence of children that affects marital adjustment (Houseknecht, 1979). Parenthood is a heavy burden because the married professional woman still assumes more responsibility in the home than her husband (Bryson, Bryson, & Johnson, 1978; Ericksen, 1979; Finkelman, 1966). On the other hand, Gillette (1961) stated that working mothers participate less and have more help from their husbands in household tasks. Even though they carry heavy burdens, 91% of the female professionals remain in the labor force (Broschart, 1978). In 1976, two-fifths of the full-time working mothers had children over 6 years of age while only one-fourth of full-time working mothers had children under 6, (U.S. Department of Labor, March 1976; Spencer, 1976). Hoffman (1974) stated that educated women preferred to take care of their children while they were small rather than to work. A question a mother asks herself is how the children will be affected and to what extent when she goes out to work? In the study comparing Whites and Negro perceptions of wives' work, Axelson (1970) stated that Whites felt wives' employment could have a negative effect on the

children. Sussman (1961) indicated that there is no psychological basis which keeps an achieving professional woman from being a good mother; on the other hand, Fuchs (1971) stated that there will be negative effects on the stability of the family. A mother who concentrates exclusively on her children will not help them prepare for adult life. Sussman (1961) and Byrne (1977) indicated that the popular belief was that there would be negative effects on the children and on the family as well when she worked outside of the home. Some of these popular beliefs were defeminization, family instability, rejection of children, creation of juvenile delinquents, distorted personality development of children, and poor school achievements. But significant studies rejected these popular beliefs, and working mothers do so too.

Factors that determine the work participation of wives are the education, income of the husband, and economic necessity (Gordon, 1980). Wives under 18, without children, and whose husband's income are between \$10,000 and \$15,000 tend to be in the labor force, but the rate declines when the husbands' incomes increase. Low income mothers do not face the crisis that middle-class educated families face. The husband from low income families accepts his wife's going to work in order to help to

support the family. The additional income the wife brings home makes it possible for the family to acquire additional symbols of status like expensive housing, clothing, automobiles, vacations, and entertainment. When the husband's income is low or below average, the wife's income is a great contribution (Day, 1961) to the aspired status. Therefore, the wife's work is looked on as desirable, strengthening the marriage ties (Blood & Wolfe, 1960). If she did not work, the economic strain would negatively affect the marital relationship. The wife's income is less useful when her husband's income increases. Gover (1963) in agreement with Blood and Wolfe (1960) found that nonworking wives on the average experienced higher marital adjustment than working wives. The additional income the wife brought and the satisfaction that she derived from work eventually wiped out the stress which the husband's adjustment to the wife's work brought.

Studying the social, economic status and achievement, and success of women with doctorates, Broschart (1978) reports that family responsibilities keep the professional women from higher ranking professional positions although married professional women were found to be more productive than single or childless women. Even though the proportion of women in high status professional fields has remained

basically the same. The fact that women have not achieved the highest professional status they are capable of having is mainly due to female roles and maternal responsibilities.

Education of Married Women

As in any society, this culture expects some type of behavior from its members. This behavior is denoted as roles, and women are expected to assume roles in society. This cultural expectation molds the lives of women from the time that they are born (Mitchell, 1968). However, Mitchell (1968) stated that, as a result of a study of females with doctorates, some women are realizing that only through higher education can they reach total self-fulfillment in social, cultural, and economic status. The woman who plans to pursue a doctor's degree will be faced with many problems, some of which may be related to her marital adjustment.

Within the boundary of cultural expectations of women's roles, there are a series of factors which mold the life of a woman in her life cycle. The internal factors include her desires for self-satisfaction, a better job, recognition and leadership, and perceptions of duty to herself, the family and society. The external factors are composed of parents, siblings, gifted women models,

encouragement, family responsibilities pressures, type of employment and income. The external and internal factors influence her complete life progression.

Holmstrom and Holmstrom (1974) observed that earning advanced degrees to enhance work skills frequently places a strain on those women who are motivated to continue or resume their education following marriage and motherhood, a factor that may negatively affect the completion of graduate work (Feldman, 1973). Among women who earn the doctorate, the strongest motivation is the desire to know more and to enjoy the personal fulfillment derived from it. Other motivations are a higher sense of competence, work, a need for accomplishment, recognition, leadership, aspirations for a higher status, and the personal attitudes toward and values of a career (Hoffman, 1974). The best influence a woman has in pursuing graduate work is her individual preferences. Other influences on the decision to enter graduate school are the family, teachers, self-need for intellectual challenges, and work associates or friends. Sometimes spouses could be encouraging of their wives pursuing a degree. Women in general have less family encouragement than men do; that is one of the reasons they tend to get degrees later than men. Most women marry by the age of 20 (a changing life pattern);

by 30, they have had children that are of school age, and they find that they have about thirty years more of active life ahead of them. Family life is slowing the process towards the doctorate, not because women are less capable than men, who can advance at a faster rate toward the doctorate, but because of the double role women have to play. More financial aid is given to males than females because males do not have the primary responsibilities of day to day maintenance of the home and children and are, therefore, free to proceed rapidly toward earning a degree. It is very difficult for married women with children to receive fellowships, due to the limited amount of time they will have left for scholarship after attending to their families. Therefore, married women often need to be part-time students in order to reduce the conflict between their two roles; this status as a part-time student makes it harder for women to receive fellowships since this type of financial aid is usually reserved for full-time students. In addition, usually decisions to award fellowships favor men when the selection is between a man and a woman (Feldman, 1973).

In addition to the problems related to earning advanced degrees which are caused by the necessity of married women's assuming double roles during their

education and the scarcity of financial assistance from institutions of higher education for part-time students, married women have the additional problem of access to colleges and universities. Since a family is usually located close to the husband's place of employment, married women do not always live within commuting distances of institutions of higher education. The contemporary expansion of the junior or community college system does not alleviate the problem for those who wish to do graduate work. Evening colleges and provisions for transportation by colleges and universities assist such women in part, but in general married women who wish to earn advanced degrees must accommodate their own lives to university locales and schedules. This accommodation may place strains upon marital adjustment.

Interpersonal Relations

Studies dealing with personality theories go back to Freud, Jung, and Adler, the most prominent theorists in psychoanalysis. Even though the area of concern for each of these men was the same, the theoretical emphasis characterized the uniqueness of each man's theory. The core of Jung's theory was the person's relation to the world and history. For Adler, the core was the overcoming of feelings of inferiority. Freud emphasized the libido,

centered around feelings of sex and love. Schutz (1958) has related Jung's concepts with inclusion; Adler's concepts with control; and Freud's concepts with affection. If what Schutz (1958) postulated (that every individual has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection) is true, personality types should fall into these three different categories.

According to Horney (1945) the individual chooses between three possible moves to cope with the environment; these are "moving away from people," "moving against people," and "moving toward people." The undersocial is well described within Horney's framework. The description of the undersocial is closely related to the area of inclusion. This type of person avoids having responsibility and intimate contact with other individuals; he wants only to stay away from others because they may not understand him. All of his efforts and qualities are directed towards his main need: not getting involved. The undersocial needs to put an imaginary wall between himself and others in every possible contact with others. Apparently this type of person seems to get along with people. The impression that people get from the undersocial is that he is independent although his aim is not to let others influence, coerce, or make him do certain things. Other people's

expectations, rules, standards and timetables, even marriage are a threat to him. Outwardly he seems to conform to all expectations, rules, standards and timetables, but inside he rebels and rejects them all (Horney, 1945).

In "moving against people" Horney described mainly the autocrat in the area of control. The focus is on power regardless of love. This type of person accepts the hostility around him and is ready to fight and rebel. He distrusts every feeling and good intention of others with him. For his protection and for revenge, he desires to be the strongest and the winner. The root of his need is derived from the belief that only the strongest and most powerful survive; therefore, if he strongly believes it, his need is one of control over others in order to survive. The power seeker maneuvers to dominate in different ways, either by using direct authority or by using indirect manipulation.

Similar to the overpersonal described by Schutz (1958) is Horney's "moving toward people." This type of person feels helpless, so he tries to lean on others and win affection; there is a strong need for affection; thus, he feels safe when his desire for love is fulfilled. This marked need for love, approval, and a companion may be summarized as the desire for human intimacy.

Freud's (1950) classification applicable to inclusion, control, and affection falls within the category of what he calls "normal." He described the undersocial in the inclusion area, the autocrat in the control area, and the overpersonal in the affection area. Freud labeled these three libidinal types as the narcissistic, the obsessional, and the erotic. The main interest of the narcissistic type, as in inclusion, is self-preservation. This type of person is characterized by independence; he gets involved in activities and assumes the role of leader. The obsessional type desires to be a strong authoritative figure, similar to the autocrat. For this type of person, the governing force is the anxiety of the conscience.

The erotic type can be identified with the affection area. This erotic or overpersonal is mostly concerned with love. Being loved is the most important thing in life. The fear of losing the love of someone makes the erotic dependent on the person who has the power to give or withhold love for him. Freud's libidinal types seem to correspond with Schutz's (1958) inclusion, control, and affection types.

Fromm's types of interpersonal relations corresponding to inclusion, control, and affection are withdrawal-destructiveness, symbiotic, and love. The withdrawal-

destructiveness type feels powerless; therefore, he gets away from people who are experienced as threats. There is an inner feeling of indifference toward others masked by special interest in others. The outer form of the withdrawal-destructiveness is the desire to destroy others by fear of being destroyed by them. Being ignored in a social sense is interpreted as being destroyed.

The symbiotic type corresponds to Schutz's control area. In this personality type emphasis is on power relation and freedom. He never gets to be completely independent; the fear of aloneness makes him become part of another person, either by absorbing his personality or being absorbed by the other person. The person who escapes from freedom is the one who looks for security in another, giving up the self and attaching his self to another individual. This dependency may be masked by love or sacrifice. The outer form of the symbiotic type is to have complete dominion over another person. He is characterized by closeness and intimacy at the expense of freedom and integrity.

Fromm's type corresponding to affection is love. This type is the most productive of all the personality types so far described. It is characterized by responsibility, care, respect, knowledge, and the wish to let the

other person grow and develop. The expression of love in an intimate relationship is conditioned to the preservation of each other's integrity. This type of person has a positive attitude toward others in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Fromm called this type of person the well adjusted individual.

The study of interpersonal relationships has been researched extensively for scientific as well as for clinical purposes, specifically in the formation of different kinds of days as well as in the relationship of an individual within a group. Schutz's (1978) interpersonal needs (inclusion, control, and affection) form the foundation for studying the interpersonal relations between people. Based on his theory, the term "interpersonal" has been defined as the relations occurring between people. The term need refers to a condition of a person, the realization of which leads to undesirable consequences. An interpersonal need is one that may be satisfied only through the establishment of a satisfactory relation with other persons.

Schutz's (1978) scale is designed to help the individual be aware of the way her perceives himself and of his relations to other people. The measure of the way the individual behaves is in terms of the present; the person

has the choice and power to change his behavior at any given time whenever he is not pleased with his behavior.

The truth in a person is what is true about himself. When the individual becomes aware, he allows himself to know his truth. Becoming aware helps the person deal more efficiently with his life. Not letting oneself become aware permits many things to stay in his unconscious; this means that the person is making choices without knowing what he is choosing. By being aware one allows himself to run his own life. The key to successful interpersonal relations is honesty, and a person is honest when he shares his awareness with other people.

The core of the theory behind the FIRO-B is based on the phrase "people need people." Schutz (1978) postulated that all the relationships between people may be grouped into three dimensions, that is inclusion, control, and affection. In all three categories, there is a need to establish and maintain a satisfactory relationship with people. With each dimension, there is an explicit word that encompasses its meaning. For example, the key word for inclusion is interaction; for control is power; and for affection is love. Some terms that imply positive inclusion are communicate, pay attention to, togetherness, join, companion, and belong. Terms that connote negative

inclusion are lonely, detached, ignore, withdrawn, and outcast. Authority, dominance, influence, superior, and leader are some of the terms most related to positive control. Negative control is best stated with the terms submissive, rebellion, and follower. Personal, intimate, friend, and emotionally close are terms that denote positive affection. Some of the terms that stand for negative affection are hate, cool, and rejecting.

The second part of the theory of interpersonal relations is based on the postulate that people need others to give and to receive. For many people, the source of happiness is other people, and people need people, whether it is for their joy or misery (Schutz, 1967). This part of the relationship of giving and receiving has two directions: wanted and expressed behavior, the behavior a person expresses toward others and the way this person wants others to behave with him. The interpersonal needs (inclusion, control, and affection) of a person are not completely satisfied by other people responding toward the self in any particular way. Nor are the needs of a person entirely satisfied by acting toward others in a particular way. The interpersonal nature of an individual requires that he establish and maintain an equilibrium, a satisfactory

balance within the three areas (inclusion, control, and affection) and between the self and others.

Inclusion

This interpersonal need refers to the desire to be attended to, wanting to attract attention and interest. Inclusion behavior is the first step of a cycle that repeats itself in the formation of a relationship between people, between dyads or between a person and a group. While control is concerned with top or bottom, affection is concerned with close or far; and inclusion deals with in or out. People with low scores on inclusion are called undersocial (Schultz, 1967); they tend to be introverted and withdrawn. They want to stay at a distance from others and insist that they do not want to be involved with people. But unconsciously they want people to pay attention to them. What the undersocial fears most is that people with whom he relates will leave him out, will ignore him, will not be interested in him. Since he really believes that he is worthless, empty, that his self is of no value, he decides to stay away from people instead of taking the risk of being ignored. The technique used by the persons who score low on inclusion is self-sufficiency and complete independence from people. His feelings are summarized as follows: "Since I am worthless, I am going

to stay away from people; I will not depend on them." He thinks that if no one pays attention to him, he must be of no value whatsoever. His anxiety is based on the feeling of abandonment.

The oversocial is like the undersocial; the only difference is in the way they behave; the overt behavior says: "Pay attention to me." He feels the need to make people pay attention to him because he feels his self is of no value. He is constantly looking for companionship; he cannot be alone. All of his activities are planned to be with people, to be together with others. In this way, he forces people to notice him. He needs people to counteract his feeling of emptiness. He usually tends to be in power but only to gain attention (Schutz, 1967).

Individuals who do not have this need feel comfortable when they are with people and when they are alone. Unconsciously this type of individual feels that he is a valuable person. Either taking contact with others or being alone is acceptable to him (Schutz, 1967).

Control

In the development of an interpersonal relation, control follows inclusion. Inclusion is the first step towards a relation while control behavior is the second step; it determines the kind of relationship that will be

established. Once the relationship has been formed, people start taking different roles, and often power struggles are of main concern. An abdicrat is the person who scores too low on control. This role is characterized by submissiveness, giving up power and responsibility. People low on control often tend not to take responsibility for making decisions; they do not control others; they prefer to be followers and let others be the decision-makers. Therefore, final decisions are never made by an abdicrat. He has the feeling that he is incompetent and irresponsible and others know it. The feelings of inadequacy make him avoid situations that will confirm his feelings.

On the other extreme is the autocrat, the person who scores high on control. He wants to be at the top with the rest of the people with whom he relates as followers. One of the autocrat's fears is that he will not be able to control people; instead people will dominate him. As with the abdicrat, the autocrat has the feeling that he is incompetent and irresponsible. The autocrat takes every opportunity to prove to himself and others that he is responsible and capable of making decisions; in that way he can be in power.

For the person who does not have the need for power or the need to be powerless, giving or not giving orders or making decisions is appropriate when the circumstances determine it. He feels comfortable in both situations when he is either in command or a follower. This person feels that other people trust him and respect him and that he is capable of decision-making (Schutz, 1967).

Affection

In the development of an interpersonal relation, affection is the last phase. Once a relation has been established and the participants have worked out how they are going to relate to each other, affection ties are formed. The low score on affection is indicative of a person who tends to have superficial relationships with others; he also feels comfortable when others behave the same with him. His wish is not to get emotionally involved; he desires to keep the relationship at a distance. According to Schutz (1978), this is the underpersonal; this type of person fears that no one loves him. Because he feels unlovable, he can not accept other people's feelings of love toward him. Usually the underpersonal has been rejected, and the affection area is painful; therefore, he avoids close personal relations with others. The technique is to be superficially friendly

to everyone; this protects him from becoming personal with another person. The overpersonal is the type of person who scores high on affection; his desire is to become extremely close to others; he desires others to treat him in a personal way and be very close to him. His unconscious feelings tell him that even though the affection experiences were unhappy, if he tries again, they may be happy this time. He feels unlovable and rejected so he tries to relieve this anxiety and gain approval by attempting to be extremely personal and intimate.

Both the overpersonal and the underpersonal have a strong need for affection. Behind the anxiety of ever being loved is a great deal of hostility due to the feeling that he will be rejected (Schutz, 1967).

Close emotional relations with others is no problem for those individuals who resolved their affectional relations with others in childhood. He feels good (no anxiety) in a situation that requires close emotional relations as well as in a situation that requires emotional distance.

It is important for this individual to be liked by others, but if he is not liked, he interprets the dislike as the relation between himself and another individual. Being disliked does not mean that he is an unlovable

person. It is acceptable to be liked by some and not liked by others. This type of person is capable of close emotional ties, of giving genuine affection to those with whom he feels close, and with others maintaining an emotional distance; he feels lovable; therefore, there is no need to be overpersonal or underpersonal in his relationship with others (Schutz, 1967).

A study concerned with interpersonal relations was done by Pollack (1971). He wanted to investigate the effect of group composition (heterogeneous and homogeneous). The results indicated that heterogeneous groups expressed positive change on the FIRO-B as shown between the expressed and wanted behaviors.

Mendelsohn and Rankin (1969) examined the client-counselor compatibility and the outcome of counseling. Results indicated that FIRO-B compatibility scores can reveal predictors of outcome for the female client.

The FIRO-B served as an aid to the counselor and client in predicting couple's interpersonal compatibility (Robbins & Toomer, 1976) where they find that the areas of constant fighting among the couples studied were control and affection. If one of the spouses tried to take control, the other spouse would withhold his affection as punishment. Teacher-pupil compatibility (as measured by

the FIRO-B and the FIRO-BC) and teacher's ratings of children's behavior was examined by Bloom (1976); in the study, he found that there is no relationship between the variables mentioned.

A study of elementary and secondary school teachers (Bruininks, 1978) revealed that teachers whose scores were high on expressed control (using the FIRO-B) tended to praise school work more than children's ideas, initiative, creativity, ideas and personal and social behavior.

Kuehl, DiMarco, and Wims (1975) used the FIRO-B to support the hypothesis that an individual's leadership orientation is influenced by his interpersonal needs.

Burke and Weir (1976) studied the personality characteristics of spouses in traditional and two-career families; all respondents completed the FIRO-B. The results indicated that members of two-career families scored lower in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. Although not statistically significant, members of the two-career families were more highly educated than members of the traditional family. Housewives scored high on expressed and wanted inclusion, expressed and wanted affection, and wanted control. They had the lowest score on expressed control. A significant finding is the fact that women in two-career families scored high on expressed

control but scored lower on the remaining five scales. This finding may suggest that working wives are not so concerned in getting gratification or fulfillment through interpersonal relationships with other persons as housewives are. Husbands of housewives scored high on expressed control and lower on wanted control. The results implied that spouses in dual-career families are autonomous and more self-reliant than spouses in a traditional family. Where working wives are more assertive than housewives, husbands of housewives were more concerned with power and dominance than husbands of working wives.

This study may suggest that work, education, and income give power to women. Housewives were less assertive, less concerned with power and more willing to give up responsibility and authority to the husband. Less educated husbands with housewives may be more concerned with power, authority and responsibility for decision-making. It seems that husbands in traditional families fit the stereotyped male role better than husbands in dual-career families. Dual-career families fit in the companionship marriage in which power is shared by the spouses, a type of relationship that allows for growth and development of two different personalities.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Description of the Subjects

The sample for this study consisted of a captive audience of married female graduate students enrolled during the summer of 1980 at a university in the North Texas region. A random sample representative of a specific population is not claimed since subjects volunteered to participate in the study by answering the questionnaires. A cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assuring anonymity was attached to the demographic information sheet. The data was obtained from 148 women who completed a general information sheet about their lives. Two questionnaires were included, the FIRO-B and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale.

Procedure

The approval from the Human Research Review Committee was sought in order to carry on the study at a university in the North Texas region. Verbal consent was secured from the professors to administer the questionnaires during class time. Only married female graduate students were asked to participate. Oral and written instructions were

given to the participants. Those who volunteered to participate in the study did so knowing that answering the questionnaires was interpreted as giving consent to participate in it. A cover letter was attached to the instruments briefly explaining the purpose of the study.

Instrumentation

The following instruments were used in the study:

(a) The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale (Locke & Wallace, 1959) consists of fifteen items; the possible score ranges from 2 to 158 points. The lowest score in the scale line means very unhappy; middle scores mean happy; and the highest possible score means perfectly happy. The reliability coefficient for The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale computed by the split-half technique was of .90. Locke and Wallace (1959) indicated that the scale has validity since it measures what it intends to measure, that is, marital adjustment, and (b) The FIRO-B (Schutz, 1978) is a sociometric questionnaire consisting of six scales, comprising 54 items that make up a total score. This questionnaire uses the Guttman scales techniques, measuring the typical way one interacts with people in the areas of inclusion, control, and affection. This instrument facilitates the prediction

of interaction between people, the assumption that all human interaction falls into three categories: inclusion, control and affection. This scale measures the need to establish a satisfactory relationship with people in respect to interaction, association, control, power, love and affection. The behavior may be in two directions, the expressed and the wanted behavior. Expressed behavior is the behavior one expresses towards others whereas wanted behavior is the behavior one desires from others. Each of the six scales contain nine items. The scales are defined as follows: (a) expressed inclusion-one desires to mingle with others, to communicate and express interest in other people; (b) wanted inclusion-one is detached, a loner, also shows withdrawn characteristics; one expresses the need for others to invite him; (c) expressed control-one feels the need to make decisions, be in power, have authority and even tell others what to do; (d) wanted control-one feels the need to be controlled by others, to be submissive or a follower; (e) expressed affection-one needs to be emotionally close, intimate and friendly; (f) wanted affection-one desires others to show affection and be friendly; one may act cool, rejecting and at other times be emotionally distant. Included with the questionnaires were 24 demographic items which gave a general background of the

respondent's life as well as a view of the family income, and the educational and occupational status of the spouses. Reproducibility measures the coefficient of internal consistency, which not only indicates the degree to which the items measure the same thing but allows for the items to occur in a certain order. The FIRO-B exceeds the 90% criterion of reproducibility of all six scales. The coefficient of stability is the correlation test scores and retest after a period of time (1 week). The test retest coefficient of stability ranges between 71% through 82% on the six FIRO-B scales. The content validity measures how well the test items measure the content about which conclusions will be drawn. Content validity is a property of all cumulative scales, therefore of the FIRO-B scales. Reliability and validity for this instrument have been established (Schutz, 1978).

Analysis of Data

To analyze the demographic information about the subjects, a percentage and frequency count was utilized. A percentage and frequency distribution was also used to determine wives' perceptions of marital adjustment; (mostly concerned with the perceived degree of happiness in the marriage) and wives' interpersonal relationships. The most

important areas in the study of interpersonal relationships was the respondents' personal need for expression toward others or the desire for others to behave in specific ways towards the respondents.

A Pearson correlation coefficient was computed to examine the relationships between each of the six interpersonal needs and marital adjustment. The one-way analysis of variance on the FIRO-B Scale scores and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores across demographic categories were utilized in the examination of the hypotheses. Also, a correlation on the FIRO-B and The Short-Marital Adjustment within demographic groups was done.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Description of Subjects

A general description of the 148 married female graduate students who participated in this study is presented in Table 1. The respondents ranged from age 20 to over 46. The highest percentage (43%) was in the age categories between 36 and 45. The smallest proportions were in the age categories of 20 to 25 (5%). At the time of the study, all of the respondents were enrolled during the summer of 1980 at a university in the North Texas region. Not all respondents were pursuing specific degrees; 97% reported that they were students; 76% were part-time students and 23% were enrolled as full-time students. The highest proportion--96 students (65%)--were Master's candidates; 27 (18%) were Doctor's candidates while only 25 (17%) were post-graduate. Of those respondents pursuing a Master's degree, 71 had from 0-24 credit hours beyond the last degree obtained. Only one subject had from 50-100 earned credit hours beyond the Bachelor's degree. The highest number of respondents had from 0-24 earned credit hours towards the

doctorate while only 3 respondents had from 50-100 earned credit hours beyond the Master's degree. Besides being students and wives, 132 (90%) were employed; only 14 (10%) were not employed. The respondents reported having husbands with either a Bachelor's (38%) degree or Master's (24%) degree; the smallest proportion was among those whose husbands held a Doctor's degree (10%). Ninety-seven percent of the respondents' husbands were employed; only 3% were not employed. The occupation of 131 respondents was either teaching, administration or research in an educational setting; the smallest proportion (6) were in white collar, clerical or sales positions. The husbands' occupations were distributed as 40 among other professionals, which includes lawyers, physicians, and executives; the lowest number (11) were among other occupations. The highest percent (25%) were among those respondents who had been married for over 16 years; the two lowest percent (16) were among those women married between 1 and 5 years, and 11 and 15 years. Of the 148 subjects, only 24 had been previously divorced; 4 were former widows, and only 1 respondent had her previous marriage ended by annulment. Seventy-two (49%) respondents indicated they had not more than two children, while only 5% indicated they had five or more children. The ages of the children were 13 and over while only 7 respondents indicated having children 1 year

old and younger.

The husband was the one who earned most of the income for 115 (78%) families; only 10 wives (7%) indicated they earned most of the income for the family. The yearly combined income range for 80 families was over \$31,000; only 1 respondent reported a yearly income between \$5,000 and \$10,000. Of those respondents who were previously divorced or separated, only 9 indicated that they were students at the time of the divorce or separation; 23 indicated that they were not students at the time of the divorce or separation. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents felt that their educational attainments had contributed to their marital satisfaction; 21% gave no as an answer. No was the answer of 115 respondents when they were asked to indicate if their educational attainments had contributed to their marital dissatisfaction. Seventy-two percent of the wives felt that their educational status did not make their husbands feel superior or inferior while 5% reported that their husbands felt superior to the wives' educational attainments. Seventy-eight percent of the subjects felt that their occupational status did not present a threat to the self-image of their spouses; only 7% indicated that their occupational status presented a threat to the self-image of their spouses. The respondents indicated that if their educational levels were higher than

their spouses' educational level, they felt equal to their spouses (35%); only 4% indicated they felt superior to their spouses. Eighty-one percent indicated that they had worked before marriage; only 19% had not worked before marriage. Once married 64% indicated that they had stayed at home from 0 to 1 year, only 3% had stayed at home following marriage from 5 to 6 years.

Table 1
Characteristics of Female Graduate Students

Variable	Category	Number	Percent
Age.	20-25	8	5.4
	26-30	20	13.5
	31-35	30	20.3
	36-45	64	43.2
	46- Above	26	17.6
At present are you a student?	Yes	144	97.3
	No	4	2.7
If a student, are you enrolled?	Part-time	106	76.3
	Full-time	33	23.7
What degree are you pursuing?	Master's	96	64.9
	Doctor's	27	18.2
	Post-graduate	25	16.9
Credit hours earned beyond the last degree obtained.	B.A. 0-24	70	47.4
	25-49	26	17.7
	50-100	1	.7
	M.A. 0-24	36	24.1
	25-49	12	8.1
	50-100	3	2.0

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Percent
Are you employed?	Yes	134	90.4
	No	14	9.6
Educational level of your spouse.	High School	17	11.5
	College credits	25	16.9
	Bachelor's degree	56	37.9
	Master's degree	36	24.3
	Doctor's degree	14	9.5
Is your spouse employed?	Yes	143	96.6
	No	5	3.4
Your occupation.	Teaching, administration or research in an educational setting.	131	88.5
	White collar, clerical or sales.	6	4.1
Spouse's	Other	11	7.4
	Teaching, administration or research in an educational setting.	27	18.2
	Other professional.	40	27.1
	Managerial, owner of business.	27	18.2
	White collar, clerical or sales.	17	11.5
	Skilled or semi-skilled worker.	26	17.5
	Other	11	7.5
How long have you been married to your present spouse?	1-5 years	23	15.9
	6-10 years	29	20.0
	11-15 years	23	15.9
	16-20 years	39	24.8
	21-More years	34	23.4

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Percent
If this is not your first marriage, was ended by?	Divorce	24	82.4
	Death of spouse	4	13.8
	Annulment	1	3.4
State the number of children you have.	None	27	18.2
	1-2	72	48.7
	3-4	41	27.7
	5-More	8	5.4
What are their ages?	Infant-1 year	7	3.2
	2-5 years	38	17.5
	7-12 years	51	23.5
	13-Over	121	55.8
Who earns most of the income for your family?	Respondent	10	6.8
	Spouse	115	77.8
	Equal	23	15.4
Yearly combined income range.	\$5,000-10,000	1	.7
	11,000-15,000	5	3.4
	16,000-20,000	11	7.4
	21,000-25,000	24	16.2
	26,000-30,000	27	18.2
	31,000-Above	80	54.1
If you were previously divorced, were you a student at that time?	Yes	9	28.1
	No	23	71.9
Your educational attainments have contributed to your marital satisfaction.	Yes	117	78.6
	No	31	21.4

Table 1 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Percent
Your educational attainments have contributed to your marital dissatisfaction.	Yes	22	16.1
	No	126	83.9
Your educational status in some way makes your spouse feel.	Superior	8	5.4
	Inferior	17	11.5
	Neither	106	71.6
	Not applicable	17	11.5
Your occupational status presents a threat to the self-image of your spouse.	Yes	11	7.5
	No	116	78.9
	Don't know	15	10.2
	Not applicable	6	3.4
Did you ever work before marriage	Yes	120	81.0
	No	28	19.0
Once married, how long did you stay at home before you started working?	0-1 year	95	64.2
	2-4 years	21	14.2
	5-6 years	4	2.7
	7-8 years	5	3.4
	9-10 years	8	5.4
	11-More	15	10.1

Short-Marital Adjustment Scale Item Responses

The responses to items in The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale indicated that the subjects perceived their marriages as happy. Respondents rated themselves on the scale line which described the degree of happiness (all things considered) of their marriages at the time of the study.

The scale gradually ranged on one side from those who are very unhappy in marriage (0) through the middle point (happy-15) which represents the degree of happiness that most people get from marriage to the other extreme (perfectly happy-35), those few who experience extreme joy in marriage. One hundred six respondents rated themselves as happy while only 13 felt they were unhappy in their marriages. The highest per cent was in the category of "almost always agree," in the following variables: in family finances (43%), recreation (52%), affection (49%), friends (51%), and sex relations (43%). The per cent on the category "always disagree" was less than 3 per cent on the mentioned variables. The wives responded most favorably to the item, "If you had your life to live over, would you marry the same person?" The mean was 114.2 while the highest possible score on marital adjustment was 158.

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
Degree of happiness.	Very unhappy	13	8.8
	Happy	106	71.5
	Perfectly happy	29	19.7
Handling family finances.	Always disagree	2	1.4
	Almost always disagree	4	2.7
	Frequently disagree	11	7.4
	Occasionally disagree	45	30.4
	Almost always agree	64	43.2
	Always agree	22	14.9
Matters of recreation.	Always disagree	1	.7
	Almost always disagree	3	2.0
	Frequently disagree	9	6.1
	Occasionally disagree	39	26.4
	Almost always agree	77	52.0
	agree		
	Always agree	19	12.8
Demonstrations of affection.	Always disagree	4	2.7
	Almost always disagree	3	2.0
	Frequently disagree	12	8.1
	Occasionally disagree	25	16.9
	Almost always agree	73	49.3
	agree		
	Always agree	31	20.9

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
Friends.	Always disagree	2	1.4
	Almost always disagree	2	1.4
	Frequently disagree	1	.7
	Occasionally disagree	33	22.3
	Almost always agree	76	51.4
	Always agree	34	23.0
Sex relations.	Always disagree	5	3.4
	Almost always disagree	4	2.7
	Frequently disagree	7	4.7
	Occasionally disagree	34	23.0
	Almost always agree	63	42.6
	Always agree	35	23.6
Conventionality.	Always disagree	2	1.4
	Frequently disagree	12	8.1
	Occasionally disagree	24	16.2
	Almost always agree	64	43.2
	Always agree	46	31.1
Philosophy of life.	Always disagree	2	1.4
	Almost always disagree	3	2.0
	Frequently disagree	14	9.5
	Occasionally disagree	24	16.2
	Almost always agree	67	45.3
	Always agree	38	25.7

Table 2 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
Ways of dealing with in-laws.	Always disagree	4	2.7
	Almost always disagree	2	1.4
	Frequently disagree	11	7.4
	Occasionally disagree	25	16.9
	Almost always agree	66	44.6
	Always agree	40	27.0
When disagreements arise they usually result in.	Husband giving in	10	6.8
	Wife giving in	27	18.2
	Mutual agreement	111	75.0
Mates engage in out-side interest together.	None of them	2	1.4
	Very few	24	16.2
	Some of them	102	68.9
	All of them	20	13.5
In leisure time, you generally prefer to.	Opposite	32	24.2
	Both on the go	26	19.7
	Both at home	74	56.1
You ever wish you had not married?	Frequently	7	4.7
	Occasionally	36	24.3
	Rarely	45	30.4
	Never	60	40.5
Do you confide in your mate?	Almost never	4	2.7
	Rarely	9	6.1
	In most or everything	135	91.2

Table 3

Marital Adjustment Data (N=148)

Scale	Mean	<u>SD</u>
Marital Adjustment	114.2	31.26

Expressed Inclusion Scale item Responses

The responses to items on The Expressed Inclusion Scale showed that the respondents on the average possessed moderate desires with respect to interaction and association with people; they function without anxiety in one area of interpersonal relations (inclusion). The scores ranged from a low of 0-2 to a high score of 7-9; the mean on this scale was 4.46, a moderate score.

The respondents showed the highest scores on the following items: "I try to be with people;" "Include others in my plans;" "Tend to join in;" and "Participate in group activities." The lowest scores in The Expressed Inclusion Scale were on the "never" category.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Expressed Inclusion Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I try to be with people.	Rarely	1	.7
	Occasionally	12	8.2
	Sometimes	31	21.1
	Often	76	51.7
	Usually	27	18.4
I join social groups.	Never	6	4.1
	Rarely	29	19.6
	Occasionally	38	25.7
	Sometimes	39	26.4
	Often	26	17.6
	Usually	10	6.8
Join social organizations.	Never	7	4.7
	Rarely	40	27.0
	Occasionally	47	31.8
	Sometimes	27	18.2
	Often	18	12.2
	Usually	9	6.1
Informal social activities.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	8	5.4
	Occasionally	35	23.8
	Sometimes	50	34.0
	Often	45	30.6
	Usually	8	5.4
Include others in my plans.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	2	1.4
	Occasionally	14	9.5
	Sometimes	42	28.6
	Often	63	42.9
	Usually	25	17.0
Have people around me.	Rarely	7	4.8
	Occasionally	27	18.4
	Sometimes	50	34.0
	Often	48	32.7

Table 4 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
	Usually	15	10.2
Tend to join in.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	10	6.8
	Ocasionally	32	21.9
	Sometimes	61	41.8
	Often	31	21.2
	Usually	11	7.5
Avoid being alone.	Never	9	6.1
	Rarely	46	31.3
	Occasionally	34	23.1
	Sometimes	42	28.6
	Often	12	8.2
	Usually	4	2.7
Participate in group activities.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	11	7.5
	Occasionally	19	13.0
	Sometimes	64	43.8
	Often	39	26.7
	Usually	12	8.2

Wanted Inclusion Scale Item Responses

As shown on Table 5, respondents scored low on The Wanted Inclusion Scale. The mean score was 2.83; among all of the six scales means, wanted inclusion was the one with the lowest mean (see Table 10). The highest per cent was among the items "I like people to invite me to things" (49%); "I like people to invite me to join their activities" (48%); "I like people to invite me to participate in their

activities" (56%). There was a low score on the item: "I like people to include me in their activities" (.7%).

Table 5
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Wanted Inclusion Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
Like people to invite me to things.	One or two	1	.7
	A few people	27	18.5
	Some people	71	48.6
	Many people	36	24.7
	Most people	11	7.5
Invite me to join their activities.	One or two	6	4.1
	A few people	26	17.7
	Some people	70	47.6
	Many people	33	22.4
	Most people	12	8.2
I like people to include me in their activities.	Nobody	1	.7
	One or two	2	1.4
	A few people	25	17.0
	Some people	82	55.8
	Many people	23	15.6
I like people ask me to participate in their discussions.	Most people	14	9.5
	Nobody	1	.7
	One or two	10	6.8
	A few people	11	7.5
	Some people	60	41.1
I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	Many people	47	32.2
	Most people	17	11.6
	Nobody	1	.7
I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.	One or two	3	2.0
	A few people	15	10.2
	Some people	68	46.3
	Many people	41	27.9

Table 5 (Continued)

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Wanted Inclusion Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
	Most people	20	13.6
I like people to invite me to things.	Never	2	1.4
	Rarely	2	1.4
	Occasionally	23	15.6
	Sometimes	51	34.7
	Often	45	30.6
	Usually	24	16.3
I like people to invite me to join their activities.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	1	.7
	Occasionally	21	14.3
	Sometimes	64	43.5
	Often	42	28.6
	Usually	18	12.2
I like people to include me in their activities.	Rarely	2	1.4
	Occasionally	18	12.2
	Sometimes	64	43.5
	Often	41	27.9
	Usually	22	15.0
I like people to invite me participate in their activities.	Rarely	3	2.0
	Occasionally	19	12.0
	Sometimes	64	43.5
	Often	40	27.2
	Usually	21	14.3

Expressed Control Scale Item Responses

Table 6 describes how the respondents evaluated themselves in the area of expressed control. When asked to indicate the category they felt was most representative of their behavior, ("I try to take charge of things when I am with people"), 65 respondents answered "some people" (44%). The lowest category of "never" had one response (.7%) for the item: "I try to have people do things I want."

Table 10 shows a mean of 3.07 on The Expressed Control Scale, a moderate score. The respondents seemed not to be concerned with the control area up to the point of being hostile or anxious about it.

Table 6
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Expressed Control Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I try to influence strongly other people's actions.	Nobody	11	7.5
	One or two	25	17.0
	A few people	48	32.7
	Some people	48	32.7
	Many people	10	6.8
	Most people	5	3.4
I try to take charge of things when I am with people.	Nobody	4	2.7
	One or two	29	19.7
	A few people	33	22.4
	Some people	65	44.2

Table 6 (Continued)

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Expressed Control Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
	Many people	13	8.8
	Most people	3	2.0
Try to have things done my way.	Nobody	12	8.2
	One or two	36	24.5
	A few people	31	21.4
	Some people	47	32.0
	Many people	13	8.8
	Most people	8	5.4
Try to be the dominant person.	Never	9	6.1
	Rarely	40	27.2
	Occasionally	38	25.9
	Sometimes	43	29.3
	Often	15	10.2
	Usually	2	1.4
Try to have people do things I want.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	34	23.1
	Occasionally	4	27.9
	Sometimes	53	36.1
	Often	14	9.5
	Usually	4	2.7
I try to influence strongly other people's actions	Never	10	6.8
	Rarely	39	26.5
	Occasionally	38	25.9
	Sometimes	47	32.0
	Often	11	7.5
	Usually	2	1.4
Take charge of things when I am with people.	Never	3	2.0
	Rarely	39	26.5
	Occasionally	37	25.2
	Sometimes	49	33.3
	Often	17	11.6
	Usually	2	1.4

Table 6 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
Do things the way I want them done.	Never	8	5.4
	Rarely	24	16.3
	Occasionally	61	41.5
	Sometimes	36	24.5
	Often	16	10.9
	Usually	2	1.4
Take charge of things when I am with people.	Never	2	1.4
	Rarely	31	21.1
	Occasionally	43	29.3
	Sometimes	48	32.7
	Often	20	13.6
	Usually	3	2.0

Wanted Control Scale Item Responses

The responses to items in The Wanted Control Scale disclosed that the respondents possessed positive attitudes in their relationship with people. Table 7 shows the responses to the items. Responses to "I let other people strongly influence my actions" showed that the respondents are very much in control of their own lives and will allow only one or two persons to influence their actions (45%); the lowest score had 2 responses (1%): only two respondents will allow most people to influence their actions. Seventy-one respondents (48%) sometimes let other people decide what to do while only 2 respondents never let other people decide what to do. As further indicated on Table 10,

the mean score on wanted control was 3.53, a moderate score indicative of a democratic type of personality, that is, the type of person who has no problems with power and control.

Table 7
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Wanted Control Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I let other people decide what to do.	Never	2	1.4
	Rarely	6	4.1
	Occasionally	34	23.0
	Sometimes	71	48.0
	Often	27	18.2
	Usually	8	5.4
I let other people strongly influence my actions.	Never	5	3.4
	Rarely	39	26.4
	Occasionally	52	35.1
	Sometimes	42	28.4
	Often	10	6.8
I let other people control my actions.	Never	7	4.8
	Rarely	62	42.2
	Occasionally	46	31.3
	Sometimes	24	16.3
	Often	7	4.8
	Usually	1	.7
I am easily led by people.	Never	8	5.5
	Rarely	61	41.8
	Occasionally	46	31.5
	Sometimes	26	17.8
	Often	5	3.4
I let other people decide what to do.	Nobody	2	1.4
	One or two	34	22.1
	A few people	43	29.3

Table 7 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
	Some people	45	30.6
	Many people	11	7.5
	Most people	12	8.2
I let other people take charge of things.	Nobody	6	4.1
	One or two	42	28.8
	A few people	44	30.1
	Some people	47	32.2
	Many people	4	2.7
	Most people	3	2.1
I let other people strongly influence my actions.	Nobody	11	7.5
	One or two	66	45.2
	A few people	47	32.2
	Some people	19	13.0
	Many people	1	.7
	Most people	2	1.4
I let other people control my actions.	Nobody	36	24.5
	One or two	56	38.1
	A few people	41	27.9
	Some people	10	6.8
	Many people	2	1.4
	Most people	2	1.4
I am easily led by people.	Nobody	31	21.1
	One or two	72	49.0
	A few people	34	23.1
	Some people	9	6.1
	Many people	1	.7

Expressed Affection Scale Item Responses

The responses to items in The Expressed Affection Scale revealed that 56% of the respondents try to be friendly to most people; only one respondent will be friendly to only

one or two persons. Thirty per cent of the respondents will act cool and distant in their personal relations with few people; 2% will act cool and distant to most people (see Table 8). The mean in the expressed affection area was 3.86, a moderate score. The mean score may indicate that the respondents do not have problems in a personal relation or in a relation that requires emotional distance (see Table 10).

Table 8
Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Expressed Affection Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I try to have relationships with people.	Rarely	8	5.4
	Occasionally	17	11.5
	Sometimes	51	34.5
	Often	43	29.1
	Usually	29	19.6
I try to have close personal relationships with people.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	10	6.8
	Occasionally	19	12.9
	Sometimes	43	29.3
	Often	48	32.7
	Usually	26	17.7
I try to get close and personal with people.	Rarely	14	9.6
	Occasionally	22	15.1
	Sometimes	51	34.9
	Often	44	30.1
	Usually	15	10.3

Table 8 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I try to be friendly to people.	One or two	1	.7
	A few people	10	6.8
	Some people	17	11.5
	Many people	37	25.0
	Most people	83	56.1
My personal relations with people are cool and distant.	Nobody	19	13.1
	One or two	38	26.2
	A few people	44	30.3
	Some people	37	25.5
	Many people	3	2.1
	Most people	4	2.8
I try to have close relationships with people.	Nobody	1	.7
	One or two	16	10.9
	A few people	39	26.5
	Some people	60	40.8
	Many people	18	12.2
	Most people	13	8.8
I try to get close and personal with people.	Nobody	1	.7
	One or two	17	11.6
	A few people	43	29.5
	Some people	60	41.1
	Many people	18	12.3
	Most people	7	4.8
I act cool and distant with people.	Nobody	21	14.3
	One or two	46	31.3
	A few people	39	26.5
	Some people	32	21.8
	Many people	4	2.7
	Most people	5	3.4
I try to have close, personal relationships with people.	Nobody	1	.7
	One or two	20	13.6
	A few people	40	27.2
	Some people	59	40.1
	Many people	18	12.2
	Most people	9	6.1

Wanted Affection Scale Item Responses

The responses to the item "I like people to act friendly toward me" received the most (51%) favorable responses. The respondents tend to be friendly to most people. Only 2% will be friendly to few people. Fifty-six per cent of the respondents do not like people to act cool and distant toward them; less than one (.7%) preferred most people to act cool and distant toward them (see Table 9). The mean on The Wanted Affection Scale was 4.91 (see Table 10), the highest mean among all of the six scales on the FIRO-B. It may be indicative of a desire for warmth and affection. This type of person is capable of giving love and affection.

Table 9

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Wanted Affection Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I like people to act close and personal with me.	One or two	12	8.2
	A few people	31	12.1
	Some people	73	49.7
	Many people	20	13.6
	Most people	11	7.5
I like people to act close toward me.	One or two	10	6.8
	A few people	42	28.6
	Some people	61	41.5
	Many people	22	15.0
	Most people	12	8.2

Table 9 (Continued)

Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Responses
to The Wanted Affection Scale

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I like people to act cool and distant toward me.	Nobody	81	55.5
	One or two	32	21.9
	A few people	19	13.0
	Some people	13	8.9
	Most people	1	.7
I like people to act friendly toward me.	A few people	3	2.0
	Some people	28	19.0
	Many people	41	27.9
	Most people	75	51.0
I like people to act distant toward me.	Nobody	86	58.5
	One or two	29	19.7
	A few people	16	10.9
	Some people	14	8.8
	Many people	1	.7
	Most people	2	1.4
I like people to act close toward me.	Never	1	.7
	Rarely	3	2.0
	Occasionally	33	22.4
	Sometimes	56	38.1
	Often	34	23.1
	Usually	20	13.6
I like people to act cool and distant toward me.	Never	69	46.9
	Rarely	56	38.1
	Occasionally	12	8.2
	Sometimes	9	6.1
	Often	1	.7
I like people to act close and personal with me.	Rarely	8	5.4
	Occasionally	28	19.0
	Sometimes	65	44.2
	Often	29	19.7
	Usually	17	11.6

Table 9 (Continued)

Variable	Category	Number	Per cent
I like people to act distant toward me.	Never	70	47.6
	Rarely	57	38.8
	Occasionally	12	8.2
	Sometimes	8	5.4

Table 10

FIRO-B Data (N=148)

Scale	Mean	<u>SD</u>
eI	4.46	1.95
wI	2.83	3.02
eC	3.07	2.58
wC	3.53	2.01
eA	3.86	2.42
wA	4.91	2.38
eT	11.39	4.72
wT	11.27	5.57
FIRO-B Total	22.66	8.93

Table 11
Summary of FIRO-B Scales Score
Sums Within Need Areas (N=148)

Behavior	I	C	A	Sum (I+C+A)
e	4.46	3.07	3.86	11.38
w	2.83	3.53	4.91	11.26
Sum (e+w)	7.29	6.60	8.77	22.64
Difference (e-w)	1.63	-.46	-1.05	.12

Note, High score is 7, 8, and 9.
Medium score is 3, 4, 5, and 6.
Low score is 0, 1, and 2.

Table 11 interprets the summary scores as follows: The sum of the mean scores on expressed and wanted inclusion was 7.29; this high score on inclusion may indicate a strong desire for contact with people. The sum of the mean scores on expressed and wanted control (6.58) is a medium score; it may indicate that interaction with people is no problem at all. This type of person is considered sociable and feels comfortable with people or alone. This type of person feels confident and worthwhile; he feels he has an identity and individuality. The sum of the mean scores on expressed and wanted affection is 8.77, a high score, which may indicate

that, on the average, respondents wish for a great deal of affection and warmth, either giving or receiving it.

The sum of the mean scores on expressed inclusion, control and affection is a high score (11.38) which is interpreted as the active initiation of behavior toward others (Schutz, 1978). The sum of the mean scores on wanted inclusion, control and affection is also a high score (11.26). This score may indicate that there is a desire for people to initiate behavior toward one (Schutz, 1978). The total sum of the mean scores was 22.64, indicating a preference for a great deal of interaction with people in the areas of inclusion, control and affection.

The difference of the mean scores on expressed and wanted inclusion (dI) shows a low score of 1.63, which is interpreted as the desire to belong, to join, of initiating inclusion behavior; they want to associate and communicate with others. The (dC) (dC equals the difference on the mean scores on expressed and wanted control) is a negative low score (-.46), which may indicate that the person prefers to be the follower and receive orders from others, which is characteristic of a submissive personality. A negative score on the difference scores on affection (dA = -1.05) may be indicative of a person who is emotionally distant in his behavior with others, which may indicate the

respondents' preference for receiving rather than giving affection. The total difference score is .12, which may indicate the respondents' preference for wanting behavior.

Examination of the Hypotheses

The one-way analysis of variance was used to examine the hypothesis that there is no significant relationship in the total scores on the Fundamental Interpersonal Relationship Orientation-Behavior Scale and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale, across demographic categories. The (Newman-Keull) Multiple Range Test was further utilized to determine where significant relationships existed among all possible pairs of groups when the analysis of variance showed a significant F value. A Pearson correlation coefficient was done on each of the six FIRO-B Scales and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale in order to determine whether to retain or fail to retain the hypotheses. To analyze the data, the Kruskal-Wallis Test was utilized; a chi-square test was used for significant findings.

H_1 There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed inclusion as measured by the FIRO-B.

The results indicated that there is no significant relationship between The Expressed Inclusion Scale scores and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores. As further indicated in Table 12, a correlation coefficient of $-.01$ was obtained, indicating no significant relationship. This hypothesis is retained.

Table 12
Correlation Between Expressed Inclusion
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	4.46	1.95	$-.01$	NS

H₂ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted inclusion as measured by FIRO-B. A correlation coefficient of $.09$ (Table 13) indicated that no significant relationship existed between The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores and Wanted Inclusion Scale scores. This hypothesis is retained.

Table 13
Correlations Between Wanted Inclusion
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	2.83	3.02	.09	NS

H₃ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B. In using the Pearson correlation coefficient to examine this hypothesis, a correlation coefficient of $-.01$ was obtained, which shows no significant relationship. Therefore the hypothesis is accepted (see Table 14).

Table 14
Correlations Between Expressed Control
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	3.07	2.58	$-.01$	NS

H₄ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted control as measured by the FIRO-B. A correlation coefficient of .07 was obtained; this statistical test was used to examine this hypothesis, indicating no significant relationship existed in The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores and Wanted Control Scale scores (see Table 15). This hypothesis is retained.

Table 15
Correlation Between Wanted Control
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	3.53	2.01	.07	NS

H₅ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed affection as measured by the FIRO-B. No significant relationship was found between marital adjustment and Expressed Affection Scale scores. As Table 16 shows, a correlation coefficient of .12 was obtained. This hypothesis is retained.

Table 16
Correlations Between Expressed Affection
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	3.86	2.42	.12	NS

H₆ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted affection as measured by the FIRO-B. As Table 17 indicates, a significant relationship was found in the marital adjustment and wanted affection scores. A correlation coefficient of .18 was obtained, which shows a significant relationship at the

.01 level. Wives tend to perceive their marriages as adjusted when they have the need of wanted affection. Table 10 shows that among the six FIRO-B scales, wanted affection had the highest mean (4.91), reflecting a moderate desire for affection and warmth. This is the type of person whom Schutz (1978) calls the personal. The personal type feels comfortable in situations requiring either emotional distance or close emotional relations. This is the type of person who feels lovable even when someone dislikes her. This type of person is capable of giving love. Hypothesis 6 is not retained.

Table 17
Correlations Between Wanted Affection
and Marital Adjustment

Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>r</u>	Significance
148	4.91	2.38	.18	.01

H₇ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of wives' education. In order to determine whether there was a significant relationship between marital adjustment and wives' education, the Kruskal-Wallis Test was applied. Table 18 shows a chi-square of .12, indicating no significant relationship. Thus hypothesis 7 is retained.

Table 18
Marital Adjustment Scale Scores and
Respondents' Education

Respondents' Education	Number	Mean	χ^2	Significance
Master's Degree	96	62.6	.12	NS
Doctor's Degree	27	59.9		

H₈ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of wives' occupational status. As further indicated in Table 19, there was no significant relationship between marital adjustment and wives' occupational status.

The Kruskal-Wallis Test was applied; a chi-square of 3.40 was obtained, indicating no significant relationship. This hypothesis is retained.

Table 19
Marital Adjustment Scale Scores
 and Respondents' Occupation

Occupation	Number	Mean	χ^2	Significance
1. Teaching, adm. or research in an educational setting.	131			
2. White collar clerical or sales.	6	65.8	3.40	NS
3. Other occupations.	11			

H₉ There is no significant relationship between wives' perceived marital adjustment as measured by The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale and the demographic variable of income. A series of nonparametric correlations were applied to selected variable pairs. A rank biserial correlation on coefficient of .31, significant at the .001 level (see Table 20). These findings indicate that wives

Table 20

Rank Biserial Correlations: Marital Adjustment
Scale Score and Respondents' Combined Income

Variable Pair	Number	<u>r</u>	Significance
Income and Marital Adjustment	147	.31	.001

perceived a higher degree of marital adjustment when the income range is considered high. There is a positive direct relationship between marital adjustment and income.

A one-way analysis of variance using the F test was also applied to the variable of income and marital adjustment. Table 21 shows an F of 3.76, highly significant at the .01 level. There is a significant relationship between marital adjustment and income. The higher the income, the higher respondents scored on marital adjustment. On this hypothesis, the (Newman-Keulls) Multiple Range Test was further utilized when the analysis of variance showed a significant F value. The Newman-Keulls procedure showed the highest means among those respondents who had the higher income, and the lowest mean for those respondents who had the lowest income. This hypothesis is not retained.

Table 21

Marital Adjustment Scale Scores and Combined Income

Income	Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	Significance
\$11,000-15,000	5	93.8	43.1		
16,000-20,000	11	92.9	32.7		
21,000-25,000	24	105.8	31.1	3.76	.01
26,000-30,000	26	114.8	39.0		
31,000-Above	80	121.7	24.1		

H_{10} There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' education and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted control as measured by the FIRO-B. The Kruskal-Wallis Test was applied, giving a chi-square of 2.79; this statistical value shows there is no significant relationship between wives' education and wanted control (see Table 22). This hypothesis is retained.

Table 22

Wanted Control Scale Scores and Respondents'

Education

Education	Number	Mean	<u>x</u> ²	Significance
Masters	96	64.6		
Doctors	27	55.3	2.79	NS

H₁₁ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' education and the interpersonal relationship variable of wanted inclusion as measured by the FIRO-B. A chi-square of .292 (see Table 23) indicated that no significant relationship existed between Wanted Inclusion Scale scores and wives' education. This hypothesis is accepted.

Table 23
Wanted Inclusion Scale Scores
 and Respondents' Education

Education	Number	Mean	χ^2	Significance
Masters	96	62.1	.29	NS
Doctors	27	66.1		

H₁₂ There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of wives' occupational status and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B. There is no significant relationship between wives' occupational status and expressed control; Table 24 shows a chi-square of 5.71, indicating no significance. Thus, this hypothesis is accepted.

Table 24

Expressed Control Scale Scores
and Respondents' Occupation

Occupation	Number	Mean	χ^2	Significance
Teaching, adm. or research in an educational setting.	131	90.0	5.71	NS
White collar, clerical or sales.	6	69.8		
Other occupations.	11	47.4		

H_{13} There is no significant relationship between the demographic variable of income and the interpersonal relationship variable of expressed control as measured by the FIRO-B. One-way analysis of variance was applied to test this hypothesis. The F -ratio was of 3.12, significant at the .01 level. These findings reflect the following: (See Table 25.) The lowest pair income bracket had the lowest mean while the highest pair income bracket had the highest mean. This finding indicates that the higher the income, the more they expressed control; the lower the income the less they expressed control. This hypothesis is rejected.

Table 25

Expressed Control Scale Scores
and Combined Income

Income	Number	Mean	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	Significance
\$11,000-15,000	5	1.60	1.81		
16,000-20,000	11	2.56	3.01		
21,000-25,000	24	2.29	2.05	3.12	.01
26,000-30,000	26	2.27	1.80		
31,000-Above	80	3.70	2.72		

H₁₄ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of educational attainments. The correlations of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment within selected educational groups indicates the following: The Master's group showed a correlation coefficient of .19, significant at the .05 level. This result may indicate that respondents' interpersonal needs are intimately related to education and the perception of marital adjustment. Marital adjustment, interpersonal needs, and education are not significant among the Doctor's group (see Table 26). However, it is significant among the Master's group. Thus, part of the hypothesis is rejected and part of it is accepted.

Table 26

Correlation of Interpersonal Needs and Marital
Adjustment within Educational Levels

Education	Number	<u>r</u>	Significance
Masters	96	.19	.05
Doctors	27	-.10	NS

H₁₅ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of combined income. Table 27 shows the correlations of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment broken down by categories of combined income. There is a significant relationship on the pair category of \$16,000-20,000 at the .05 level; categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 are not significant. Thus, categories 1, 3, 4, and 5 are accepted, while category 2 is rejected.

H₁₆ There is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of occupational status. As further indicated, Table 28 shows there is no significant difference in the relationship of interpersonal needs and marital adjustment between the levels of occupational status.

Table 27

Correlations of Interpersonal Needs and Marital
Adjustment within Levels of Combined Income

Income	Number	<u>r</u>	Significance
\$11,000-15,000	5	.23	NS
16,000-20,000	11	.04	.05
21,000-25,000	24	.25	NS
26,000-30,000	26	-.03	NS
31,000-Above	80	.15	NS

Table 28

Correlations of Interpersonal Needs and Marital
Adjustment within Levels of Occupational Status

Occupation	Number	<u>r</u>	Significance
Teaching, adm. or research in an educational setting.	131	.12	NS
White collar, clerical or sales.	6		

Respondents' occupations do not seem to affect marital adjustment and interpersonal needs. This hypotheiss is accepted.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY

Discussion

The overall purpose of this study was to ascertain married female perceptions of their marital adjustment and to relate these perceptions to their interpersonal needs. The sample consisted of 148 married female graduate students enrolled at a university in the North Texas region during the summer of 1980.

The respondents were predominantly over 36 years of age. Besides the role of wife, mother, and full-time employment, they were students, most of them part-time (76%), either working towards the Master's or Doctor's degree. Almost all (97%) of the respondents had employed professional husbands.

Only 29 respondents had previous marriages. Most of the subjects had been married for over 16 years, had one or two children whose ages were over 13 years old. The combined mean income range for the family was over \$31,000.

Two valid and reliable instruments were utilized: (a) The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale, and (b) The Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale; included

was an information sheet for general background data.

To analyze the data, a correlation coefficient was utilized on each of the FIRO-B Scales; also intercorrelations were done on the FIRO-B Scales and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale. The chi-square test was utilized to analyze the data on The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores among selected demographic variables. The one-way analysis of variance on the FIRO-B Scale scores and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores across demographic categories were utilized in the item analysis.

In analyzing the responses to the items of The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale, it was found that wives perceived their marriages as happy and well adjusted. The analyzed responses to the items of the FIRO-B Scale means shows that respondents scored moderately (3, 4, 5) in five of the six scales; only Wanted Inclusion Scale scores were low (2.83).

The Pearson correlation coefficient indicates that significant relationships exist in The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores and Wanted Affection Scale scores. The one-way analysis of variance indicated that there are highly significant relationships between income and The Short-Marital Adjustment Scale scores and between income and Expressed Control Scale scores.

A correlation between interpersonal needs (total scores on inclusion, control and affection) and marital adjustment

was used among selected variables of education, income and occupational status.

The data revealed several trends consistent with previous research: (a) The movement of middle and upper class educated women into the labor force; (b) The movement of women over 35 years of age in returning to continue graduate studies; (c) The departure of women from traditional roles; (d) The movement of women into higher education as soon as their children are over 13 years of age; (e) The trend of women having fewer children than women of earlier generations.

The results indicated that respondents carry on several roles: the role of wife, mother, full-time worker and part-time graduate student. It seems that educated wives have resolved the conflicts and frustrations experienced by women (Gove and Tudor, 1973) when they move away from society's expected roles.

The study answered the questions stated in the problem: (a) Wives perceived their marriages to be happy and adjusted; (b) The respondents' behavior is oriented in terms of what they want from others; (c) Marital adjustment is reflected in the way wives want others to behave with them.

Burke and Weir's (1976) findings harmonize with the present findings that respondents felt in agreement with

their mates on such matters as sexual relations, recreation, friends, dealing with in-laws and resolving conflicts by mutual compromise. The present findings indicate that respondents feel adjusted in the marriage and have a sense of satisfaction with the spouse.

Wanted inclusion was significant among spouses' educational levels. Wives whose husbands had a Doctor's degree scored the lowest on wanted inclusion. Husbands with Bachelor's degrees had wives whose scores were higher on wanted inclusion. Therefore the higher the spouses' educational level, the lower respondents scored on wanted inclusion; the lower the spouses' educational level, the higher the wives scored on wanted affection. The higher the spouses' education, the less involvement with others; the lower the spouses' education, the more involvement women desired with other people. This finding may indicate the vicarious fulfillment women derive from the spouses' educational attainments. Those who lack this vicarious experience may need the support and attention from other people to meet the need for inclusion.

In terms of occupation, the significant scores were among spouses' occupational levels. The higher the occupational status of the spouse, the less wives desired inclusion with other people; the lower the occupational status of the husband, the more wives wanted inclusion.

An additional finding significant among spouses concerned education and expressed affection. The higher the educational level of the spouse, the less respondents scored on expressed affection. Respondents whose spouses had a high school diploma or a Bachelor's degree showed high expressed affection, and respondents whose spouses had a Doctor's degree showed a lower expressed affection.

Inclusion showed a pattern of differences among the categories of spouses' educational level. Respondents with spouses with Doctor's degrees showed the lowest scores on wanted inclusion while respondents whose spouses had Bachelor's degrees had the highest scores on wanted inclusion.

Spouses' educational level correlated with control, showed that respondents scored high on wanted control when the husband had a high school diploma while respondents showed lower scores on wanted control when the husband had a Doctor's degree.

A similar pattern was revealed on the correlation of affection and spouses' educational level. Wives whose husbands had Doctor's degrees had the lowest scores on affection; wives whose husbands had Bachelor's degrees had the highest scores on expressed affection. The results of this study indicated that the more educated the spouses were,

the less respondents were involved with people.

Income seems to make a significant difference in marital adjustment. The data supports the theory stated by Blood and Wolfe (1960) that there is less marital adjustment when the income is low and there is an increase in marital adjustment when the income is high.

Maybe money gives women additional freedom to assert their independence to make decisions and be in control of their lives. The higher the income, the higher respondents scored on expressed control; the lower the income the less expressed control. This finding indicates that money and power are intimately related.

There is a negative correlation among expressed control and respondents' employment. Those subjects who were unemployed expressed less control; those subjects who were employed showed a higher expressed control. Even though this finding was not a part of the hypothesis to be tested, it is an important resource that gives power. Respondents may feel, if they do not work, they depend on somebody else for support; therefore, they will tend to be submissive, not expressing control, but if they work, money may give them the power to express control.

The study seems to indicate that women's educational attainments enrich the marital relationship (79%). Most of

the respondents (72%) felt that their educational status did not affect their husbands. It seems that positive interpersonal relationships are related to marital adjustment.

Although the purpose of the study was not to measure variables of companionship and communication, these two variables along with affection and sexual relations seem to be necessary in a companionship marriage among educated women. The educated women showed positive interpersonal relationships, an expected factor to be significant in a companionship marriage.

The total scores on the interpersonal needs may indicate that the respondents are stable mature persons who resolved their needs in earlier periods of life, therefore feeling secure and capable of giving as well as receiving, with no pathological needs in terms of interaction, power and love. It seems that respondents are in sound emotional health, with positive attitudes toward people. The present findings are in agreement with Birbaum (1971), Blood and Wolfe (1960), and Burke and Weir (1976). Whether the increased general well being and positive attitudes toward people is the cause or effect of work and education at this point remains unanswered.

Conclusions

Even though it was not statistically significant, the positive interpersonal relationships respondents have are related to the high degree of perceived marital adjustment and satisfaction with the spouse. Marital adjustment seems to be enhanced by positive interpersonal needs, education and money. Money is also a significant variable in terms of power expressed. The respondents' needs seem to be in terms of the behavior desired from others. Educated married women will tend to be happier if they have the need for affection fulfilled.

The interpersonal needs shown by the respondents fall in the category of what Freud (1950) calls normal. The mean responses to the six scales on the FIRO-B point out the general well being of the educated married female graduate students.

The data indicates that three of the sixteen hypotheses to be tested showed significant differences: (a) Marital adjustment and wanted affection showed the significance of its relationship the more affection the wife wants, the happier she will feel in her marriage; (b) Also the higher the family income, the more satisfied the wife feels in the marriage; (c) The higher the income, the more the respondents expressed control; the lower the income, the less

control they expressed.

Recommendations

This study was based on data from volunteer college-educated women and is not applicable to the general population of college-educated women. Also limited is the fact that husbands' marital adjustment was not considered part of this study.

In future studies, it would be desirable to study couples; spouses' perceptions of the degree of marital adjustment, couple compatibility, and interpersonal relationships would possibly yield more interesting results. The most significant differences existed among spouses' education, occupation, and income as revealed by respondents. Further research with husbands and wives would appear to reveal a better understanding of interpersonal relationships and marital adjustment.

APPENDIX

July 10, 1980

Dear Respondents:

A study is being conducted to investigate the perceived marital adjustment of women with advanced degrees as related to their interpersonal relationships.

Your participation in this study is voluntary, therefore by responding to the questionnaires attached to this letter you agree to participate in it. Anonymity is assured, no names should be written on the questionnaires. You have the right to withdraw from the study at any time.

Although you may experience a sense of repetitiveness in some of the FIRO-B items, answer each item independently, each item is different.

No medical service or compensation is provided to subjects by the University as a result of injury from participation in research.

I appreciate your participation in this research. It is only through the cooperation of persons like you that we can have a better understanding of the husband-wife relationship.

Cordially,


Ada Arocho

Attachments

FIRO-B

Will Schutz, 1977

Directions

This questionnaire explores the typical ways you interact with people. There are no right or wrong answers. Sometimes people are tempted to answer questions like these in terms of what they think a person should do. This is not what is wanted here. We would like to know how you actually behave. Some items may seem similar to others. However, each item is different so please answer each one without regard to the others. There is no time limit, but do not debate long over any item.

Questionnaire

For each statement below, decide which of the following answers best applies to you. Place the number of the answer in the box at the left of the statement. Please be as honest as you can.

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Never | 4. Sometimes |
| 2. Rarely | 5. Often |
| 3. Occasionally | 6. Usually |

- ____ 1. I try to be with people.
- ____ 2. I let other people decide what to do.
- ____ 3. I join social groups.
- ____ 4. I try to have close relationships with people.
- ____ 5. I tend to join social organizations when I have an opportunity.
- ____ 6. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
- ____ 7. I try to be included in informal social activities.
- ____ 8. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.
- ____ 9. I try to include other people in my plans.

- ___ 10. I let other people control my actions.
- ___ 11. I try to have people around me.
- ___ 12. I try to get close and personal with people.
- ___ 13. When people are doing things together I tend to join them.
- ___ 14. I am easily led by people.
- ___ 15. I try to avoid being alone.
- ___ 16. I try to participate in group activities.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Nobody | 4. Some people |
| 2. One or two people | 5. Many people |
| 3. A few people | 6. Most people |

- ___ 17. I try to be friendly to people.
- ___ 18. I let other people decide what to do.
- ___ 19. My personal relations with people are cool and distant.
- ___ 20. I let other people take charge of things.
- ___ 21. I try to have close relationships with people.
- ___ 22. I let other people strongly influence my actions.
- ___ 23. I try to get close and personal with people.
- ___ 24. I let other people control my actions.
- ___ 25. I act cool and distant with people.
- ___ 26. I am easily led by people.
- ___ 27. I try to have close, personal relationships with people.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- | | |
|----------------------|----------------|
| 1. Nobody | 4. Some people |
| 2. One or two people | 5. Many people |
| 3. A few people | 6. Most people |

- ___ 28. I like people to invite me to things.
- ___ 29. I like people to act close and personal with me.
- ___ 30. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
- ___ 31. I like people to invite me to join in their activities.
- ___ 32. I like people to act close toward me.
- ___ 33. I try to take charge of things when I am with people.
- ___ 34. I like people to include me in their activities.
- ___ 35. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
- ___ 36. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
- ___ 37. I like people to ask me to participate in their discussions.
- ___ 38. I like people to act friendly toward me.
- ___ 39. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
- ___ 40. I like people to act distant toward me.

For each of the next group of statements, choose one of the following answers:

- | | |
|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Never | 4. Sometimes |
| 2. Rarely | 5. Often |
| 3. Occasionally | 6. Usually |

- ___ 41. I try to be the dominant person when I am with people.

- ___ 42. I like people to invite me to things.
- ___ 43. I like people to act close toward me.
- ___ 44. I try to have other people do things I want done.
- ___ 45. I like people to invite me to join their activities.
- ___ 46. I like people to act cool and distant toward me.
- ___ 47. I try to influence strongly other people's actions.
- ___ 48. I like people to include me in their activities.
- ___ 49. I like people to act close and personal with me.
- ___ 50. I try to take charge of things when I'm with people.
- ___ 51. I like people to invite me to participate in their activities.
- ___ 52. I like people to act distant toward me.
- ___ 53. I try to have other people do things the way I want them done.
- ___ 54. I take charge of things when I'm with people.

MARITAL ADJUSTMENT

GENERAL INFORMATION

Place a check mark () next to your selection.

1. Age
 - a. 20 - 25 _____
 - b. 26 - 30 _____
 - c. 31 - 35 _____
 - d. 36 - 45 _____
 - e. 46 - Above _____
2. Indicate the number of credit hours you have earned beyond the last degree obtained.
 - a. Bachelors's degree _____
 - b. Master's degree _____
 - c. Doctor's degree _____
3. At present are you a student?
 - a. Yes _____
 - b. No _____
4. If a student, are you enrolled?
 - a. Part-time _____
 - b. Full-time _____
5. What degree are you pursuing?
 - a. Bachelor's degree _____
 - b. Master's degree _____
 - c. Doctor's degree _____
6. Are you employed?
 - a. Yes _____
 - b. No _____
7. Check the educational level of your spouse.
 - a. High school diploma or less _____
 - b. College credits _____
 - c. Bachelor's degree _____
 - d. Master's degree _____
 - e. Doctor's degree _____

8. Is your spouse employed? _____
a. Yes _____
b. No _____
9. State your occupation or position.

10. State your spouse's occupation.

11. How long have you been married to your present spouse?
a. 1 - 5 years _____
b. 6 - 10 years _____
c. 11 - 15 years _____
d. 16 - 20 _____
e. 21 - More years _____
12. If this is not your first marriage, was your previous marriage ended by:
a. Divorce _____
b. Death of spouse _____
c. Annulment _____
13. State the number of children you have.
a. None _____
b. 1 - 2 _____
c. 3 - 4 _____
d. 5 - More _____
14. What are their ages? You may check more than one blank.
a. Infant - 1 year _____
b. 2 - 4 years _____
c. 5 - 7 years _____
d. 8 - 12 years _____
e. 13 - 18 years _____
f. 19 - Over _____
g. Not applicable _____
15. Who earns most of the income for your family?
a. Respondent _____

- b. Spouse
- c. Equal
- d. Other

16. Yearly income range combined for the couple.

- a. \$ 5,000 - 10,000
- b. 11,000 - 15,000
- c. 16,000 - 20,000
- d. 21,000 - 25,000
- e. 26,000 - 30,000
- f. 31,000 - Above

17. If you were previously divorced or separated, were you a student at that time?

- a. Yes
- b. No

18. Do you feel that your educational attainments have contributed to your marital satisfaction?

- a. Yes
- b. No

19. Do you feel your educational attainments have contributed to your marital dissatisfaction?

- a. Yes
- b. No

20. Does your educational status in some way make your spouse feel:

- a. Superior
- b. Inferior
- c. Neither
- d. Not applicable

21. Does your occupational status present a threat to the self-image of your spouse?

- a. Yes
- b. No
- c. I do not know
- d. Not applicable

22. If your educational level is higher than your spouse's, do you feel:
- a. Equal to your spouse _____
 - b. Inferior _____
 - c. Superior _____
 - d. Neither _____
23. Did you ever work before marriage?
- a. Yes _____
 - b. No _____
25. Once married how long did you stay at home before you started working?
- a. 0 - 1 years _____
 - b. 2 - 4 years _____
 - c. 5 - 6 years _____
 - d. 7 - 8 years _____
 - e. 9 - 10 years _____
 - f. 11 - More years _____

SHORT-MARITAL ADJUSTMENT SCALE

Locke and Wallace

Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered of your present marriage. The middle point "happy," represents the degree of happiness which most people get from marriage, and the scale gradually ranges on one side to those few who are very unhappy in marriage, and on the other, to those few who experience extreme joy or lelicity in marriage.

1.	0	2	7	15	20	25	35
	Very			Happy			Perfectly
	Unhappy						Happy

State the appropriate extent of agreement or disagreement between you and your mate on the following items. Please, check each column.

	Always agree	Almost always agree	Occasionally disagree	Frequently disagree	Almost always disagree	Always disagree
2. Handling family finances	5	4	3	2	1	0
3. Matters of recreation	5	4	3	2	1	0
4. Demonstrations of affection	8	6	4	2	1	0
5. Friends	5	4	3	2	1	0
6. Sex relations	15	12	9	4	1	0

7. Conventional-
tional-
ity
(right, good,
or proper con-
duct) 5 4 3 2 1 0
-
8. Philoso-
phy of
life 5 4 3 2 1 0
-
9. Ways of
dealing
with in-
laws 5 4 3 2 1 0
-
10. When disagreements arise, they usually result in:

Husband giving in _____ 0 _____
Wife giving in _____ 2 _____
Agreement by mutual give and take _____ 10 _____
11. Do you and your mate engage in outside interests
together?

All of them _____ 10 _____
Some of them _____ 8 _____
Very few of them _____ 3 _____
None of them _____ 0 _____
12. In leisure time, do you generally prefer to :

Be "on the go" _____ (Both stay at
Stay at home _____ home 10)
Does your mate generally prefer to:
Be "on the go" _____ (Both on the go
Stay at home _____ 3)
(Opposite 2)
13. Do you ever wish you had not married?

Frequently _____ 0 _____
Occasionally _____ 3 _____
Rarely _____ 8 _____
Never _____ 15 _____

14. If you had your life over, do you think you would:

Marry the same person	<u>15</u>
Marry a different person	<u>0</u>
Not marry at all	<u>1</u>

15. Do you confide in your mate?

Almost never	<u>0</u>
Rarely	<u>2</u>
In most things	<u>10</u>
In everything	<u>10</u>

REFERENCES

- Astin, H. S. Some action of her own. Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1976.
- Arnott, C. C. Husbands' attitude and wives' commitment to employment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34(4), 673-648. (a)
- Arnott, C. C. Married women and the pursuit of profit: An exchange theory perspective. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34(1), 122-131. (b)
- Axelson, L. J. The marital adjustment and marital role definitions of husbands of working and non-working wives. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1963, 25, 139-195.
- Axelson, L. J. The working wife: Differences in perception among Negro and White males. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32(3), 457-464.
- Axelson, L. Personal adjustment in the postparental period. Marriage and Family Living, 1960, 22, 66-68.
- Birnbaum, J. L. A. Life patterns, personality style and self-esteem in gifted family oriented and career committed women. In R. J. Burke, and T. Weir, Some personality differences between members of one-career and two-career families. (Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38(3), 453-459).
- Blood, R. O., & Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of married living. Glemcoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.
- Bloom, R. B. Teacher-pupil compatibility and teachers' ratings of children's behavior. Psychology in the Schools, 1976, 13, 142-145.
- Booth, A. Wife's employment and husband's stress: A replication and refutation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 37, 645-650.

- Broschart, K. R. Family status and professional achievements: A study of women doctorates. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 71-76.
- Brown, B. W. Wife employment and the emergence of equalitarian marital role prescriptions: 1900-1974. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1978, 9(1), 5-17.
- Bruininks, V. L. Patterns of personality correlates of teachers' interaction with students. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 239-242.
- Bryson, R., Bryson, J. B., & Johnson, M. F. Family size, satisfaction and productivity in dual-career couples. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1978, 3(1), 67-77.
- Burr, W. R. An expansion and test of a role thoery of marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, 33(2), 368-372.
- Burke, R. J., & Weir, T. Relationship of wive's employment status to husband and pair satisfaction and performance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 28, 279-287.
- Byrne, S. Nobody home: The erosion of the American family. Psychology Today, May 1977, 41-44.
- Day, L. H. Status implications of the employment of married women in the United States. American Journal of Economics and Sociology, July 1961, 20, 391-397.
- Dincan, P., & Perrucci, C. C. Dual occupation families and migration. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41(2), 252-261.
- Ericksen, J. A., Yancey, W. L., & Ericksen, E. P. The division of family roles. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41(2), 301-313.
- Feldman, S. D. Impediment or stimulant? Marital status and graduate education. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 982-994.
- Felson, M., & Knoke, C. Social status and the married woman. Journal of Marriage and the Family, August 1974, 36, 516-521.

- Freud, S. Libidinal types. In Collected papers. London: The Hogarth Press, 1950, 5(23), 247-251.
- Fromm, E. Man for himself. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1947.
- Fuchs, R. Different meanings of employment for women. Human Relations, December 1971, 24, 495-499.
- Gordon, H. A., & Kammeyer, K. C. W. The gainful employment of women with small children. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1980, 42(2), 327-336.
- Gove, W. R., & Tudor, J. F. Adult sex roles and mental illness. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78(4), 812-835.
- Gover, D. O. Socio-economic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1963, 25, 452-458.
- Gump, J. P. Sex role attitudes and psychological well being. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28(2), 79-91.
- Gurin, G., Veroff, Jr., & Feld, S. American view their mental health. New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Haug, M. Social class measurements and women's occupational roles. Social Forces, September 1973, 52, 86-98.
- Hicks, M. W., & Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 553-573.
- Hoffman, L. W., & Nye, F. I. Working mothers. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1974.
- Holmstrom, E. I., & Homstrom, R. W. The plight of the woman doctoral student. American Educational Journal, 1974, 11(1), 1-17.
- Holmstrom, L. L. The two-career family. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Comapany, 1972.
- Horney, K. Our inner conflicts. New York: Norton and Company, Inc., 1945.

- Houseknecht, S. K. Childlessness and marital adjustment. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1979, 41(2), 259-265.
- Kaley, M. Attitudes toward the dual role of the married professional woman. American Psychologist, 1971, 26(3), 301-306.
- Kapur, P. The changing status of the working woman in India. Vikas Publishing House, 1974.
- Kliger, D. S. The effects of the employment of married women on husband and wife roles: A study in culture change. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1954.
- Komarovsky, M. Women in the modern world. Boston: Little Brown, 1953.
- Kreps, J. M. Changing roles of women and statistical policy. In Issues in federal statistical needs relating women. U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.
- Kuehl, C. R., DiMarco, N., & Wims, E. W. Leadership orientation as a function of interpersonal need structure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60(1), 143-145.
- Locke, H. J., & Mackenprang, M. Marital adjustment and the employed wife. American Journal of Sociology, 1949, 54(6), 536-537.
- Locksley, A. On the effects of wives' employment on marital adjustment and companionship. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1980, 42(2), 337-346.
- Luckey, E. Number of years married as related to personality, perception and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, February 1966, 28, 44-48.
- Mahoney, E. R., & Richardson, J. G. Perceived social status of husbands and wives: The effects of labor force participation and occupational prestige. Sociology and Social Research, January 1979, 63, 364-374.

Marital and family characteristics of the labor force in March 1976 No. 206, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau Labor statistics. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1977.

Mendelsohn, G. A., & Rankin, N. O. Client-counselor compatibility and the outcome of counseling. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 1969, 74(2), 157-163.

Mitchell, S. B. Women and the doctorate: A study of the enabling or impeding factors operative among Oklahoma's women doctoral recipients in the attainment and use of the degree. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 024 352)

Nye, F. I. Maternal employment and marital interaction: Some contingent conditions. Social Forces, 1961, 40, 113-119.

Oppenheimer, V. K. Demographic influences on female employment and the status of women. American Journal of Sociology, 1973, 78, 946-961.

Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. M. Working wives and marital happiness. American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74(4), 392-407.

Pollack, H. B. Change in homogeneous and heterogeneous sensitivity training groups. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1971, 37(1), 60-66.

Robbins, G., & Toomer, J. E. Innovative uses of the FIRO-B in couple counseling. Journal of Marriage and Family Counseling, 1976, 2(3), 277-282.

Safilios-Rothschild, C. Family and stratification: Some macro-sociological observations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 855-860.

Schutz, W. C. FIRO-A three dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York, New York: Rinehart and Winston Company, Inc., 1958.

Schutz, W. C. FIRO awareness scale manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.

Schutz, W. C. Joy expanding human awareness. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1967.

Spencer, B. G., & Feathersone, D. C. Married female labor force participation: A minor study. Ottawa, Ontario: Dominion Bureau of Statistics, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 053 300)

Sussman, M. B. Needed research on the employed mother. Marriage and Family Living, 1961, 23, 368-373.

Watley, D. J. Career or marriage?: A longitudinal study of able young women. Evanston, Illinois: 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 035 010)