

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1986

Development of the Couples Inventories and Testing the Reliability of the Communications Items

James K. Sessions
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sessions, James K., "Development of the Couples Inventories and Testing the Reliability of the Communications Items" (1986). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2541.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2541>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



DEVELOPMENT OF THE COUPLES INVENTORIES AND TESTING

THE RELIABILITY OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ITEMS

by

James K. Sessions

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Human Development

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The completion of this thesis is the result of the hard work and sacrifice of many individuals, and I would like to acknowledge the contributions of some of them.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. D. Kim Openshaw whose encouragement, professional expertise and constant assistance have made completion of this project possible. His feedback and support have been a great source of assistance and motivation throughout my research. To Dr. Jeannie Kleber Wilcox, Dr. Glen Jenson and Dr. Richley Crapo I would like to express my thanks for their support and assistance as committee members. I would like to express my appreciation to Maria Norton and her staff for the many hours of advisement given in completing my data analyses. And to my wife Cathy and the rest of my family I owe more than just thanks. They have been behind me as a constant source of support and encouragement no matter what challenges they had to endure. Without them, completion of this thesis would not have occurred.

James K. Sessions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Purpose	1
Introduction	1
Conceptual contributions	2
Clinical/educative contributions	3
Definition of Terms	4
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
History of Marital Prediction	7
The Marital Inventories	8
Perception as a critical element in the understanding of relationship quality.	8
Verbal communication: One dimension of relationship quality	11
Openness and understanding: Dimensions of communication	12
Summary	19
III. METHOD	21
Sample	21
Instrument	21
Instrument Administration	23
The CI booklet	23
The computer sheet	24
Administering the CI	25
Returning the CI	25
Analysis	26
Linear composites	26
Estimate of reliability	29
Structural equivalence	30

IV. RESULTS	31
Factor Analysis I	31
Subscale one: Openness	31
Subscale two: Problem solving	43
Subscale three: Decision making	43
Subscale four: Misunderstanding	43
Subscale five: Conflict management.	44
Factor Analysis II	44
Factor one: General openess	44
Factor two: Emotional openness	44
Factor three: Understanding	47
Factor four: Conflict management	49
V. DISCUSSION	51
Estimate of Reliability	54
Issues of Validity	54
Identified Factors	55
General openness	55
Emotional openness	56
Understanding	56
Conflict management.	56
Implications	57
Conclusions	61
Limitations	62
Recommendations for Future Research	64
REFERENCES	66
APPENDIX	71

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Items Comprising the Communications Dimension . . .	32
2. Factor Analysis I Openness (Self-perception) . . .	33
3. Factor Analysis I Openness (Perception of Other)	34
4. Factor Analysis I Problem Solving (Self- perception)	35
5. Factor Analysis I Problem Solving (Perception of Other)	36
6. Factor Analysis I Decision Making (Self- perception)	37
7. Factor Analysis I Decision Making (Perception of Other)	38
8. Factor Analysis I Misunderstanding (Self- perception)	39
9. Factor Analysis I Misunderstanding (Perception of Other)	40
10. Factor Analysis I Conflict Management (Self- perception)	41
11. Factor Analysis I Conflict Management (Perception of Other)	42
12. Factor Analysis II General Openness (Final)	45
13. Factor Analysis II Emotional Openness (Final)	46
14. Factor Analysis II Understanding (Final)	48
15. Factor Analysis II Conflict Management (Final)	50

ABSTRACT

Developing the Couples Inventories and Testing
the Reliability of the Communications Items

by

James K. Sessions, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1986

Major Professor: Dr. D. Kim Openshaw
Department: Family and Human Development

This study is a revision of the Marital Inventories so that both self-perception and perception of other data can be collected. The revised inventory, titled the Couples Inventories, was administered to a population of 183 couples comprised mainly of university students from communities across the United States. From the collected data, principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation was used to analyze the items addressing couple communication. This study analyzed data from self-perception and perception of other, as well as including the variables of the respondent's age and gender as a test for structural equivalence. As a test of reliability Theta, a special case of Cronbach Alpha, was calculated for the identified factors.

The major findings of this study were: (a) perception of other is critical to the understanding of relationship communication; (b) structural equivalence enables researchers to identify those items that have utility for heterosexual couples at various ages; (c) openness, understanding, problem solving, and conflict management are

crucial dimensions of communication; (d) openness is comprised of at least two dimensions; namely, general openness and emotional openness; and (e) understanding is unidimensional as opposed to a continuum ranging from understanding to misunderstanding.

(111 pages)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Purpose

The Marital Inventories (MI) is an instrument designed to collect history, values, role expectations, and personal and couple readiness data from couples who are dating, engaged, married, or living together (Yorgasen, Burr & Baker, 1980). Practitioners, researchers, and theorists have used the MI to assess and/or predict marital/relationship (hereafter referred to as relationship) readiness, as well as relationship quality. However, in its present format, the MI may have limited utility in assessing or predicting relationship quality due to its almost complete reliance on self-perception data only.

The purposes of the proposed study were (a) to examine the MI items and rewrite them so that both self-perception and perception of other data could be collected; (b) to create composite scales for the communication items in the Couples Inventories (hereafter referred to as the CI); and (c) to assess the stability of the composite scale scores for those factors dealing with relationship communication.

Introduction

Several assumptions set forth in extant research are essential to this study (for a review see Lewis & Spanier, 1979). The first assumption indicates that the relative degree of marital quality is based on a couple's subjective

evaluation of their relationship. The second suggests that the variables associated with marital quality are the same as those correlated with relationship quality per se. Therefore, marital quality can be viewed as a subset within the broader context of relationship quality.

To accurately measure relationship quality, various dimensions of the relationship must be clearly conceptualized. This study posits that the level of conceptual clarity associated with relationship quality, and its attendant substantive dimensions, is a function of the relative accuracy of self-perception and perception of other. Consequently, instruments must assess relationship quality in such a way that multiple perceptions may be obtained. With such data, the measure of congruence or incongruence between the way partners see their roles and values, as these pertain to the relationship, will more accurately depict the dynamics of that relationship. Based on the data obtained, the present degree of relationship stability can be measured, providing useful information to formulate an interventive plan.

This study can potentially make several fundamental conceptual and clinical contributions to the study of relationship development and maintenance.

Conceptual contributions. The CI includes relational variables, values and role expectations, which have been previously identified as predictive of relationship quality (e.g., Spanier & Lewis, 1980). Because these particular variables are incorporated into one instrument, users can collect more

information pertaining to the dynamics of the relationship than is possible within the constraints of most relationship-oriented inventories. The CI was developed to create an instrument which would provide a method of assessing relationship dynamics from two empirically and clinically identified sources--namely, self-perception and perception of other (e.g., Beck, Rush, Shaw & Emery, 1979; Laing, Phillipson, & Lee, 1966).

Clinical/educative contributions. The present study has important applied significance and will undoubtedly play an important role in the development of therapeutic and educative programs designed to improve relationship quality.

In terms of therapy, presently no instrument is designed to collect a broad range of identified relational variables. Clinicians must use multiple inventories if they desire to collect various forms of information. Although several instruments were identified which incorporate data of both self-perception and perception of other (e.g., Spanier, 1976; Stuart, 1980), no instrument was found where both self-perception and perception of other data are collected using such a broad range of variables as in the CI. This unique addition will provide clinicians with considerable information upon which they can develop a dynamic formulation of the relationship.

In addition to the clinical contributions, the CI has great potential for use in education. To help prevent marital conflict, the CI can be used as an educational tool in high

school, college, and university classes where students are learning about the formation and maintenance of relationships. The information provided by the CI will enable educators and students to discuss the identified relational variables and the importance of understanding both self-perception and perception of other within any relationship.

In conclusion, only one psychometric instrument, the Taylor-Johnson Temperament Analysis (T-JTA) is known which collects data of both self-perception and perception of other. However, the instrument is designed to assess only personality/temperament. However, if the T-JTA were combined with the CI, a potential wealth of data could be collected for the purposes of a) providing an assessment instrument of a more holistic nature; b) designing interventive therapeutic programs for clinical use with couples; and c) educating students in courses focusing on relationship dynamics.

Definition of Terms

1) Role: A pattern of behavior, adopted by an individual, which is structured around an integrated set of beliefs, expectations, rights, duties, and status pertaining to the role as prescribed by society (Kleber, 1982; Nye, 1978; Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969). An ascribed role is defined as a role automatically attained (e.g., male, female); an achieved role, on the other hand, has either been chosen or earned based upon individual efforts and/or actions (e.g., professor, student, etc.).

2) Role expectation: The entire range of responses or behavior associated with a particular role. Role expectations include individuals' expectations of themselves, as well as the expectations of others (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969).

3) Value: An abstract, generalized principle of behavior to which an individual, couple, or group feel a strong, emotionally charged positive commitment and which provides a standard of measurement whereby the individual and/or society may judge specific acts and goals. Values, more than mere overt statements, reflect individual commitment and are incorporated in the socialization process (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1969). By definition a value is distinguished from a value indicator by the fact that a value is freely chosen from a set of alternatives after considering the consequences of each alternative. In addition, a value is prized and acted upon in a repetitive fashion. On the other hand, a value indicator refers to the movement toward being a value, but at the moment consists of only a portion of the elements comprising a value; for example, an individual may act but may not have chosen freely from a set of alternative actions (Hall, 1973).

4) Marital quality: The subjective evaluation of marital relationships that encompass satisfaction, happiness, role strain, conflict, communication, integration, adjustment, etc. (Lewis & Spanier, 1979).

5) Marital stability: Lewis & Spanier (1979) indicate that "marital stability is defined as the formal or informal

status of a marriage as intact or nonintact" (p. 269). A stable marriage is one which is either intact or has been terminated by the natural death of one spouse or the other; an unstable marriage results in willful termination (e.g. divorce, long-term separation, or desertion).

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Marital Prediction

Considerable extant research has been devoted to the development of empirically-based instruments which assess and predict relationship readiness and relationship quality (e.g., Burgess & Cottrell, 1959; Burgess & Wallin, 1943; Locke & Wallace, 1959). Based upon these instruments, other investigators have begun to classify variables according to their correlation with relationship stability (e.g., Burr, 1973; Hicks & Platt, 1970; Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

During the 1970's significant advancements were made in relationship research (see Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970 & 1980). New correlates were identified with the hope that they would account for more of the variance in marital quality and stability (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). A few of the new correlates include verbal and nonverbal communication (Kahn, 1970; Miller, Corrales, & Wackman, 1975; Navran, 1967) and interspousal variables affecting tension, anxiety, and cohesion, etc. (Spanier & Cole, 1976).

In addition to the conceptualization of new correlates, advances were also noted in the areas of theory and methodology (Spanier & Lewis, 1980). That relationship quality necessitated a multidimensional, as opposed to the traditional univariate, perspective was recognized (Lewis & Spanier, 1979). Thus, an accurate understanding of relationship quality requires a multivariate methodological

approach.

The Marital Inventories. Aided by ten family researcher theorists from across the country (The Marriage Study Consortium), three family researcher theorists at Brigham Young University began, in 1979, the arduous task of developing a relationship instrument known as the MI to collect history, couple and personal readiness for marriage, values, and role expectations data.

Since its conception the MI has undergone rigorous empirical investigation to substantiate the validity and reliability of its scales (e.g., Kleber, 1982) as well as a longitudinal followup on initial participants. The instrument is currently being used to examine relationship correlates associated with dating, courtship, and marriage. The data, to date, suggests that the MI is a relatively valid and reliable predictor of couple compatibility and marital success. Caution needs to be taken, however, in that validity and reliability studies have not been completed on all scales; moreover, the MI is limited to self-perception data.

Perception as a critical element in the understanding of relationship quality. The subjective measure of relationship quality is predicated on the assumption that issues and roles associated with the relationship are indeed going much the way they are expected. This suggests that there is congruence in role perceptions and the actual performance of those roles (Hawkins & Johnsen, 1969; Hicks & Platt, 1970). These concepts must be assessed from two points of

view: namely, one's perception of her/himself (self-perception) and one's perception of her/his partner (perception of other).

Perception refers to individuals' cognitive awareness of their internal and/or external world (Beck et al., 1979; Laing et al., 1966). This study is concerned with two specific forms of perception. The first is "self-perception," the ability of individuals to critically evaluate their awareness of self. Such individuals a) are aware of sensory information; b) are able to accurately interpret the information received; c) associate an appropriate emotional response to the interpretation of the sensory data; d) are aware of the intentions formulated in response to both interpretation and emotions; and e) are able to respond appropriately verbally and/or nonverbally, (e.g. Miller, Nunnally & Wackman, 1975).

Considerable empirical and clinical evidence suggests that self-perception is an important factor in diagnostically identifying potential areas of relational conflict (Beck et al., 1979; Burgess & Wallin, 1943; Burr, 1967; Hawkins & Johnsen, 1969; Laing, et al., 1966; Locke & Wallace, 1959).

The second form of perception critically associated with relationship quality is "perception of other," which refers to an individual's accuracy in understanding, or being empathically aware of, the partner's self-perception (Beck et al., 1979; Miller et al., 1975a; Paolino & McCrady, 1978;

Smith, 1976; Stryker, 1962). The work of Laing et al. (1966) and Nye (1979) reveals the relative importance of perception of other. They report that accuracy in perceiving one's partner's point of view, regarding substantive relationship issues, was significantly lower in a sample of couples requesting marital therapy than for couples who had not reported marital distress. Couples who were able to accurately perceive their partner's views on substantive relationship issues (e.g., sex, desired number of children, childrearing, finances, etc.) were more satisfied than were couples in which one or both partners were low in accuracy (Norton & Glick, 1976; Miller et al., 1975a; Luckey, 1964, 1966).

Researcher theorists since 1970 have indicated that in addition to self-perception data, perception of other should be taken into consideration when evaluating relational dynamics (e.g., Norton & Glick, 1976). For example, Nye (1979), summarizing the importance of perception as a test of relationship quality states that ". . . the integrative quality of a {relationship} is reflected in the degree of congruence or incongruence between the way each partner sees himself in the {relationship} and the way he is perceived by the other partner" (p. 73). However, despite the proposed importance of evaluating relationships from the perspective of both self-perception and perception of other, all research measuring marital quality prior to the 1970's has focused exclusively on evaluating relationships using self-perception

data alone (Spanier, 1976).

Simply stated, researcher theorists are suggesting that the assessment of relationship quality necessitates collecting data of self-perception, as well as perception of other to maximize the quality of their relationship (Stukert, 1963; Tharp, 1963).

This study proposes that perception is uniquely intermeshed within the various substantive relationship issues, as well as within the interpersonal dynamics through which the couple play out their expectations associated with substantive relationship issues. Therefore, based on the research and clinical evidence suggested, even though a couple may appear to be identical in substantive areas of the relationship, when self-perception data alone is collected, it is possible that this similiarity may not be as significant or predictive as when self-perception and perception of other data are jointly assessed.

Verbal communication: One dimension of relationship quality. "Communication may be viewed as a symbolic transactional process, or to put it more simply, the process of creating and sharing meanings" (Galvin & Brommel, 1986, p.9). By symbolic, Galvin and Brommel refer to the fact that messages are transmitted vis-a-vis symbols. The degree to which meanings associated with the symbols are mutually shared determine whether or not the message is understood (Miller et al., 1975b).

Prior to the 1960's, minimal time and effort was

dedicated to researching communication and correlating the relationship between communication and relationship quality (Navran, 1967). Not until the late 1960's and early 1970's did researchers begin testing the influence of communication in relationship dynamics. Early extant research showed that communication, "nonverbal and verbal behavior in a social context" (Sauber, L'Abate & Weeks, 1985, p.27), was significantly related to the level of relationship quality. More recent research, such as that of Sauber et al. (1985), has suggested that the ability of the couple to effectively implement communication skills can be used as a reliable indicator of interpersonal functioning and that the level of satisfaction across the life cycle is a function of the couples' ability to effectively use communication skills (Jorgensen & Janis, 1980; Kahn, 1970; Miller et al., 1975b; Montgomery, 1981; Navran, 1967; Witkin & Rose, 1978).

The ability of a couple to communicate reflects strengths as well as difficulties in the various substantive areas of the relationship, and predisposes the couple to future satisfaction or discord (Lederer & Jackson, 1968; Levenson & Senn, 1967; Navran, 1967; Rausch, Barry, Hertel, & Swain, 1974).

Openness and understanding: Dimensions of communication.

Recognizing that relationship communication, and the consequent evolution of a "shared meaning," is fundamental to the facilitation of relationship quality (Galvin & Brommell, 1986; Miller et al., 1975b; Stuart, 1980; Thomas, 1977),

researchers have attempted to develop instruments capable of measuring various aspects of communication which correlate with relationship quality (e.g., Navran, 1967; Thomas, 1977). While other important dimensions of communication may be related to relationship quality, two dimensions are frequently cited: namely, openness and understanding.

Openness is the relative degree of self-disclosure, as well as the level of self-expression, between two or more interactants. The explicit intent of openness is to facilitate the formulation of a "shared meaning" (Miller et al., 1975b) such that understanding is enhanced. Openness is a continuous variable ranging from uncensored self-disclosure to censored self-disclosure. Uncensored self-disclosure is predicated on the "let-it-all-hang-out" ethic (Stuart, 1980, p.220). Censored self-disclosure refers to the lack of focus on information, perceptions or feelings; messages are infrequent, short, very intentional, and under conscious control. Such self-disclosures are often impersonal and inaccurate reflections of the communicator (Knapp, 1984).

Knapp (1984) has suggested that "The person who feels compelled to engage in a great deal of intimate self-disclosure {uncensored self-disclosure} in almost any setting is no more adjusted than the person who hides {censored self-disclosure} almost everything from everyone regardless of the setting. These indiscriminate high disclosers are not adapting their messages to their {receiver} audience" (p.211). Thus, too much self-disclosure can be problematic to both the

sender and the receiver.

Two studies (Navran, 1967; Reusch, 1957) address the effect of censored self-disclosure and suggest that those couples who censor their communication have distressed relationships. While the negative relationship between censored self-disclosure and relationship quality may appear to be relatively weak, due to the lack of direct attention on the issue, it should be noted that the majority of relationship communication studies allude to the fact that censored self-disclosure is negatively related to relationship quality.

While the two ends of the continuum are represented by uncensored and censored self-disclosure, the gradient in between is referred to as selective self-disclosure. Research suggests that "there are implicit boundaries of acceptable self-disclosure" (Stuart, 1980, p.217) depending on the level of the relationship (Fitzgerald, 1963; Jourard, 1959, 1971; Savicki, 1972). Selective self-disclosure of information takes into consideration the message's expected effect on the receiver. The purpose of selective self-disclosure is to enhance the probability that communication will have adaptive relationship value (Haley, 1963; Watzlawik, Beavin & Jackson, 1967). The question then is not so much, "What can I do to be totally open?" but rather, "What do I want to accomplish and how can I do it best" (Knapp, 1984, p.211). In order to selectively disclose information in a manner conducive to relationship development, the

communicator must consider such factors as: a) what is the issue; b) whether the disclosure is relevant; c) motives for the disclosure; d) amount of detail necessary; e) timing of the disclosure; f) the level of the relationship; g) the short/long term effects of the disclosure on the relationship; and h) the capacity of the receiver to respond (Knapp, 1984; Stuart, 1980).

When reviewed "in toto," however, studies in relationship communication suggest that the relationship between the amount of self-disclosure and relationship quality is curvilinear (e.g., Blau, 1964; Cozby, 1973; Cutler & Dyer, 1965; Goodrich, Ryder & Rausch, 1968; Jourard, 1971; Kanouse & Hanson, 1972; Knapp, 1984; Navran, 1967; Newcomb, 1953; Ruesch, 1957; Simmel, 1964; Stuart, 1980; Stukert, 1963; Stryker, 1962; Taylor, 1968).

The second dimension of communication is understanding, a continuous variable which ranges from understanding to misunderstanding and refers to the cognitive process by which an interactional exchange of ideas, emotions, intentions, etc. are mutually comprehended. Understanding stresses the ability to clearly and accurately perceive, as well as make intelligible, the meaning of information received and sent. Thus, as a couple can accurately perceive and make intelligible the ideas, emotions, intentions, etc. communicated, empathy can evolve within the relationship.

At a conscious level, the receiver frequently interprets the emotions, intentions, etc. literally, limiting the

understanding of the message to its content level. If the receiver sufficiently comprehends the literal intent of the message, the message is said to be understood at the content level.

Understanding requires more of receivers than their ability to correctly clarify and interpret the content of an intended message. Understanding necessitates that a couple consciously go beyond the content of the message and begin to comprehend the meaning the information has for the partner.

Although understanding at the content level is necessary, it is not a sufficient condition to effectively interact with others, especially in the context of an intimate relationship. If understanding is limited to the content level, this limitation impedes the ability of partners to empathize with each other and negates the probability of acquiring a "shared meaning." Understanding at the meaning level involves skills associated with content level understanding and those advanced communication skills necessary to accurately interpret content at a meaning level (e.g., Brammer, 1973; Carkhuff & Anthony, 1979).

Misunderstanding, the opposite end of the understanding continuum, is defined as the inability on the part of the receiver to accurately interpret and clarify messages disclosed so that shared meaning can evolve. Misunderstanding may arise as a result of either a sender or receiver deficit. The identified sender deficits include the inability of

senders to accurately interpret their own self-perceptions and/or failure to disclose self-perceptions.

To send messages that accurately reflect what the sender is experiencing requires an awareness of self, which is an essential aspect of the understanding process (Miller et al., 1975b). If individuals are unaware of their own perceptions, thoughts, and feelings, it is relatively impossible to share these with a partner without confusion. As individuals share common experiences, they begin to develop an understanding of what another person is saying through the communication process. Just as individuals develop the ability to understand one another through shared experiences, so interpersonal understanding is enhanced within relationships as couples develop shared meanings surrounding such substantive relationship issues as attitudes, beliefs, values, expectations, and feelings (Indvik & Fitzpatrick, 1982).

In addition to self-awareness, the sender must also be able and willing to self-disclose (Miller et al., 1975b). When the sender either fails to self-disclose or only partially discloses personally relevant information, the receiver must require the sender to provide interpretations, based on assumed meaning, when in reality this assumed meaning may not be accurate.

The two primary receiver deficits are assuming that the message received has been accurately understood and "mind-reading" (Bach & Deutsch, 1970). The most obvious receiver deficit influencing understanding is to assume that the message received is understood. Receivers who maintain

the assumptive process, based on their reality alone, will fail to develop the level of shared meaning and degree of empathetic communication necessary for interpersonal understanding.

Closely allied to assuming that the message received is understood is "mind-reading," defined as "making assumptions about the thoughts, feelings, and motives of a partner, then telling the partner what the partner thinks or feels, or ought to think or feel" (Sauber et al., 1985, p.108). This behavior by the receiver inhibits the communication process; the receiver's supposed "mind-reading" abilities are affirmed but understanding decreases.

In conclusion, mutual understanding can only occur when couples accurately share their thoughts, feelings, and beliefs with each other. Only accurate, selective disclosure develops interpersonal understanding (Littlejohn, 1978; Montgomery, 1981; Stuart, 1980), providing the necessary foundation for dealing with interpersonal differences and developing as well as maintaining satisfying intimate relationships (Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Stuart, 1980; Witkin & Rose, 1978).

Just as selective self-disclosure and accurate understanding are critical to the effective communication patterns of relationships,

Too much,
Too little,
Too early,
Too late,
At the wrong place,
Is the disturbed message's fate
(Reusch, 1957, p.41).

Summary

Prior to the 1970's considerable theoretical and empirical effort was devoted to developing instruments capable of assessing relationship quality. However, these instruments are limited to either assessing the identified relationship based on a small group of variables and/or evaluating the relationship largely based on self-perception only. During the 1970's researcher theorists (e.g., Lewis & Spanier, 1979; Olson, 1970) suggested that an accurate assessment of relationship quality necessitated instruments which derived data through multiple perceptions: namely, self-perception and perception of other. One example of an instrument that assesses a large pool of variables, as well as collects data for both self-perception and perception of other is the T-JTA. This instrument focuses on personality/temperament, however, rather than relational variables. As important as temperament data is to the user, it reflects only one aspect of the relationship. Thus, this study posits that a more holistic understanding of relational dynamics could be obtained if researchers, theorists, clinicians, and educators had an instrument which assessed temperament and an instrument which assessed relational variables from the perspective of self-perception and perception of other.

The intent of this study was a) to revise the MI into an instrument capable of measuring relationship strengths, as well as identifying potential areas of relationship conflict,

using both self-perception and perception of other data; b) to create factor structures for the communications items found in the CI; and c) to assess the stability of the communication scale scores.

Once future data analyses have been completed on all the items in the CI and factor structures have been completed, it is proposed that the CI could be combined with other instruments such as the T-JTA, for the purpose of devising interventive programs with the intent of enhancing relationship development and/or remediating relationship conflict. As such, the CI could make many clinical, theoretical, and educative contributions to the knowledge available on relationship quality.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Sample

The data for the study was collected in 1983-1984 by members of the Marriage Study Consortium at various locations around the United States. The study sampled 200 couples, comprised mainly of college students, both graduate and undergraduate, as well as other members of the respective communities where the inventory was administered.

In order to be included in the population sample, subjects had to be (1) married, (2) engaged, (3) planning to marry, or (4) living together. In addition to the relationship requirement, other factors associated with inclusion in the study included: (1) completion of all portions of the inventory (e.g., since the inventory took approximately 3.5 hours to complete, some only completed parts thereof); (2) appropriate completion of the inventory (e.g., some included multiple responses where only one response was asked for); and (3) inclusion of all identification data for matching one partner's responses with the other partner's. Of the 200 couples sampled, 183 couples (91.5%) qualified for the present study.

Instrument

The CI is a revised version of the MI, which incorporates data of self-perception and perception of other. The CI is divided into three major sections:

(1) "History and Plans," (2) "Values in Marriage; Part A," and (3) "Values in Marriage: Part B." The History and Plans section is comprised of 123 items which pertain to the respondent (e.g. sex, relationship status, birth order, education, occupation, etc.) and the respondent's relationship with her/his parents (e.g., feelings toward each parent, perceived parental roles, feelings of security, etc.). Respondents answer this section only once, in terms of how each question applies to themselves.

Values in Marriage: Part A is comprised of 95 items focusing on role expectations. Values in Marriage: Part B contains 165 items addressing the issues of values as well as personal and couple relationship readiness. Values in Marriage: Part A and Part B are answered twice. First, respondents answer both sections according to how the items apply to themselves (self-perception). Second, they answer the same questions as they perceive these would apply to the partner (perception of other).

The revised inventory incorporates self-perception and perception of other data. Items in the inventory were based on the original MI items but were rewritten so that respondents would be able to answer each item in terms of self-perception and perception of their partner (perception of other). For example: "I prefer to spend my leisure time in social activities rather than by myself" was rewritten to read, "_____ prefers to spend her/his leisure time in social activities rather than by her/himself." By putting

their own name and then their partner's name in the blank, respondents are able to answer each item according to how the item relates to themselves first, then how it pertains to their partner (See Appendix A).

To insure content validity of the items in the inventory, the author James K. Sessions and D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D., independently reworded each item. They then compared each item for rewording consistency. Next the author and Dr. Openshaw compared the rewording of each item with the corresponding item found in the MI to insure that the content remained consistent. Finally, several members of the Marriage Study Consortium (Darwin L. Thomas, Ph.D., & Jeanne E. Wilcox, Ph.D.) compared the rewritten items with the original items in the MI. The results of this procedure determined that the rewritten items were content consistent with those of the original MI.

Instrument Administration

Instructions pertaining to the administration of the CI and its return were given to members of the Marriage Study Consortium. These instructions were divided into four basic areas with a clarification of each area as follows:

The CI booklet. The CI booklet is divided into the following six parts:

PART ONE: A letter to the participants in the research project.

PART TWO: Instructions for completing the "Identification Information."

PART THREE: "General Instructions" for completing the CI.

PART FOUR: "History and Plans" section of the inventory (pp. 1-15).

PART FIVE: "Values in Marriage: Part A" section of the inventory (pp. 16-21).

PART SIX: "Values in Marriage: Part B" section of the inventory (pp. 22-31).

The computer sheet. The computer sheet was designed to collect the following data:

1. The initials, age, and social security number (the social security number recorded twice, once on both parts of the form) of the individual completing the inventories and their partner.
2. Demographic and basic relationship information (History and Plans: Self) of the individual completing the CI.
3. Values and expectations in marriage of the individual completing the CI (Values in Marriage: Parts A and B, self-perception).
4. Values and expectations in marriage of the partner, as perceived by the individual completing the CI (Values in Marriage: Parts A and B, perception of other).
5. Identifying information to be used for potential longitudinal research and the mailing of research findings to the participants.
6. A small box at the bottom of the second sheet of the inventory to be completed by the individual administering the CI. The person administering the CI marks "C" if the couple comes from a clinical population, "NC" if not.

Couples need to be instructed not to separate the computer sheets because the perforation accommodates the reading of the completed forms by the scanner.

Administering the CI. Because the CI is slightly more difficult to administer and complete than the MI, those administering the inventories should take them first so that they can give clear instructions. The following steps should be followed when administering the CI:

STEP ONE: Instruct the couple how to complete the "Identification Information" on the computer sheet.

STEP TWO: Read the "General Instructions" with the couple, pointing out aspects of the CI you and your partner noted while completing it.

STEP THREE: Instruct the couple to complete the Values in Marriage: Parts A and B first how it applies to themselves (self-perception), and second how it applies to their partner (perception of other). Demonstrate for them how to go back and re-do these sections as they perceive their partner. It is critical that the couple clearly understands how to do these portions of the CI.

STEP FOUR: Encourage the couple to complete all questions as accurately as possible.

STEP FIVE: Instruct the couple to complete the CI independent of each other.

Returning the "CI". Upon completion of the inventory, have the couple return the booklets and computer sheets to you. Check to see that it has been done accurately; then mark the box at the

bottom of the computer sheet which identifies whether the couple comes from a clinical or non-clinical population.

After the CI had been completed by the sample population, the computer sheets were returned to:

D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D.
Department of Family and Human Development
UMC 29
Logan, Utah 84322

Analysis

This study created linear composite scales or factors for the communication items of the CI and examined the reliability of the derived factors.

Linear composites. Blalock (1970), Kleber (1982), and Marradi (1981) suggest factor analysis as an analytic procedure designed to improve measurement through the development of linear composites, or factors, each of which contain multiple items of a theoretical concept. The following outlines the sequence of steps taken from Kleber (1982) involved in the factor analysis procedure used to create the linear composite scores, and briefly discusses the rationale associated with each step. The requirements which factor analysis places on computer memory space necessitates these steps as opposed to submitting all items to a factor analysis.

STEP ONE: Select items assumed to be best for each variable.

Based on extant research in the area of communication, items were selected from the Values in Marriage Parts A and B. These items have previously been found to correlate with

communication which facilitates relationship development and quality (e.g. Burgess & Wallin, 1943; Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

STEP TWO: Organize items into a priori subscales.

From the identified pool of communications items, items were grouped according to content associated with previously identified theoretical communication concepts. Thus, items were organized into a priori subscales based on the content encompassed therein.

STEP THREE: Submit each subscale to one principal components factor analysis (PA1) with varimax rotation.

All proposed subscales were submitted to a principal components factor analysis without iterations (PA1), using varimax rotation. PA1 assigns a communality of 1.0 to each variable after all possible factors are extracted. Varimax rotation "maximizes the variance of the squared factor loadings for each factor" (Kim & Mueller, 1978, p.35) and imposes the restriction of orthogonality between factors (Kleber, 1982).

STEP FOUR: Examine factor loadings to see if there are any items which:

- a) do not load on any factor;
- b) load on more than one factor;
- c) load on either the gender or age variables; or
- d) do not load on both self-perception and perception of other analyses.

It was important in this study that items account for a sufficient amount of accumulative variance to suggest that the obtained factor was representative of the construct being measured. A criterion loading of .50 was selected for

deciding whether or not to retain an item.

In addition, if an item loaded on more than one factor, it was essential to determine whether or not the content of the item was consistent with either of the factors. If an item was not consistent with the factor, it was discarded.

Due to the requirement of structural equivalence, if an item loaded on either gender or age, the item was deleted.

Because this study was designed to develop an instrument capable of collecting both self-perception and perception of other data, it was necessary that the items correlate significantly on the factors derived from the analysis of both self-perception and perception of other.

STEP FIVE: Examine factors to see if any contain items which do not make sense. Delete items which are uninterpretable.

All items were examined to determine whether or not they were consistent one with another. Items which were not connected with the intent of the factor were discarded.

STEP SIX: After deleting items in 4a and/or 4b (unless 4b makes sense for a priori subscales) and in 4c and 4d, resubmit the smaller pool of items to a second factor analysis using PA1 with varimax rotation.

STEP SEVEN: Repeat steps FOUR and FIVE above.

STEP EIGHT: Refactor each factor obtained separately to see if only one dimension has been empirically identified. Repeat steps FOUR and FIVE above as necessary.

It is critical at this point to be certain that the analyses have resulted in the identification of one

dimension, and that a single factor has been created and judged to be theoretically relevant (Marradi, 1981; Kleber, 1982).

The SPSSx computer program is not designed to analyze only two items. With the conflict management subscale, the factor analysis which included age and gender was used. This procedure resulted in a decreased eigenvalue and factor loading.

STEP NINE: Create factor scores.

Factor scores were computed by multiplying each individual score for each item by the factor loading for the respective item on that particular factor and summing (Bailey, 1978). The SPSSx factor procedure generates standardized factor scores with a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. All missing values found in the data were assigned a value equal to the mean for that item. There were no items in which more than 3% of the respondents required this mean substitution.

Estimate of reliability. In addition to using factor analysis as a procedure identified for increasing the reliability of measures, as well as the validity thereof (Jackson & Borgatta, 1981; Zeller & Carmines, 1980), this study examined the reliability of the communication scales through the use of Theta, a special case of Cronbach's alpha. "Specifically, Theta is the alpha coefficient for a composite in which the weighting vector has been chosen so as to make alpha a maximum. In other words, Theta may be considered a maximized alpha coefficient" (Greene & Carmines, 1980, p.62).

Structural equivalence. Family researchers, theorists, and clinicians are concerned with the applicability of the instrument for males and females, regardless of their age. The importance of identifying and/or constructing measures which are structurally equivalent is particularly relevant in analyzing data if comparisons are made between individuals of different gender and/or age. Research focusing on relationships necessitates the development of measures which are structurally equivalent in order to accurately analyze and predict quality and stability. In the analysis of this study, gender and age variables were utilized to determine whether or not the derived factors were structurally equivalent.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Factor Analysis I

Twenty-one (21) items (see Table 1) were identified from the Values in Marriage Parts A and B sections of the CI to comprise the communication dimension (Analysis Step One).

These items were then organized into 5 subscales (Step 2): openness, problem solving, decision making, misunderstanding, and conflict management. Principal components factor analysis (PA1) with varimax rotation (Step Three) was used to analyze each subscale. To test structural equivalence, the variables age and gender were included in each analysis.

Factors derived from each subscale were evaluated according to the criteria in Step Four. Results of the first factor analysis are found in Tables 2 through 11.

Subscale one: Openness. Ten items were identified as comprising this subscale. In the self-perception analysis (see Table 2), eight of the ten items achieved the requisite factor loading. Two of the original ten items did not meet the criteria identified in Step Four. Item 21 correlated with age and Item 219 did not achieve the requisite .50 factor loading.

The results of the perception of other analysis (see Table 3) showed nine items achieving a factor loading greater than .50. However, Item 21 had been deleted in the self-perception analysis as had Item 219. Three of the remaining eight items had also loaded on a second factor. In looking at these

Table 1

Items Comprising the Communication Dimension

Booklet Number	Variable Number	
		PART A
(6)	21.	Both should frequently confide in each other.
(38)	53.	The wife should have most of the say in deciding where they will go and what they will do when they go out.
(61)	76.	If the wife is the primary breadwinner, she should have the most say in family decisions.
(65)	80.	It is unwise to openly disagree in front of the children.
(66)	81.	Both should permit the children to share according to their abilities in making family decisions.
(68)	83.	Both should be very agreeable.
(69)	84.	If there is a difference of opinion, the wife ought to have at least as much say as the husband.
(83)	98.	It is acceptable to show or show anger when we are upset.
(84)	99.	If there is a difference of opinion, the husband should have more say in most areas.
		PART B
(12)	122.	_____ believes a person should talk over important decisions (such as marriage, employment, and residence) with family members before taking action.
(95)	205.	_____ is able to openly discuss personal feelings.
(109)	219.	_____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.
(117)	227.	_____ really knows and understands the partner.
(132)	242.	_____ believes we share with each other our ideals.
(140)	250.	_____ confides in the partner.
(148)	258.	_____ is able to be open and disclose inner feelings to the partner.
(149)	259.	_____ (mis)understands the partner's moods and feelings.
(156)	266.	_____ feels the partner (mis)understands his/her moods and feelings.
(158)	268.	_____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.
(160)	270.	_____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.
(163)	273.	_____ believes the partner understands him/her well.
(164)	274.	_____ believes we think in terms of "we" rather than "I".
(165)	275.	_____ shares innermost feelings with the partner.

Table 2

Factor Analysis I Openness (Self-perception)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
275. _____ share innermost feelings with the partner.	.79727		
258. _____ is able to be open and disclose inner feelings to the partner.	.74892		
250. _____ confides in the partner.	.72183		
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.69925		
242. _____ believes we share with other our ideals.	.66974		
205. _____ is able to openly discuss personal feelings.	.63582		
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.59758		
274. _____ believes we think in terms of "we" rather than "I".	.58226		
Age of Respondent		.81199	
21. Both should frequently confide in each other.		.63246	
Gender of respondent			-.80690
219. _____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.			

Table 3

Factor Analysis I Openness (Perception of Other)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.71806		
242. _____ believes we share with each other our ideals.	.67508		
250. _____ confides in the partner.	.60710	.54031	
275. _____ shares innermost feelings with the partner.	.59687	.55768	
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.59620		
274. _____ believes we think in terms of "we" rather than "I".	.57698		
258. _____ is able to be open and disclose inner feelings to the partner.	.56964	.52244	
205. _____ is able to openly discuss personal feelings.	.53016		
21. Both should frequently confide in each other.		.78658	
219. _____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.		.	
Age of respondent			.84388
Gender of respondent			-.58318

Table 4

<u>Factor Analysis I Problem Solving (Self-Perception)</u>			
<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
84. If there is a difference of opinion, the wife ought to have at least as much say as the husband.	-.76820		
99. If there is a difference of opinion, the husband should have more say in most areas.	.75681		
219. _____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.	-.56485		
Gender of respondent	.50915		
76. If the wife is the primary breadwinner, she should have the most say in family decisions.		.75095	
Age of respondent		-.72633	
53. The wife should have the most say in deciding where they will go and what they will do when they go out.			

Table 5

<u>Factor Analysis I Problem Solving (Perception of Other)</u>		<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
<u>Item</u>				
84.	If there is a difference of opinion, the wife ought to have at least as much say as the husband.	.80262		
99.	If there is a difference of opinion, the husband should have more say in most areas.	-.78427		
219.	_____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.	.		
76.	If the wife is the primary breadwinner, she should have the most say in family decisions.		.75897	
53.	The wife should have most of the say in deciding where they will go and what they will do when they go out.		.64800	
	Age of respondent		-.56290	
	Gender of respondent		.	

Table 6

Factor Analysis I Decision Making (Self-Perception)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
122. _____ believes a person should talk over important decisions with family members before taking action.	.73987		
81. Both should permit the children to share according to their abilities in making family decisions.	.63225		
83. Both should be very agreeable.	.61051		
98. It is acceptable to should and show agner when we are upset.		-.75196	
80. It is unwise to openly disagree in front of the children.		.69243	
Age of respondent			.74593
Gender of respondent			-.64960

Table 7

Factor Analysis I Decision Making (Perception of Other)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
122. _____ believes a person should talk over important decisions with family members before taking action.	.70668		
98. It is acceptable to shout or show anger when we are upset.	-.69628		
81. Both should permit the children to share according to their abilities in making family decisions.	.64058		
83. Both should be very agreeable.		.76892	
80. It is unwise to openly disagree in front of the children.		.66290	
Gender of respondent			-.74104
Age of respondent			.71599

Table 8

<u>Factor Analysis I Misunderstanding (Self-Perception)</u>			
<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
266. _____ feels the partner (mis)understands his/her moods and feelings.	.84550		
259. _____ (mis)understands the partner's moods and feelings.	.83038		
Age of respondent		.76610	
Gender of respondent		-.71403	

Table 9

<u>Factor Analysis I Misunderstanding (Perception of Other)</u>			
<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
259. _____ (mis)understands the partner's moods and feelings.	.84784		
266. _____ feels the partner (mis)understands his/her moods and feelings.	.83327		
Gender of respondent		.75764	
Age of respondent		-.71599	

Table 10

Factor Analysis I Conflict Management (Self-Perception)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.87198		
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.82698		
Gender of respondent		.87129	
Age of respondent		-.57626	

Table 11

Factor Analysis I Conflict Management (Perception of Other)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Factor 2</u>	<u>Factor 3</u>
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.82356		
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.79610		
Gender of respondent		.85584	
Age of respondent		-.59337	

items, it was determined that a separate concept of openness with emotions had been identified. Therefore, Items 250, 275, 258, and 205 were identified as one factor dealing with general openness, and Items 270, 242, and 268 identified as a second factor of emotional openness.

Subscale two: Problem solving. Five items were identified for this subscale. In the self-perception analysis (see Table 4), Items 84, 99, and 219 correlated with gender and Items 76 and 53 correlated with age. In the perception of other analysis (see Table 5), Items 84 and 99 did not correlate with age or gender, but to be consistent between self and other perception, this subscale and all its items were dropped from analysis.

Subscale three: Decision making. Five items were selected for this subscale. In the self-perception analysis (see Table 6), all the items achieved the required factor loading of .50 or greater but formed two separate factors. This also occurred in the perception of other analysis (see Table 7). However, Items 88 and 93 did not load on the same factor for both self and other perception, so these items were deleted. The remaining three items formed two factors. Items 81 and 122 on Factor 1 and Item 80 on Factor 2 could not be analyzed further due to limitations of the SPSSx program.

Subscale four: Misunderstanding. Two items were used to conceptualize this subscale. In both the self-perception and perception of other analyses, the two items achieved the requisite factor loading of .50 or greater and were not

correlated with age or gender (see Tables 8 and 9). Because the computer program cannot analyze two items only, these items were combined with the two items addressing understanding, Items 273 and 227.

Subscale five: Conflict management. Two items that dealt with conflict management were identified. In both the self-perception and perception of other analyses (see Tables 10 and 11), these two items achieved the requisite factor loading of greater than .50 and were not correlated with age or gender. However, because only two items cannot be submitted to a factor analysis, these results were viewed as final.

Factor Analysis II

Previous research (Marradi, 1981; Kleber, 1982) has suggested that once a single factor has been identified, to assess the reality of the obtained dimension the items must be submitted to one additional factor analysis. If the items group together as a single factor, they then depict one dimension of the identified concept; no further analysis is needed. After this single factor has been identified, the researcher can compute the Theta scores for these factors. Tables 12 through 15 show the results of the second factor analysis.

Factor one: General openness. Items 270, 250, 242, and 268 were submitted to this second analysis and all achieved a factor loading greater than .50 on factor one (see Table 12).

Factor two: Emotional openness. Items 258, 275, and 205

Table 12

<u>Factor Analysis II General Openness (Final)</u>		Self-perception	
<u>Item</u>		Factor 1	Communality
270.	_____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.78071	.60950
250.	_____ confides in the partner.	.76563	.58618
242.	_____ believes we share with each other our ideals.	.74237	.55111
268.	_____ feels free to give constructive, confrontative feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.70154	.49215
	Eigenvalue	2.23897	
	Theta	.737	
<hr/>			
<u>Item</u>		Perception of Other Factor 1	Communality
270.	_____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.79280	.62853
250.	_____ confides in the partner.	.76578	.586419
242.	_____ believes we share with each other our ideals.	.71260	.51779
268.	_____ feels free to give constructive, confrontative feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.62507	.39071
	Eigenvalue	2.114	
	Theta	.703	

Table 13

<u>Factor Analysis II Emotional Openness Factor (Final)</u>		<u>Self-perception</u>	
<u>Item</u>		<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Communality</u>
258. _____	is able to be open and disclose inner feelings to the partner.	.87639	.76805
275. _____	shares innermost feelings with the partner.	.86972	.75641
205. _____	is able to openly discuss personal feelings.	.77351	.59832
	Eigenvalue	2.123	
	Theta	.7935	
<hr/>			
<u>Item</u>		<u>Perception of Other</u>	
		<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Communality</u>
258. _____	is able to be open and disclose inner feelings to the partner.	.87388	.76366
275. _____	shares innermost feelings with the partner.	.86802	.75352
205. _____	is able to openly discuss personal feelings.	.82536	.68122
	Eigenvalue	2.114	
	Theta	.703	

were submitted to this final analysis; all achieved the requisite factor loading greater than .50 and were thus considered to comprise a single factor (see Table 13).

Factor three: Understanding. Previous research (Kleber, 1982) had attempted to combine Items 266, 259, 273, and 227 to create an understanding-misunderstanding continuum. The results of this research, however, indicated that these items do not comprise a single factor. Thus, Kleber (1982) suggested that these items may be methodological artifacts, and she therefore deleted them from further analyses. In the present study, however, the items were interpreted as representing a single dimension--understanding. To accommodate further analysis on this hypothesis, two steps were necessary. First, for analysis purposes, the items were inversely weighted. For example, a response of 1 was recorded as a 5; a response of 2 was recorded as a 4; etc. Second, the two items worded as misunderstanding (Items 266 and 259) were reworded for consistency with the new understanding dimension. This rewording would accommodate future analyses in that researchers would not be required to re-weight Items 266 and 259 before using them in an analysis. After completing these steps, the four items comprising this subscale were submitted to a second factor analysis (see Table 14). All items achieved a factor loading greater than .50 on factor one, therefore requiring no further analysis.

Table 14

<u>Factor Analysis II Understanding Factor (Final)</u>		Self-perception	
<u>Item</u>		<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Communality</u>
273.	_____ believes the partner understands him/her well.	.77960	.60777
227.	_____ really knows and understands the partner.	.74980	.56220
266.	_____ feels the partner (mis)understands his/her moods and feelings.	.70740	.50042
259.	_____ (mis)understands the partner's moods and feelings.	<u>.57173</u>	.32686
	Eigenvalue	1.997	
	Theta	.665	
<u>Perception of Other</u>		<u>Factor 1</u>	<u>Communality</u>
273.	_____ believes the partner understands him/her well.	.75644	.57220
227.	_____ really knows and understands the partner.	.70356	.49499
266.	_____ feels the partner (mis)understands his/her moods and feelings.	.73828	.54505
259.	_____ (mis)understands the partner's moods and feelings.	<u>.60559</u>	.36673
	Eigenvalue	1.979	
	Theta	.659	

Factor four: Conflict management. Although a second analysis on this factor is not possible because the computer program requires the submission of more than two items to the factor analysis, Items 268 and 270 will be discussed as they appear in the first analysis (see Table 15) It is important to note that the eigenvalue and Theta score for this factor are smaller than would be possible without the inclusion of age and gender.

Table 15

Factor Analysis II Conflict Management (Final)

<u>Item</u>	Self-perception	
	Factor 1	Communality
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.87198	.76035
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.82698	.68389
Gender of respondent		
<u>Age of respondent</u>	Eigenvalue	1.60669
	Theta	.50334
<u>Item</u>	Perception of Other	
	Factor 1	Communality
268. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.	.83256	.69315
270. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.	.79610	.51395
Gender of respondent		
<u>Age of respondent</u>	Eigenvalue	1.48912
	Theta	.43784

CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

This study was undertaken to accomplish the following objectives: (a) to revise the MI to facilitate the collection of self-perception and perception of other data; (b) to create the linear composite scales for the communication dimension; and (c) to assess the stability of the composite scale scores for those factors correlated with relationship communication.

Researchers, theorists, and clinicians, for over half a century, have worked on devising instruments predictive of relationship quality. Two factors have generated this activity: first, the high divorce rate in the United States, which had risen to 1,180,000 in 1984 [5.1 per 1,000 population] (National Center for Health Statistics, 1986); second, research has determined that the stability of a relationship is highly correlated with the quality thereof (Lewis & Spanier, 1979).

In an attempt to assess substantive areas correlated with relationship quality, three researchers at Brigham Young University, in collaboration with ten prominent family experts from around the United States (The Marriage Study Consortium), have compiled items from previously developed inventories thought to be predictive of relationship quality. Although these researcher theorists should be commended for having added to our present knowledge of relationship quality and the assessment thereof, they have

neglected several factors critical to the development of an instrument capable of providing an accurate assessment of relationship quality. The present study suggests that perception of other and structural equivalence have been omitted.

A couple's evaluation of relationship quality is primarily subjective in nature, based on two forms of perception. The first is the perception one has of her/his own functioning within the expectant roles of the relationship (self-perception). The second is the individual's perception of the partner's role performance (perception of other). This second form of perception is predicated on a preconceived set of expectations which may or may not have been disclosed to the partner but remain as the basis for evaluating the partner.

With the addition of this second form of perception, many of the items previously used to assess and predict relationship quality, more specifically communication, were found to be insignificantly correlated with relationship quality. For this reason, the prerequisite for retaining an item for further analyses was that the item achieve a factor loading of .50 or greater.

Structural equivalence has also been omitted from earlier studies. Structural equivalence, for the purpose of this study, refers to the fact that an item is relevant and predictive regardless of the respondent's age and/or gender. Even though an item has been correlated with some identified relationship dimension for both self-perception and

perception of other, the item does not accurately contribute to the overall assessment of the particular substantive area of the relationship if it is found to be correlated with age and/or gender. To merely assume that an item is structurally equivalent because it correlates with a given dimension or subscale is methodologically problematic.

Structural equivalence for age and gender is particularly important when designing an instrument which has utility for heterosexual couples of various ages. For this reason, age and gender were included as variables in the factor analyses of the present study to eliminate those items identified from extant research which may be biased.

When perception of other, age, and gender were included in the analyses, many of the items previously believed to comprise communication were determined inappropriate and did not warrant further attention. In conclusion, this research study suggests that the items which were eliminated from further analyses were not accurate representations of relationship communication or the dimensions thereof.

In this study factor analyses were performed on the items comprising the communication dimension of the CI. The factor analyses followed those procedures outlined in the Analysis section. The issues of perception and structural equivalence were considered. Theta, a test of reliability, was calculated on those factors found to be theoretically consistent.

Estimate of Reliability

The four factors remaining that met the criterion established in the Analysis procedures were General Openness, Emotional Openness, Understanding, and Conflict Management. Although no set rules have been established for determining a significant Theta score, all the identified factors achieved a score greater than .50 and were thus considered reliable (see Tables 12, 13, 14, and 15). Since the subscales are comprised of relatively few items, it was anticipated that the reliability coefficient would be low. In this study, however, all reliability coefficients were greater than .66; therefore, should future researchers determine other items which would correlate with those already identified and add them in, the result would be a higher reliability coefficient.

Issues of Validity

Several experts in the family field reviewed each communication item and agreed that the selected items were representative of communication.

Although deemed important, as continued work on the construction of the CI progresses, it was not the intent of the present study to assess criterion-related validity. It should be noted, however, that previous research using items in the CI have shown a correlation between the item and a given criterion. This suggests that criterion-related validity is present even though the new factors have not been specifically tested for criterion-related validity.

Also, after the CI has been fully developed, researchers can test for construct validity administering the measures to two groups (clinical and nonclinical) known to be different. If construct validity is upheld, the two groups should produce different scores (Eckhardt & Ermann, 1977).

Identified Factors

For one of the subscales, problem solving, none of the items met the specified criteria (e.g., theoretical consistency, structural equivalence, loading on the same factor for both self-perception and perception of other, and/or a factor score of .50 or greater). This subscale was, therefore, considered problematic and deleted from further analysis. Analysis of the decision making subscale could not be completed due to limitations of the SPSSx computer program.

General openness. Four items, which address such issues as personal problems, confiding in each other, sharing personal ideals, and giving feedback to the partner (see Table 12), comprise this communication factor. When these items are combined, a global dimension of openness is formed, revolving around the most well-recognized areas of relational disclosure. A global measure of general openness is advantageous in various contexts of assessment. After a general assessment has been made, it is then possible to focus more specifically on substantive relationship issues divulged by the couple during the process of communication. Thus, beginning with global, then proceeding to more specific is a logical explanatory process.

Emotional openness. The emotional openness factor is comprised of three items assessing the degree of couple disclosure and sharing of information concerning personal feelings (see Table 13).

Emotional openness, though global in nature, is a dimension of general openness. This finding is also significant in that it suggests that openness may be multidimensional. The identification and understanding of the various dimensions of openness become critical to accurately perceiving the partner in terms of the partner's ideas, thoughts, and feelings.

Understanding. Previous research has treated understanding as a continuum ranging from understanding to misunderstanding. This conceptualization is problematic since the way the items in this subscale factor does not suggest a continuum. This study addressed the problem by conceptualizing understanding as a unidimensional construct. To remedy the conceptual difficulty, the items previously identified as depicting misunderstanding were re-weighted. When these re-weighted items were included in the factor analysis with those previously identified as indicants of understanding, the analysis resulted in the four items loading as one factor (see Table 14). The items, as they appeared in the inventory have been reworded so that they are theoretically consistent with the construct and re-weighting is no longer necessary.

Conflict management. Although the eigenvalue and Theta score for this factor are decreased due to the necessary

inclusion of age and gender (see Table 15), this factor identifies a dimension of communication that deserves further attention. Conflict management is important to the maintenance of relationships (e.g. Stuart, 1980) and necessary to relationship quality.

Implications

This study has identified important information that will contribute to the study and assessment of relationship quality. With the addition of perception of other to self-perception information, clinicians will have a more holistic view of the dynamics of relationship communication. Clinicians will be able to use the couple openness and understanding measures to assess specific couple needs. Based on the data collected and the evaluation derived therefrom, the clinician will be better able to formulate interventive strategies and instigate these strategies in such a way to directly enhance relationship communication and indirectly facilitate relationship quality.

Moreover, the use of these measures of communication is not restricted to clinical populations, but can be effectively used to improve already desirable relationship communication patterns, through perhaps the most recognized manner, the communication training offered in relationship enhancement programs.

This study makes several important theoretical and methodological contributions which will facilitate future research in relationship dynamics in general and,

specifically, in relationship communication.

First, the present study goes beyond merely supporting previous research which has set forth self-disclosure and understanding as important communication dimensions of relationship communication. This research indicates that the number of items in current inventories could be significantly reduced by taking into account their relevance to perception of other, self-perception, and structural equivalence. The result would be a pool of items which could more appropriately examine dynamic relationship communication.

Second, this study demonstrates that certain dimensions of relationship communication can be more accurately assessed when the researcher combines and examines the results of self-perception and perception of other data. Using this methodology, it is suggested that the data acquired is more likely to lead to the formation of empirically based conclusions and recommendations that facilitate intervention programs which would directly address the enhancement of relationship communication.

Third, the findings of this study, particularly the relative importance of perception of other data in assessing relationship issues, as well as structural equivalence, have potential generalizability to other substantive relationship areas (e.g., role expectations, values, etc.).

Fourth, the items retained through the complete analytic process were those which appeared to present a more global, as

opposed to a specific, conceptualization of the communications construct under investigation. Such variables permit a multiplicity of issues to be explicitly and/or implicitly examined within the same context. From a more global perspective, when all areas have been analyzed, the pool of general possibilities could be reduced and focused to more specific areas.

Fifth, there is some evidence, even at a global level, of multidimensionality. This was particularly noted in the findings related to openness, wherein two independent factors were found.

Within family life education, communication forms the foundation on which most of the substantive information is predicated. This appears to be true regardless of whether the subject is human sexuality, parenting processes, etc. In fact, an examination of the reasons given for divorce (e.g., sex, finances, incompatibility, etc.) suggest that these reasons are closely related to the inability of the couple to communicate and resolve problematic issues.

Communication factors add several important contributions to family life education. First, the communication items, and in the future the CI, will provide a basis for the assessment of potential relationship problems, as well as strengths. It is proposed that the completed CI will be appropriate for use in high school family life education courses, as well as colleges and universities. Students who are dating, engaged, living together, or married will be

able to take the inventory and obtain results regarding substantive areas of their relationship.

Second, the communication items can be used by practitioners to assess relationship communication, providing them with the necessary knowledge to educate couples who have taken the inventory in the skills necessary to facilitate openness, understanding, and conflict management.

Third, in educational settings addressing relationship development, the communication factors identified in this study provide new information regarding important variables in relationship communication. Relationship issues presently taught in educational courses are not taking into consideration the combined role of self-perception and perception of other, openness, and understanding as described in this study. College and university classes such as Marriage and the Family, could also benefit from this new information, especially when the analyses on the entire CI have been completed.

Finally, because the overall project intends to provide couples with a useful instrument for assessing their own relationship and interpreting the results thereof, couples could take the inventory with their partner and privately examine the results. This information can give couples a greater knowledge of their relationship and suggest what they can do to increase their awareness of one another.

Conclusions

By combining self-perception and perception of other data with the test for structural equivalence, this study has identified four factors that are reliable measures of couple communication: namely, general openness, emotional openness, understanding, and conflict management. These dimensions of communication are important when multiple perceptions and structural equivalence have been evaluated. This study has identified four topics that are of special significance.

First, with the assessment of communication items through the use of self-perception and perception of other, many items previously thought to be reliable measures of coupled communication were found to be limited to self-perception only. When combined with a test for structural equivalence, these communication items became less biased in terms of whom the measures can accurately assess.

Second, the openness dimension, and probably the others as well, appear to be multidimensional. Instead of assuming that the present measures are inclusive of all possible components of the given dimension, this study suggests that further research in this area is needed.

Third, prior to this study, understanding has been viewed as a continuum ranging from understanding to misunderstanding. The results of this study indicate that this does not hold true. When the items measuring misunderstanding were changed to assess understanding, the items formed one factor instead of splitting into two

factors, as was found in previous research.

Fourth, those items previously included as measures of problem solving and decision making were highly correlated with age and gender of the respondent or did not make theoretical sense and were therefore unreliable, biased measures.

Limitations

Although the communications items previously discussed are applicable in a number of settings, several limitations have been identified; namely, sampling, the inability to complete analysis on two of the identified communication subscales due to a flaw in the computer program, the validity of the scales, and the need to measure relationship quality through the use of multiple relational variables.

First, the sample size for this study was restricted to 183 couples due to the limitations imposed by a) the sampling process and b) the length of the inventory. Due to the reliance on colleagues around the United States to collect data, the majority of subjects sampled were affiliated with a university and as such may not be representative of the population in general. In addition, there were no subjects identified as "clinical" and therefore no conclusions or comparisons can be suggested regarding this population.

The length of the inventory also proved a limitation. All researchers involved in the collection of data noted that many couples either did not complete the inventory or did not participate due to the amount of time required for completion.

Although the sample size for the overall inventory was necessarily small because the analyses did not look specifically at a restricted area, it was determined to be adequate to analyze the communication subscales.

In addition to sample size producing potential limitations to the study, the generalizability of the study has also been limited by the fact that the sample obtained was not random. It should be noted, however, that due to the exploratory nature of this study, the sampling procedures were considered adequate to address the questions necessary to limiting the size of the inventory for future investigations.

It is recommended that when the analyses on remaining subscales are completed, the resulting smaller pool of items be readministered to a larger representative sample. Such a procedure will overcome the sampling limitations and will increase the probability of identifying relational factors correlated with relationship quality.

Second, as was discussed in the Results chapter, the SPSSx computer program used to analyze the data assigned all factors containing less than three variables the same factor score. This made final analysis of the decision making and conflict management dimensions impossible within the restrictions of the present program.

Third, although reliability scores for the identified factors were high, the study was not designed to directly address the questions of criterion-related and construct validity.

Fourth, this study was part of a larger study which is in the process of analyzing the remaining subscales contained in the CI. Until these analyses are completed, the communications factors identified in this study have limited utility in view of the need to look at relationship quality from a multidimensional perspective.

This study, despite the limitations identified, focusing specifically on the communication dimensions referred to as understanding and openness, significantly contributes to the present knowledge of relationship communication. Furthermore, when the CI is completed, it will significantly contribute to the present knowledge on relationship quality and the assessment thereof.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results of this study have identified several important contributions to the knowledge on couple communication. However, there are several recommendations that would greatly add to this knowledge and the utility of the identified communication dimensions.

First, although the results of this study are important, future research should focus on identifying additional items which could be used to measure the previously identified communications dimensions.

Second, since the openness dimension appears to be multidimensional, this study recommends that all communications dimensions be evaluated in order to test the hypothesis that they may also be general dimensions which can

be broken down into more than one communication measure.

Third, future research should also address non-verbal communication, specifically how this communication impacts verbal communication between couples.

Fourth, completion of the CI analyses should be completed so that profiling of the identified dimensions can be initiated. This step is necessary if the CI is to have utility as an assessment tool. When this profiling is completed, the CI could be combined with other instruments such as the T-JTA to provide a more holistic assessment of the given relationship.

Finally, a longitudinal study should be undertaken from a representative sample. From this study, the validity of the CI scales could be completed; the CI would then become a viable instrument for assessing the quality and stability of heterosexual relationships.

REFERENCES

- Bach, G., & Deutsch, R. (1970). Pairing. New York: Avon Publishing.
- Bailey, D. (1978). Methods of social research. New York: The Free Press.
- Beck, A. T., Rush, A. J., Shaw, B. F., & Emery, C. (1979). Cognitive therapy of depression. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Blalock, H. (1970). Estimating measurement error using multiple indicators at several points in time. American Sociological Review, 35, 101-111.
- Blau, P. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Brammer, L. M. (1973). The helping relationship: Process and skills. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Burgess, E. W., & Cottrell, L. S., Jr. (1959). Predicting success or failure in marriage. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc..
- Burgess, E. W., & Wallin, P. (1943). Homogamy in social characteristics. American Journal of Sociology, 49, 109-124.
- Burr, W. R. (1967). Marital satisfaction: A conceptual reformulation; theory and partial test of the theory. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- Burr, W. R. (1973). Theory construction and the sociology of the family. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Anthony, W. A. (1979). The skills of helping. Amherst, Massachusetts: Human Resource Development Press.
- Cozby, P. W. (1973). Self-disclosure: A literature review. Psychological Bulletin, 79, 73-91.
- Cutler, B. R., & Dyer, W. G. (1965). Initial adjustment process in young married couples. Social Forces, 44, 195-201.
- Eckhardt, K. W., & Ermann, M. P. (1977). Social research methods: Perspective, theory, and analysis. New York: Random House.
- Fitzgerald, M. P. (1963). Self-disclosure and expressed self-esteem, social distance and areas of the self revealed. Journal of Psychology, 56, 405-412.

- Galvin, K. M., & Brommel, B. J. (1986). Family communication: Cohesion and change. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Goodrich, W., Ryder, R. G., & Rausch, H. L. (1968). Patterns of newlywed marriage. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30, 383-391.
- Greene, V., & Carmines, E. (1980). Assessing the reliability of linear composites. In K. Schussler (Ed.), Sociological methodology (pp. 160-175). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, B. (1973). Value clarification as learning process. New York: Paulist Press.
- Haley, J. (1963). Marriage therapy. The Archives of General Psychiatry, 8, 213-214.
- Hawkins, J. L., & Johnsen, K. (1969). Perception of behavioral conformity, imputation of consensus, and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 31, 501-511.
- Hicks, M. W., & Platt, M. (1970). Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 59-78.
- Indvik, J., & Fitzpatrick, M. A. (1982). Understanding and misunderstanding in the marital dyad. Family Relations, 31, 43-51.
- Jackson, D. J., & Borgatta, E. F. (1981). Introduction: measurement in sociological research. In D. J. Jackson and E. F. Borgatta (Eds.), Factor analysis and measurement in sociological research. (pp. 3-7). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Jorgensen, S. R., & Janis, C. G. (1980). Self-disclosure and satisfaction in marriage: The relation examined. Family Relations, 29, 281-287.
- Jourard, S. M. (1959). Self-disclosure and other-cathesis. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 428-431.
- Jourard, S. M. (1971). The transparent self. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Kahn, M. (1970). Non-verbal communication and marital satisfaction. Family Process, 9, 449-456.
- Kanouse, D. E., & Hanson, L. R. (1972). Negativity in evaluation. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.

- Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. (1975). Inside the family, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). Factor analysis: Statistical issues. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.
- Kleber, J. E. (1982). The influence of similar symbolic environments on love in mate selection. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.
- Knapp, M. L. (1984). Interpersonal communication and human relationships. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc..
- Laing, R. D., Phillipson, H., & Lee, A. R. (1966). Interpersonal perception. London: Tavistock Publication.
- Lederer, W. J., & Jackson, D. B. (1968). The mirages of marriage. New York: Norton Inc..
- Levenger, G., & Senn, D. J. (1967). Disclosure of feelings in marriage. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 13, 237-249.
- Lewis, R. A., & Spanier, G. B. (1979). Theorizing about the quality and stability of marriage. In W. Burr, R. Hill, F. I. Nye, and I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, Volume I (pp. 268-294). New York: The Free Press, 268-294.
- Littlejohn, S. W. (1978). Theories of human communication. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merritt Publishing Co..
- Locke, H. J., & Wallace, K. M. (1959). Short marital adjustment prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. Marriage and Family Living, 21, 250-255.
- Luckey, E. B. (1964). Marital satisfaction and personality correlates of spouses. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 26, 47-48.
- Luckey, E. B. (1966). Numbers of years married as related to personality perception and marital satisfaction. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 28, 44-48.
- Marradi, A. (1981). Factor analysis as an aid in the formation and refinement of empirically useful concepts. In D. J. Jackson and E. F. Borgatta (Eds.), Factor analysis and measurement in sociological research (pp. 11-49). Beverly Hills, Ca.: Sage Publications.
- Miller, S., Corrales, R., & Wackman, D. B. (1975a). Recent progress in understanding and facilitating marital communication. The Family Coordinator, 24, 143-152.

- Miller, S., Nunally, E. W., & Wackman, D. B. (1975b). Alive and aware. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Interpersonal Communication Programs, Inc..
- Montgomery, B. M. (1981). The form and function of quality communication in marriage. Family Relations, 30, 21-30.
- National Center for Health Statistics. (1986). Monthly Vital Statistics Report, 34, No. 11, 2.
- Navran, L. (1967). Communication and adjustment in marriage. Family Process, 6, 173-184.
- Newcomb, T. M. (1953). An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psychological Review, 60, 393-404.
- Norton, A. J., & Glick, P. C. (1976). Marital instability: Past, present, future. The Journal of Social Issues, 32, 5-20.
- Nye, I. F. (1978). Is choice and exchange theory the key. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 40 (2), 219-232.
- Nye, I. F. (1979). Choice exchange and the family. In W. Burr, R. Hill, I. F. Nye, & I. L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, Volume I (pp. 1-42). New York: The Free Press.
- Olson, D. H. (1970). Marital and family therapy: Integrative review and critique. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 32, 501-538.
- Paolino, T. J., & McCrady, B. S. (1978). Marriage and marital Therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Raush, H. L., Barry, W. A., Hertel, R. K., & Swain, N. A. (1974). Communication, conflict and marriage. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reusch, J. (1957). Disturbed communication. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc..
- Sauber, R. S., L'Abate, L., & Weeks, G. R. (1985). Family therapy: Basic concepts and terms. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation.
- Savicki, V. (1972). Outcomes of nonreciprocal self-disclosure strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 23, 271-276.
- Simmel, G. (1964). The sociology of George Simmel. New York: The Free Press.
- Smith, H. C. (1976). Sensitivity to people. New York: McGraw-Hill Co..

- Spanier, G. B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 38, 15-28.
- Spanier, G. B., & Cole, C. L. (1976). Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment. International Journal of the Sociology of the Family, 6, 121-146.
- Spanier, G. B., & Lewis, R. A. (1980). Marital quality: A review of the seventies. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42, (4), 825-837.
- Stryker, S. (1962). Conditions of accurate role-taking: A test of Mead's theory. In A. Rose (Ed.), Human behavior and social process (pp. 41-62). Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
- Stuart, R. B. (1980). Helping couples change. New York: Guilford Press.
- Stukert, R. P. (1963). Role perception and marital satisfaction: A configurational approach. Marriage and Family Living, 25, 415-419.
- Taylor, D. (1968). The development of interpersonal relationships: Social penetration processes. Journal of Social Psychology, 75, 79-90.
- Taylor, R. M., & Johnson R. H. (1941). Taylor-Johnson temperament analysis. Los Angeles: Psychological Publications Inc.
- Tharp, R. G. (1963). Psychological patterning in marriage. Psychological Bulletin, 60, 97-117.
- Theodorson, G. A., & Theodorson, A. G. (1969). Modern dictionary of sociology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co..
- Thomas, E. J. (1977). Marital communication and decision making: Analysis, assessment, and change. New York: The Free Press.
- Watzlawick, P., Beavin, J., & Jackson, D. D. (1967). Pragmatics of human communication. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Witkin, S., & Rose, S. (1978). Group training in communication skills: A preliminary report. International Journal of Family Counseling, 6, 45-56.
- Yorgason, B. G., Burr, W. R., & Baker, T. (1980). The marital inventories. Provo Utah: The Marriage Study Consortium.
- Zeller, R. A., & Carmines, E. G. (1980). Measurement in the social sciences: The link between theory and data. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDIX

THE COUPLES INVENTORIES

Dear Participant:

You have been selected to participate in a national study for the purpose of designing an instrument that will be used to assess couple compatibility and predict the likelihood of a successful relationship.

The inventories* in this booklet are for couples who are married, engaged, seriously considering marriage, or living together. The questions deal with topics such as your readiness for marriage or an intimate relationship and how similar you are to your partner. This focus makes the inventories useful in evaluating couple compatibility and predicting changes of a successful relationship.

Upon final development of the instrument, couples who complete these inventories will have the opportunity to discuss their scores with a therapist, counselor, clergy or other helping person who has administered the instrument. This will help the couple understand what the scores mean and how the scores can help them either better prepare for marriage or enhance their present relationship.

No portion of the information provided by you will be used for purposes other than research designed to develop the instrument. Analyses will be presented on groups of couples rather than individual couples, thus assuring confidentiality and anonymity.

In behalf of my colleagues, I express our appreciation to you at this time for your willingness to take part in this very important study.

Sincerely yours,

D. Kim Openshaw, MSW, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Assistant Professor and Coordinator
Marriage and Family Therapy
Utah State University
Logan, UT 84322

*These inventories were developed by the Marriage Study Consortium, a multi-university group studying marriage and relationship development. The authors on the front cover are the primary authors, but they were assisted by the following individuals, listed alphabetically: Alan Acock, Carlfred Broderick, Wesley R. Burr, Randall Day, Martin Denker, Erik Filsinger, Richard Galligan, Thomas B. Holman, David Klein, Geoffrey Leigh, Gary Peterson, Richard Smith, and Murraray Straus.

Some of the items in these inventories were developed by other scholars in the field of marriage and the family such as Ernest Burgess and his colleagues, Gordon Allport, Wesley Poe, Marie Dunn, Graham Spanier, Richard Stuart, and others. Sincere appreciation is expressed to them.

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

1. Each person who completes the inventories should have a booklet and an answer sheet.
2. Complete the inventories alone, and do not talk with your partner or anyone else while you are answering the questions.
3. Do not write or mark on this booklet. Mark your answers only on the answer sheet provided.
4. BE SURE TO ANSWER EVERY QUESTION, even if you feel uncertain about the answer.
5. Indicate your answer on the answer sheet by making a heavy pencil mark in the appropriate space.
6. If you need to change an answer, erase your first answer completely.
7. As you complete the questions, there is sometimes a temptation to give the "ideal" answers, rather than the cold, hard truth. The more honest you are, the more valuable the scores will be to the development of the instrument. Therefore..."tell it like it is," not like you'd like it to be.

HISTORY AND PLANS

Instructions

- (a) Answer each of the following questions as they apply to your own history and plans.
- (b) Pick the answer which most accurately describes your situation.
- (c) Do not leave a blank to indicate a no answer.
1. My sex is:
 1. Male
 2. Female
 2. I am:
 1. The only child
 2. The oldest child
 3. An in-between child
 4. The youngest child
 3. My present marital status is:
 1. Single (not going with anyone in particular)
 2. Single (going with one person mostly)
 3. Living together with no plans to marry partner
 4. Living together with plans to marry partner
 5. Engaged or informally planning on marriage
 6. Married and it is my first marriage
 7. Remarried after being widowed or divorced
 8. Separated, divorced, or widowed and not remarried
 9. None of the above
 4. I am enrolled in:
 1. High school
 2. Technical school
 3. Junior college
 4. University/College
 5. I am not a student
 5. How much formal education have I completed?
 1. High school
 2. Freshman or sophomore (college or technical school)
 3. Junior or senior (college or technical school)
 4. College bachelors degree
 5. Graduate studies
 6. Graduate degree

HISTORY & PLANS

-2-

6. My scholastic average (GPA) is (or was):
 1. F
 2. D
 3. C
 4. B
 5. A

7. While growing up I lived most of my life in:
 1. A rural area
 2. A small town; under 5,000 (not a suburb)
 3. A small city; 5,000-100,000 (not a suburb)
 4. A suburb of a large city
 5. A large city; 100,000+

8. The place where I live at this time is:
 1. A rural area
 2. A small town; under 5,000 (not a suburb)
 3. A small city; 5,000-100,000 (not a suburb)
 4. A suburb of a large city
 5. A large city; 100,000+

9. My race is:
 1. White
 2. Black
 3. American Indian, Eskimo, Aleut
 4. Asian, Pacific Islander
 5. Hispanic
 6. Other

10. My religious affiliation is:
 1. Catholic
 2. Protestant
 3. Jewish
 4. L.D.S. (Mormon)
 5. Other

11. I would rate my own physical attractiveness as:
 1. Very unattractive
 2. Unattractive
 3. Average
 4. Attractive
 5. Very attractive

12. How many close friends of the opposite sex have I had?
 1. None
 2. One or two
 3. Three or four
 4. Five to ten
 5. Over ten

HISTORY & PLANS

-3-

13. How many of the opposite sex have I gone steady with?
 1. None
 2. One
 3. Two
 4. Three
 5. Four or more
14. How many dates have I had in the last year?
 1. I'm married
 2. none
 3. less than 5
 4. more than 5, but less than 25
 5. more than 25
15. How active am I in my church?
 1. I am not active
 2. I attend a few meetings
 3. I attend most of my meetings
 4. I attend all my meetings but don't really like to go
 5. I attend all my meetings and enjoy going
16. How many separated or divorced people do I know well?
 1. None
 2. One to two
 3. Three or four
 4. Five to ten
 5. More than ten
17. My political views are:
 1. Very conservative
 2. Slightly conservative
 3. Neutral
 4. Slightly liberal
 5. Very liberal
18. Where did I get most of my information about sex?
 1. Parent(s)
 2. Other adult(s)
 3. Friend(s)
 4. Brother(s) or sister(s)
 5. Reading
 6. Other sources
19. How many children do my parents have? (Include adoptions)
 1. 1
 2. 2-3
 3. 4-5
 4. 6 +

HISTORY & PLANS

-4-

20. How many children do you have?
- 1.
 2. 2-3
 3. 4-5
 4. 6 +
 5. None
21. I was reared mostly:
1. By my natural father and mother
 2. By a natural parent and a step parent
 3. By one natural parent only
 4. In a foster home(s) or orphanage(s)
 5. Other
22. On the whole, my childhood was:
1. Extremely unhappy
 2. Less happy than average
 3. About average
 4. More happy than average
 5. Extremely happy
23. The highest level of formal education completed by my mother was:
1. Grade school
 2. High school
 3. Technical school
 4. College/University
 5. Graduate school
24. The highest level of formal education completed by my father was:
1. Grade school
 2. High school
 3. Technical school
 4. College/University
 5. Graduate school
25. Which comes closest to describing my mother's occupation?
1. Homemaker
 2. Services (maid, waitress, etc.)
 3. Clerical (secretary, etc.)
 4. Professional or managerial
 5. Other
26. Which comes closest to describing my father's occupation?
1. Laborer
 2. Farm Owner
 3. Tradesman (plumber, machinist, etc.)
 4. Professional or managerial
 5. Other

HISTORY & PLANS

-5-

27. While growing up, the marital status of my mother was:
1. Married (their first marriage)
 2. Divorced or separated and not remarried
 3. Remarried after a divorce
 4. Remarried after a death of spouse
 5. One or both deceased and other not remarried
28. While growing up, the marital status of my father was:
1. Married (their first marriage)
 2. Divorced or separated and not remarried
 3. Remarried after a divorce
 4. Remarried after a death of spouse
 5. One or both deceased and other not remarried
29. How happy was my mother in her marriage?
1. Very unhappy
 2. Unhappy
 3. Average
 4. Happier than average
 5. Very happy
30. How happy was my father in his marriage?
1. Very unhappy
 2. Unhappy
 3. Average
 4. Happier than average
 5. Very happy
31. While growing up my feelings toward my mother were:
1. Very attached
 2. Attached
 3. Neutral
 4. Little attachment
 5. No attachment
32. My present feelings toward my mother are:
1. Very attached
 2. Attached
 3. Neutral
 4. Little attachment
 5. No attachment
33. While growing up my feelings toward my father were:
1. Very attached
 2. Attached
 3. Neutral
 4. Little attachment
 5. No attachment

HISTORY & PLANS

-6-

34. My present feelings toward my father are:
1. Very attached
 2. Attached
 3. Neutral
 4. Little attachment
 5. No attachment
35. While growing up, my mother showed physical affection toward me by hugging and kissing me:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
36. While growing up, my father showed physical affection toward me by hugging and kissing me:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
37. While growing up, I experienced a feeling of security in my relationship with my mother:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
38. While growing up, I experienced a feeling of security in my relationship with my father:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
39. While growing up, when my mother tried to influence me, she would explain to me the probable impact of my behavior on others and myself:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
40. While growing up, when my father tried to influence me, he would explain to me the probable impact of my behavior on others and myself:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always

HISTORY & PLANS

-7-

41. Once rules were established in my family, my mother was firm in enforcing them:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
42. Once rules were established in my family, my father was firm in enforcing them:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
43. While growing up, my mother enjoyed doing things with me:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
44. While growing up, my father enjoyed doing things with me:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
45. While growing up, my mother would get cross and angry at me when I did something she didn't approve of:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
46. While growing up, my father would get cross and angry at me when I did something he didn't approve of:
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always

HISTORY & PLANS

-8-

Everyone gets into conflicts with other people, and sometimes these lead to physical blows such as pushing, shoving, and hitting.

	Never	Once that year	About 2 to 9 times	About 10 to 20 times	More than 20 times	Not Appli- cable
A. During the last year in my parents' home, how many times, on the average, did:						
47. My brothers and/or sisters push, shove or hit me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
48. I push, shove or hit one of my brothers and/or sisters?	1	2	3	4	5	6
49. My parents push, shove or hit me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
50. I push, shove or hit my parents?	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. During the last year I was dating, how many times, on the average, did:						
51. My dating partner/fiance'(e) push, shove or hit me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
52. I push, shove or hit my dating partner/fiance'(e)?	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. During the past year of my marriage, how many times, on the average, did:						
53. My spouse push, shove or hit me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
54. I push, shove or hit my spouse?	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. During the last year, while children were in the home, how many times, on the average, did:						
55. My children push, shove or hit me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
56. I push, shove or hit my children?	1	2	3	4	5	6

HISTORY & PLANS

-9-

Sometimes our conflicts lead to more serious things like kicking, biting, hitting hard with a fist, beatings, and hitting with objects.

	Never	Once that year	About 2 to 9 times	About 10 to 20 times	More than 20 times	Not Appli- cable
A. During the last year in my parents' home how many times, on the average, did:						
57. My brothers and/or sisters kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
58. I kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat one of my brothers and/or sisters?	1	2	3	4	5	6
59. My parents kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
60. I kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat one of my parents?	1	2	3	4	5	6
B. During the last year I was dating how many times, on the average, did:						
61. My dating partner/fiance'(e) kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
62. I kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat my dating partner/fiance'(e)?	1	2	3	4	5	6
C. During the past year of my marriage how many times, on the average, did:						
63. My spouse kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
64. I kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat my spouse?	1	2	3	4	5	6
D. During the last year, while children were in the home, how many times, on the average, did:						
65. My child(ren) kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat me?	1	2	3	4	5	6
66. I kick, bite, hit with a fist or object, or beat my child(ren)?	1	2	3	4	5	6

HISTORY & PLANS

-10-

67. How many months (will elapse/elapsed) between the time I met my fiance'(e) and our marriage?
1. Less than 1 month
 2. 1 to 4 months
 3. 4 to 10 months
 4. 10 to 20 months
 5. Over 20 months
68. How many months (will elapse/elapsed) between our engagement [or the time at which we both had a definite understanding that we were to be married] and the date of our marriage?
1. Less than 1 month
 2. 1 to 3 months
 3. 3 to 6 months
 4. 6 to 12 months
 5. Over 12 months
69. The location of the marriage ceremony (will be/was):
1. Church or other religious building
 2. Home by religious leader
 3. Home by civil authority
 4. Justice of the Peace
 5. Other place
70. How does my closest friend feel about my partner?
1. Strongly approves
 2. Mildly approves
 3. Neutral
 4. Mildly disapproves
 5. Strongly disapproves
71. How do my parents feel about my marriage?
1. Both disapprove
 2. One disapproves
 3. Both are neutral
 4. Only one approves
 5. Both approve
72. How would I rate the physical appearance of my partner?
1. Very plain looking
 2. Plain looking
 3. Fairly good looking
 4. Good looking
 5. Very good looking
73. Do I ever wish I had not become engaged and/or married?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always

HISTORY & PLANS

-11-

74. Have I ever thought seriously about ending our relationship?
1. Never
 2. Occasionally
 3. Frequently
 4. Continually
75. How often do we show physical affection in our relationship (kissing, embracing, etc.):
1. Never
 2. Occasionally
 3. Frequently
 4. Continually
76. Are we satisfied with the amount of physical affection we demonstrate in our relationship?
1. Both desire less
 2. He/she desires less, other desires more
 3. He/she is satisfied, other desires more
 4. He/she is satisfied, other desires less
 5. Both satisfied
77. How similar are we in our leisure time interests?
1. Very different
 2. Some similarity, but many differences
 3. Fairly similar, but a few differences
 4. Very similar
 5. Identical in every way
78. How similar are we in our religious beliefs?
1. Very different
 2. Some similarity, but many differences
 3. Fairly similar, but a few differences
 4. Very similar
 5. Identical in every way
79. If I could change such characteristics in my partner as physical appearance, intellectual ability, temperament or personality traits, ideas, personal habits, etc., how many would I change?
1. None
 2. A few
 3. Quite a few
 4. A large number
80. My partner's attitude toward children is:
1. Strongly objects to having children
 2. Mildly objects to having children
 3. Mildly desires to have children
 4. Strongly desires to have children
81. My attitude toward children is:
1. Strongly object to having children
 2. Mildly object to having children
 3. Mildly desire to have children
 4. Strongly desire to have children

HISTORY & PLANS

-12-

82. My feeling toward my father-in-law or future father-in-law is:
1. I dislike him very much
 2. I dislike him mildly
 3. I have mixed feelings (or, I don't know him)
 4. I like him mildly
 5. I like him very much
83. My attitude toward my mother-in-law or future mother-in-law is:
1. I dislike her very much
 2. I dislike her mildly
 3. I have mixed feelings (or, I don't know her)
 4. I like her mildly
 5. I like her very much
84. How much do I like the way my in-laws or future in-laws treat each other?
1. I dislike it very much
 2. I dislike it mildly
 3. I have mixed feelings (or, I don't know them well enough to know)
 4. I like it mildly
 5. I like it very much
85. Which one of the following statements best describes how I feel about the future of our relationship?
1. Our relationship can never succeed, and there is no more that I can do to keep the relationship going
 2. It would be nice if our relationship succeeded, but I expect my partner to do most of the changing
 3. I want very much for our relationship to succeed and will do my fair share to see that it does
 4. I want very much for our relationship to succeed and will go almost to any length to see that it does
86. The political views of my partner are:
1. Very conservative
 2. Slightly conservative
 3. Neutral
 4. Slightly liberal
 5. Very liberal
87. How much money (will/did) we have in a savings account when we (get/got) married?
1. None
 2. Less than \$100
 3. \$100-\$500
 4. \$500-\$1000
 5. Over \$1,000
88. What (will be/was) our indebtedness at the time of our marriage? (Include charge accounts and amount owed on loans. Do not include car or house loans.)
1. None
 2. Less than \$100
 3. \$100-\$1000
 4. \$1000-\$5000
 5. Over \$5000

HISTORY & PLANS

-13-

Most people have some areas where they agree and others where they disagree. In your opinion, how much agreement do you and your partner have in the following areas?

	Always Disagree	Usually Disagree	Occa- sionally Disagree	Almost Always Agree	Always Agree
89. Handling finances	1	2	3	4	5
90. Religious matters	1	2	3	4	5
91. Demonstrations of affection	1	2	3	4	5
92. Friends	1	2	3	4	5
93. Ways of dealing with parents or inlaws	1	2	3	4	5
94. Sexual interaction	1	2	3	4	5
95. Daily social interaction with each other	1	2	3	4	5
96. Household management [The way chores around the house (would be/are) divided]	1	2	3	4	5
97. The way we communicate	1	2	3	4	5
98. The way we make decisions	1	2	3	4	5
99. The way we manage conflict	1	2	3	4	5
100. Child care and parenting	1	2	3	4	5
101. Personal habits and appearance	1	2	3	4	5
102. Amount of free time apart	1	2	3	4	5
103. Amount of free time together	1	2	3	4	5

HISTORY & PLANS

-14-

How much agreement do you believe your partner would indicate there is in each of the following areas?

	Always Disagree	Usually Disagree	Occa- sionally Disagree	Almost Always Agree	Always Agree
104. Handling finances	1	2	3	4	5
105. Religious matters	1	2	3	4	5
106. Demonstration of affection	1	2	3	4	5
107. Friends	1	2	3	4	5
108. Ways of dealing with parents or inlaws	1	2	3	4	5
109. Sexual interaction	1	2	3	4	5
110. Daily social interaction with each other	1	2	3	4	5
111. Household management [The way chores around the house (would be/are) divided]	1	2	3	4	5
112. The way we communicate	1	2	3	4	5
113. The way we make decisions	1	2	3	4	5
114. The way we manage conflict	1	2	3	4	5
115. Child care and parenting	1	2	3	4	5
116. Personal habits and appearance	1	2	3	4	5
117. Amount of free time apart	1	2	3	4	5
118. Amount of free time together	1	2	3	4	5

HISTORY & PLANS

-15-

119. How often do my partner and I quarrel?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
120. How often do my partner and I get on each other's nerves?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
121. How often do my partner and I have a stimulating exchange of ideas?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
122. How often do my partner and I laugh together?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always
123. In general, how often do I think that things between me and my partner are going well?
1. Never
 2. Almost never
 3. Almost always
 4. Always

VALUES - PART A

-16-

General Couple Instructions

- (a) Parts A and B of this inventory will need to be completed twice. First complete both parts as they apply to you as an individual. When you have answered for yourself, complete both parts A and B a second time as you think they apply to your partner.
- (b) Answer the questions honestly, not painting a "rosy" picture, even if it hurts a little.

VALUES IN MARRIAGE

Part A

Instructions

- (a) These questions deal with ways you and your partner believe you should act in your marriage. The only "right" answers are those which truly show what you want in a marriage.
- (b) Begin each question by inserting the phrase, "In our marriage _____ believes that." Fill into the blank the name of the individual for whom you are answering the question.
- (1) I STRONGLY AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (2) I AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (3) I'M UNDECIDED. (IT DOESN'T MATTER, OR I'M AMBIVALENT.)
 (4) I DISAGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (5) I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.

SA A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. Both should use affectionate phrases like "I love you" daily.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. A wise wife will be as informed as her husband concerning the family's financial status and business affairs.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. Both partners ought to share responsibility for housework if both work outside the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. A wife should expect to fit her life to the husband's, more than he fits his life to hers.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. It is best to avoid showing affection in public places.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. Both should frequently confide in each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. A spouse should know where the other spends their spare time.

VALUES - PART A

-17-

- SA A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. It is crucial that the spouse brush their teeth each night.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. The spouse should be their "best friend."
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. Sometimes it is OK to ignore each other's feelings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 11. Both should be willing to drop what they are doing to listen to each other's problems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. Both should visit relatives weekly whenever possible.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. The wife should combine motherhood and a career if she wishes, even though the husband may have strong feelings against her choice.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. The husband should have considerable control over the wife.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. As a married couple, they should spend at least one night each week on a date.
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. Education is less important for the wife than the husband.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. The husband should feel as responsible for the children as the wife does.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. Both should refuse sexual advances outside their relationship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. The spouse should have a happy disposition.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. The spouse ought to keep in very good physical condition.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. Both should constantly look for ways to meet each other's needs.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. The wife should be as much the children's disciplinarian as the husband.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. It's acceptable to frequently leave dirty clothes around the house.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. It is wrong to participate in sexual intimacies in marriage merely to satisfy the partner's personal desires.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. The family schedule, such as when meals will be served and when the TV can be turned on, will be determined mostly by the husband's wishes and working hours.

VALUES - PART A

-18-

- SA A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. It is best if the husband takes the lead in religious matters.
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. Both should feel free to talk with each other about their sexual relationship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. The wife should stay at home to care for the husband and the children, instead of using her time attending club meetings and entertainment outside the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. Since the husband must earn the living, he can't be expected to take a great deal of time to play with the children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. Children should have little freedom in deciding what they can and cannot do in their church activities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. Family related organizations such as PTA and church are the main interests the wife should have outside the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. Weekends are to be a period of rest for the husband, so he shouldn't be expected to help with cooking and housekeeping.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. Both should feel free to explore new and creative ways to experience sexual pleasure with each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. Providing intellectual stimulation is important.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. The husband should spend as much time with his daughters as he does with his sons.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. The wife should refrain from working when preschool children are in the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. The husband should care for small children at least one night a week so the wife can get away and do what she wants.
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. The wife should have the most say in deciding where they will go and what they will do when they go out.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. It is very important to be affectionate in the presence of our children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. The husband should be willing to give up some things that are important to him to help the wife's personal growth.
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. It is OK for one spouse to make a major purchase without consulting with the other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. We can change (rearrange) our marital roles whenever we wish.

VALUES - PART A

-19-

- SA A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. The wife should be the leader in teaching the children right and wrong.
- 1 2 3 4 5 44. Birth control is unacceptable.
- 1 2 3 4 5 45. Either spouse alone can go out with personal friends fairly frequently (like once a week).
- 1 2 3 4 5 46. Having a large family is important.
- 1 2 3 4 5 47. Both should have a lot of independence from each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 48. Neither should object to the amount of time the other gives in community or church service, even if it is 30-40 hours a week.
- 1 2 3 4 5 49. Being financially able to continue the husband's education is a good reason to delay having children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 50. The husband is justified in leaving the care of infants entirely up to his wife.
- 1 2 3 4 5 51. We should spend almost all of our leisure time together.
- 1 2 3 4 5 52. Married people should avoid even innocent expressions of affection to opposite sex friends (such as a hug or kiss).
- 1 2 3 4 5 53. It is important to go to church regularly.
- 1 2 3 4 5 54. Getting married ought to cause little change in social or recreational activities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 55. It's OK to seldom use deodorant.
- 1 2 3 4 5 56. Both should compliment each other at least once a day.
- 1 2 3 4 5 57. We should have sexual intercourse only when we want to have a child.
- 1 2 3 4 5 58. Keeping the yard, making repairs, and doing outside chores ought to be the responsibility of the person who has the time or interest to do them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 59. We should miss church meetings only for severe emergencies.
- 1 2 3 4 5 60. After marriage, it is OK if the wife stops her education and makes a home for the husband and children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 61. If the wife is the primary breadwinner, she should have the most say in family decisions.

VALUES - PART A

-20-

- SA A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that
- 1 2 3 4 5 62. Moodiness is very undesirable.
- 1 2 3 4 5 63. Both should share household tasks according to individual interests and abilities rather than according to "woman's work and man's work."
- 1 2 3 4 5 64. Keeping up our physical appearance is very important.
- 1 2 3 4 5 65. It is unwise to openly disagree in front of the children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 66. Both should permit the children to share according to their abilities in making family decisions.
- 1 2 3 4 5 67. The wife's opinion ought to carry as much weight as the husband's in money matters.
- 1 2 3 4 5 68. Both should be very agreeable.
- 1 2 3 4 5 69. If there is a difference of opinion, the wife ought to have at least as much say as the husband.
- 1 2 3 4 5 70. Both should be highly affectionate throughout their marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 71. After our roles have been established in the marriage, they should stay pretty much the same (be unchanging).
- 1 2 3 4 5 72. The wife may initiate love-making as frequently as the husband.
- 1 2 3 4 5 73. Both should make a special effort to grow and progress.
- 1 2 3 4 5 74. It is very undesirable to be impatient.
- 1 2 3 4 5 75. If we did not limit the number of children we have, we would be irresponsible.
- 1 2 3 4 5 76. The wife may work outside the home after the children are grown.
- 1 2 3 4 5 77. We should turn to others outside the relationship for help with our personal problems.
- 1 2 3 4 5 78. We should frequently go out socially with others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 79. The wife should not have a career.
- 1 2 3 4 5 80. Keeping detailed books to show where money is spent is very important.

VALUES - PART A

-21-

- SD A U D SD In our marriage _____ believes that
- 1 2 3 4 5 81. The husband should spend several evenings a week at home with the family.
- 1 2 3 4 5 82. We ought to be very sensitive to each other's feelings when we have disagreements.
- 1 2 3 4 5 83. It is acceptable to shout or show anger when we are upset.
- 1 2 3 4 5 84. If there is a difference of opinion, the husband should have more say in most areas.
- 1 2 3 4 5 85. Prayers should be very important.
- 1 2 3 4 5 86. The husband should be clean shaven when he makes affectionate advances.
- 1 2 3 4 5 87. Both should have a little personal money they can spend as they wish (without the other having to know how it is spent).
- 1 2 3 4 5 88. The husband should do all the budget planning.
- 1 2 3 4 5 89. The money the wife earns is her money.
- 1 2 3 4 5 90. The wife should spend most of her time in the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 91. Neither should purchase an item over ten dollars without consulting the other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 92. It is important that our income be strictly budgeted.
- 1 2 3 4 5 93. It is a woman's privilege to be unpredictable.
- 1 2 3 4 5 94. Neither should bring dependent parents into the home to live.
- 1 2 3 4 5 95. The wife ought to obey the husband.

VALUES IN MARRIAGE

Part B

Instructions

- (a) Answer each of the following questions by first giving your opinion and then by giving your perception of your partner's opinion. Identify how you feel about each statement.
- (b) The blank space in each question applies to yourself, unless you are describing your partner. As you read the question, insert mentally the appropriate name in the _____ space provided, but do not write in this booklet.
- (1) I STRONGLY AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (2) I AGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (3) I'M UNDECIDED. (IT DOESN'T MATTER, OR I'M AMBIVALENT.)
 (4) I DISAGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.
 (5) I STRONGLY DISAGREE WITH THIS STATEMENT.

SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 1. _____ believes a family should participate pretty much as a group at a community or social affair rather than allow members to go their own way with their personal friends.
- 1 2 3 4 5 2. _____ believes that the sense of satisfaction gained from assisting people who are in difficult situations more than compensates for the trouble.
- 1 2 3 4 5 3. _____ prefers to spend leisure time in social activities rather than alone.
- 1 2 3 4 5 4. _____ believes marriage is more of a civil or personal contract than a religious commitment.
- 1 2 3 4 5 5. _____ believes the biggest difficulty with the world is that people are not as charitable to others as they should be.
- 1 2 3 4 5 6. _____ it is more important to be financially successful than to be considered the type of person who will put himself/herself out for others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 7. _____ believes that premarital petting is morally wrong.
- 1 2 3 4 5 8. _____ believes that having compatible personalities is more important than being honest.
- 1 2 3 4 5 9. _____ believes marriage is a sacred institution.
- 1 2 3 4 5 10. _____ believes that in our society there is too much emphasis on economic gain.

VALUES - PART B

-23-

SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 11. _____ believes that full sexual relations are acceptable before marriage when the couple is in love or when they are engaged.
- 1 2 3 4 5 12. _____ believes a person should talk over important decisions (such as marriage, employment, and residence) with family members before taking action.
- 1 2 3 4 5 13. _____ believes it is occasionally desirable to manipulate others.
- 1 2 3 4 5 14. _____ believes people in our society place too much emphasis on the future.
- 1 2 3 4 5 15. _____ believes there is no reason for a woman to get a college education if she does not work outside the home.
- 1 2 3 4 5 16. _____ usually prefers to go to ball games rather than symphony concerts.
- 1 2 3 4 5 17. _____ believes the person's chosen career should be one which will give considerable status in the community.
- 1 2 3 4 5 18. _____ prefers to avoid a lot of publicity and recognition.
- 1 2 3 4 5 19. _____ greatly enjoys discussions involving philosophical speculation.
- 1 2 3 4 5 20. _____ believes it is more important for the wife to be affectionate than thrifty.
- 1 2 3 4 5 21. _____ believes we should be more concerned about the present than the future.
- 1 2 3 4 5 22. _____ believes it is a worthy goal to want to make a great deal of money, assuming that it is done legitimately.
- 1 2 3 4 5 23. _____ believes that being involved in sports either as a spectator or as a participant is very important.
- 1 2 3 4 5 24. _____ believes religion is given too much emphasis in our society.
- 1 2 3 4 5 25. _____ believes it is expecting too much to believe a marriage should last a lifetime.
- 1 2 3 4 5 26. _____ believes it is important to participate in activities which might help develop leadership ability.

VALUES - PART B
-24-

- SA A U D SD
- 1 2 3 4 5 27. _____ is always happy no matter what happens.
- 1 2 3 4 5 28. _____ does not enjoy volunteer service work.
- 1 2 3 4 5 29. _____ believes there are some circumstances which justify lying.
- 1 2 3 4 5 30. _____ believes college students should spend less time thinking about world problems and place more emphasis on social and recreational activities.
- 1 2 3 4 5 31. _____'s foremost aim is to be able to spend luxurious vacations at expensive resorts.
- 1 2 3 4 5 32. _____ believes that if a marriage does not work out, it would be ok to get a divorce.
- 1 2 3 4 5 33. _____ enjoys dramatic things like plays and musicals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 34. _____ believes our society would be better off if we emphasized the fine arts more.
- 1 2 3 4 5 35. _____ believes it is better to have a marriage performed by a church official than a civil official.
- 1 2 3 4 5 36. _____ considers it very serious and morally wrong to cheat on income tax.
- 1 2 3 4 5 37. _____ believes people have little control over their destiny.
- 1 2 3 4 5 38. _____ believes an individual's wishes should be given priority over the family's when there is a conflict of interest.
- 1 2 3 4 5 39. _____ believes it is important to spend a lot of time in personal development.
- 1 2 3 4 5 40. _____ believes it is more important to be true to oneself than to be accepted.
- 1 2 3 4 5 41. _____ believes sexual intercourse with someone other than a spouse has harmful effects in a marriage, regardless of the circumstances.
- 1 2 3 4 5 42. _____ finds it important that people recognize his/her achievements.
- 1 2 3 4 5 43. _____ believes that being a recognized authority in some field would be very appealing.

VALUES - PART B

-25-

- | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 44. _____ believes it is sometimes justifiable to make false claims on an insurance report. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 45. _____ believes it is important to be active in the political life of the community. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 46. _____ believes that the importance of religious worship is over-emphasized. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 47. _____ is sometimes confused. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 48. _____ especially likes situations in which there are many people around. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 49. _____ believes people should engage in private prayers daily. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 50. _____ believes that, regardless of the circumstances, people should never lie. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 51. _____ believes that, in premarital relationships, it is all right to go slightly beyond one's moral standards in order to avoid losing an important relationship. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 52. _____ would never take advantage of other people. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 53. _____ believes it is important to carry on the family name. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 54. _____ believes children of elderly parents should have little responsibility for the welfare of their parents. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 55. _____ believes the future is much more important than the present. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 56. _____ believes that destiny is pretty much in one's own hands. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 57. _____ thinks it is OK for a man and woman to live together and not be legally married. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 58. _____ sometimes becomes angry. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 59. _____ believes that giving time in service to others is very important. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 60. _____ prefers to be alone a great deal of the time. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 61. _____ tries to concentrate on the present much more than the future. |

VALUES - PART B

-26-

SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 62. _____ believes that most people have little control over what happens to them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 63. _____ enjoys poetry a great deal.
- 1 2 3 4 5 64. _____ usually buys name-brand clothes at fashionable stores rather than shopping around for them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 65. _____ believes we should accept the fact that everything in life is God's will.
- 1 2 3 4 5 66. _____ believes that how people feel about things is more important than time or cost of things.
- 1 2 3 4 5 67. _____ believes it is more important to enjoy the present than plan for an uncertain future.
- 1 2 3 4 5 68. _____ believes most museums are a waste of time.
- 1 2 3 4 5 69. _____ believes a marriage should be permanent.
- 1 2 3 4 5 70. _____ believes that full sexual relations are acceptable, even when one does not feel particularly affectionate toward the partner.
- 1 2 3 4 5 71. _____ believes that if a goal is important, it is occasionally acceptable to use slightly immoral means to attain the goal.
- 1 2 3 4 5 72. _____ believes that thoughts about heaven help an individual.
- 1 2 3 4 5 73. _____ accepts the change in life style that comes with marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 74. _____ accepts the responsibilities of parenthood.
- 1 2 3 4 5 75. _____ is ready to adjust some goals, if needed, to fit with the partner's goals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 76. _____ believes there are a number of positive reasons for being married.
- 1 2 3 4 5 77. _____ believes that to get away from an unhappy home environment is a good reason for marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 78. _____ is emotionally strong enough to cope with the increased pressures of married life.
- 1 2 3 4 5 79. _____ has thought about the advantages and disadvantages of marriage.

VALUES - PART B
-27-

- | <u>SA</u> | <u>A</u> | <u>U</u> | <u>D</u> | <u>SD</u> | |
|-----------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 80. _____ (is/was) ready to begin the sexual interactions that (come/came) with marriage. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 81. _____ is aware of personal weaknesses and strengths. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 82. _____ can trust others. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 83. _____ can accept criticism easily. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 84. _____ adapts well to new situations. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 85. _____ has a mature attitude toward the sexual part of marriage. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 86. _____'s mind is sometimes occupied with useless thoughts. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 87. _____ can control personal sexual drives. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 88. _____ is the type of person who is able to fulfill the needs of others. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 89. _____ says things that hurt other's feelings. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 90. _____ is able to accept expressions of affection and warmth from others. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 91. _____ experiences periods of loneliness. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 92. _____ tends to produce and give rather than only consume and take. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 93. _____ gets into difficulty because of acting impulsively. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 94. _____ is reasonably independent. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 95. _____ is able to openly discuss personal feelings. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 96. _____ can recognize personal emotions. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 97. _____ is too self-centered. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 98. _____ lives according to religious teachings or a philosophy of life. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 99. _____ knows how to love others. |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 100. _____ cooperates rather than competes in close relationships. |

VALUES - PART B
-28-SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 101. _____'s feelings are sometimes easily hurt.
- 1 2 3 4 5 102. _____ is able to understand his/her own personal behavior.
- 1 2 3 4 5 103. _____ is overly possessive in relationships.
- 1 2 3 4 5 104. _____ worries about possible misfortunes.
- 1 2 3 4 5 105. _____ has enough self-understanding to recognize personal values.
- 1 2 3 4 5 106. _____ feels miserable.
- 1 2 3 4 5 107. _____ has fears and anxieties about the sexual part of marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 108. _____ has ups and downs in mood without apparent cause.
- 1 2 3 4 5 109. _____ is able to listen to others in an understanding way.
- 1 2 3 4 5 110. _____ can postpone immediate gratification.
- 1 2 3 4 5 111. _____ is sensitive to other people's feelings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 112. _____ is touchy about some subjects.
- 1 2 3 4 5 113. _____ believes we have approximately the same economic background.
- 1 2 3 4 5 114. _____'s parents (are/were) in favor of the marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 115. _____ believes it (would be/was) good for us, spiritually, to marry each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 116. _____ believes we meditated about our relationship and, deep down, we feel good about it.
- 1 2 3 4 5 117. _____ really knows and understands the partner.
- 1 2 3 4 5 118. _____ believes (we are/were) financially ready to get married.
- 1 2 3 4 5 119. _____ believes we discussed our marriage with an objective other person.
- 1 2 3 4 5 120. _____ believes we (have/had) the money for things such as rings, wedding and honeymoon without going into debt.
- 1 2 3 4 5 121. _____ believes the partner's parents (are/were) in favor of the marriage.

VALUES - PART B
-29-SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 122. ___ believes we (have/had) the approval of our parents for our marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 123. ___ believes we (have gone/went) together long enough that we (have/had) tested our compatibility in many situations.
- 1 2 3 4 5 124. ___ believes other people treat us as a couple.
- 1 2 3 4 5 125. ___ sees in me the qualities desired in our children.
- 1 2 3 4 5 126. ___ believes we have the same degree of interest in religion.
- 1 2 3 4 5 127. ___ believes we have developed a friendship.
- 1 2 3 4 5 128. ___ believes that I will encourage the development of his/her personality.
- 1 2 3 4 5 129. ___ believes we encourage each other to be better.
- 1 2 3 4 5 130. ___ believes we are willing to accept each other, with the idea we both have imperfections and will likely continue to have them.
- 1 2 3 4 5 131. ___ recognizes the differences that we do have.
- 1 2 3 4 5 132. ___ believes we share with each other our ideals.
- 1 2 3 4 5 133. ___ believes we have found an adequate place to live.
- 1 2 3 4 5 134. ___ is physically attracted to me.
- 1 2 3 4 5 135. ___ believes we have discussed our philosophies of life extensively.
- 1 2 3 4 5 136. ___ believes we have a desire to help each other achieve our highest potential.
- 1 2 3 4 5 137. ___ believes we have strong feelings of love for each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 138. ___ believes our friends approve of our marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 139. ___ believes we would want to stay married even if one of us become handicapped or an invalid.
- 1 2 3 4 5 140. ___ confides in the partner.
- 1 2 3 4 5 141. ___ believes our relationship makes him/her a better person.

VALUES - PART B

-30-

SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 142. _____ believes that there are things more important in our relationship than physical attractiveness.
- 1 2 3 4 5 143. _____ believes we have very similar philosophies of life.
- 1 2 3 4 5 144. _____ believes we put each other on a pedestal much to frequently.
- 1 2 3 4 5 145. _____ believes we have some money in savings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 146. _____ believes we have mutual feelings of tenderness and affection toward each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 147. _____ believes we consistently bring out joyful and harmonious behavior in each other.
- 1 2 3 4 5 148. _____ is able to be open with and disclose inner feelings to the partner.
- 1 2 3 4 5 149. _____ misunderstands the partner's moods and feelings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 150. _____ believes that when we need to make a decision we both think in terms of "we" rather than "I".
- 1 2 3 4 5 151. _____ believes we have the same ideals concerning the purpose of marriage.
- 1 2 3 4 5 152. _____ believes we have discussed our feelings and fears about sex.
- 1 2 3 4 5 153. _____ believes the partner is physically attracted to him/her.
- 1 2 3 4 5 154. _____ believes we are very similar in our intellectual abilities (IQ).
- 1 2 3 4 5 155. _____ believes that the partner will meet needs in the future, as much or more than presently.
- 1 2 3 4 5 156. _____ feels the partner misunderstands his/her moods and feelings.
- 1 2 3 4 5 157. _____ is sure that our love could weather the storms of financial distress, sickness or serious misunderstanding.
- 1 2 3 4 5 158. _____ feels free to give constructive, confrontive feedback to the partner without fear of the consequences.
- 1 2 3 4 5 159. _____ believes we both feel God is pleased with our choice of each other.

VALUES - PART B

-31-

SA A U D SD

- 1 2 3 4 5 160. _____ believes we can discuss personal problems with each other without getting angry.
- 1 2 3 4 5 161. _____ believes we are similar in our desire for physical affection.
- 1 2 3 4 5 162. _____ believes we have talked about how much life insurance we should have.
- 1 2 3 4 5 163. _____ believes that the partner understands him/her well.
- 1 2 3 4 5 164. _____ believes we think in terms of "we" rather than "I".
- 1 2 3 4 5 165. _____ shares innermost feelings with the partner.