Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

5-1981

Marital Roles and Their Relationship to Marital Happiness and Self Concept

Gary L. DeVries
Utah State University

MARITAL ROLES AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

TO MARITAL HAPPINESS AND SELF CONCEPT

by

Gary L. DeVries

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

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express sincere appreciation to Dr. Michael Bertoch for his persistent encouragement and his valuable assistance in formulating the final form of this dissertation. Special thanks is extended to Dr. Keith Checketts for providing direction with the sophisticated statistical design used in this research. Appreciation is also extended to Dr. David Stone, Dr. Elwin Nielsen, and Dr. DeVoe Rickert for serving as committee members.

In a more personal sense, I would like to express sincere appreciation to my wife, Kathy, whose companionship and support have provided a source of meaning to the many hours spent in academic pursuits. A warm thanks to "our girls", Kristin, Sherilyn, Julie Ann, and Lisa Marie, for their patience and their expressed interest in the writing of this dissertation. Thanks also to my parents for their constant encouragement and their lifelong stress on the importance of "getting an education". In addition, thanks to many friends and associates whose concern and encouragement have been very meaningful.

Gary L. DeVries

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

Chapter   Page

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Marital Roles and Their Relationship

to Marital Happiness and Self Concept

by

Gary L. DeVries, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1981

Major Professor: Dr. Michael R. Bertoch
Department: Psychology

Marital roles have become a subject of major concern in recent
years. Many critiques consider traditional marriage roles to be
responsible for hindering appropriate social-emotional development of
the wife, in particular, and also the husband. Past research in
assessing the relationship between marital roles and the happiness and
well-being of husbands and wives is limited in quantity and generally
is inconclusive or controversial. This study was designed to clarify
the relationship between marriage roles and two dependent variables,
marital happiness and self concept.

The sample population consisted of 124 volunteer couples selected
from the teaching staffs of eight school districts in Southeastern
Idaho and Northern Utah. Each participant provided information for
this study by completing a questionnaire, the Tennessee Self Concept
Scale, the Marriage Adjustment Scale, and the Marriage Role Expectation
Inventory. Forty-three variables were generated from these measures

which, when factor analyzed produced 12 factors for husbands and 10 factors for wives, served as dependent and independent variables for this study.

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to identify relationships between dependent variables (self concept and marital happiness of husbands and wives) and independent variables (i.e., level of education; hours spent as an employee, religious volunteer, and in community service; freedom to choose present role; income level). Husbands and wives were assessed independent of each other.

None of the independent variables explained a significant amount of the variance on marital happiness or self concept neither when considered alone nor when stepped together in the multiple regression model. Thus, no significant relationship was determined between marital roles and marital happiness or self concept. Recommendations were made for studying more diversified populations and for controlling sample bias resulting from the use of volunteers.

(109 pages)

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Background and Justification

Traditionally the role of a woman has been to marry, have
children, and to take care of domestic responsibilities in a home
environment. Men have had the responsibility for gaining appropriate
training and preparation in order to select and adequately function in
a career and provide the family with financial independence
(Brinkerhoff & White, 1978). The idea behind these traditional roles
seems to have been that each marital partner was to take responsibility
for various aspects of family functioning thereby providing a
complimentary division of labor. Brinkerhoff and White (1978) quote a
number of authors who advocate the continuation of these traditional
roles and argue that this arrangement provides the most efficient use
of biological attributes from both sexes in terms of dividing work
roles and in developing a suitable environment for raising children.

In recent years, traditional marriage and family roles have come
under a great deal of attack and criticism by a number of groups (Arvey
& Gross, 1977; Gump, 1972; Clayton, 1975; Limpus, 1970). As a result
of these attacks, many values and procedures related to traditional
family functioning are being questioned (Arvey & Gross, 1977).

The role of the woman is presently receiving the greater amount of scrutiny. Women's groups, as well as many researchers, are identifying conventional roles such as wife, mother, and housewife as being instrumental in preventing women from developing personal skills and abilities, expanding intellectual capacities, pursuing desired interests and talents, and developing significant interpersonal relationships outside of the family unit (Clayton, 1975; Ferree, 1976a; Limpus, 1970; Millet, 1969; Jones, 1970). As a result, many married women are presently altering traditional home related roles to include roles which focus on responsibilities outside of the home.

The role of the husband has been identified as being important not only to the husband himself, but also to his wife and the marriage relationship. For example: high ambition and income of husband (Bailyn, 1970); amount of joint activity (Brinkerhoff & White, 1978); husband's prestige and status (Blood & Wolfe, 1960); husband's educational level (Barry, 1970); and husband's involvement in domestic responsibilities (Gross & Arvey, 1977) are identified as representing husband related factors which significantly affect the functioning and interaction of spouses. As Sperling (1976) points out, many conventional male roles are in a state of transition due to the criticisms directed at traditional marriage roles.

With the identified importance of roles in marital interaction, the impact of husband-wife role transition on marital happiness is an area of significant social concern. Marital happiness is an area that has received moderate attention in the research literature. In a review of marital happiness research conducted during the 1960's, Hicks

and Platt (1970) found that such diversifed variables as higher

occupational status, income, and education level for the husband;

husband-wife similarities in socio-economic status; age and religion;

affectional rewards such as esteem for spouse, sexual enjoyment, and

companionship; and age at marriage influenced marital happiness.

Husband's marital role selection has also received attention

relevant to its impact on marital happiness. Even though the woman's

role in the marital relationship appears to be undergoing the greatest

amount of re-evaluation, the husband's role is also experiencing

modification.

Generally, the data reported on the husband's role are an artifact

of research which has been conducted on the role of the wife. In the

limited research which has focused on husbands, it was found that

marital happiness was significantly influenced by the husband's

behaviors, attitudes, and roles. In fact, Pleck (1977), in reviewing

research on marital satisfaction, noted that, ". . . husband's

orientation to work or family, appeared to have a stronger affect on

marital variables than did wive's orientation" (p. 421).

The woman's role in relationship to marital happiness has been

under investigation for a good number of years. In summarizing earlier

research related to assessing marital happiness as a result of women

either assuming the role of a housewife or of assuming the role of an

employee, Gover (1963) reports the following results:

> Some investigators among them Davis (1929), Hamilton (1929),
> Havemann and West (1952), and Goode (1956), have obtained findings
> which support the idea that marital adjustment is poorer when the
> wife is employed than when she is not employed. On the other
> hand, several researchers including Klinger (1954), Locke and
> Mackeprang (1949), and Karlsson (1951) have reported that they did

not find a significant relationship between marital adjustment and wives' employment status. (p. 452)

(Note: Dates added in order to give the reader an idea of when the search was conducted.)

More recent studies designed to measure the relationship between marital happiness and wive's role selection also show some discrepancies in the results found. Most studies however, seem to support either a higher degree of marital adjustment or no difference in marital adjustment in marriages where the wife assumed the role of a homemaker as opposed to being employed. For example, a number of researchers (i.e., Ferree, 1976b; Glenn & Weaver, 1978; Booth, 1977; Thomopolous, 1974) concluded that their investigations suggested "no difference" in marital happiness between couples with employed wives as compared to couples with wives functioning as full-time homemakers. Other researchers (Axelson, 1963; Nye, 1961; Gover, 1963; Sonenstein, 1976) suggest that working wives experience less marital happiness than their non-working counterparts. These studies and most other studies focusing on marital happiness have been based almost exclusively on responses from women without taking into consideration the roles and opinions of the husband.

Another significant variable used in the research literature on marital happiness is self-esteem. Several investigators (Barnett & Nietzel, 1979; Hall, 1976; Cohen & Burdsal, 1978; Glick, 1976) report a significantly high positive correlation between self concept and overall rated marital happiness. As Cohen suggests, "This would seem to indicate that the way a married woman feels about herself and her role is associated with the marital relationship" (p. 432).

Little research was found which measures the interaction between marital happiness or marital roles and self concept for the wife and husband. Also, after an extensive review of the literature, the writer found only a limited number of articles related to marital happiness and the role of the wife and husband; especially articles presenting research completed after 1970. As Glenn and Weaver (1978) point out, ". . . knowledge of the basis of marital happiness is less than adequate . . ." (p. 269). Gass (1974) states:

> Counselors and psychotherapists must increasingly concern themselves with changing role relationships in marriage. The attempts to establish an equity in marriage . . . has received little attention in professional journals. (p. 369)

Most of the research that has been done in the 1970's identifies no difference between marital happiness and the woman's role of employee or housewife. The literature fails to report the impact of other significant male and female roles (i.e., functioning in religious assignments; volunteer work; community service; and other non-work, non-home related responsibilities.)

Several other factors become critical as one looks at the past research in the area being considered: 1) the instrumentation used in almost all of the studies reviewed was questionable due to lack of verification as to its reliability and validity (Barry, 1970); 2) usually the impact of the woman's role was considered only for full time employment and not for other role commitments such as volunteer and service oriented responsibilities; and 3) most studies measured global effects without measuring variables specific enough to direct effective marriage and family counseling interventions.

In conclusion, a review of the research indicates that most studies conducted in the area of marital happiness suggested that even though conflicting results were presented, women in the home marriages tended to be happier more often than marriages where women were working. However, a trend seems to be developing in recent years wherein this distinction is not as great.

Actually, the research in recent years related to marriage role identification and marital happiness is very sparse for women and even more so for men. This becomes socially significant when one considers that women and men are presently in transition in terms of trying to establish a role which will afford them maximum development and satisfaction. This is especially important to professionals such as psychologists, social workers, and marriage and family counselors who must understand family dynamics and the needs of family members in order to facilitate affective intervention strategies in therapy. The effect of marriage role transitions on marital relationships and the overall emotional functioning of husbands and wives is a question that needs further clarification.

Problem Statement

What is the relationship between selected marriage role related variables and marital happiness, self concept, and depression of husbands and wives?

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between male and female role selection on husband and wife marital

happiness, depression, and self concept. The specific objectives investigated were:

Objective 1. To assess the relationship between marital happiness and self concept. The Tennessee Self Concept Scale and the Marriage Adjustment Schedule were used to measure self concept and marital happiness.

Objective 2. To assess the relationship between depression and marital happiness. The Depression Adjective Check List was used to measure depression.

Objective 3. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to role expectations (i.e., traditional vs. equalitarian) as measured by A Marriage Role Expectation Inventory.

Objective 4. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to five time related variables (time devoted to: employment, religious activity, community service, other time, and total time).

Objective 5. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to one's satisfaction with three time related variables (employment, religious activity, and community service).

Objective 6. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to one's freedom to choose his/her present role (i.e., housewife, employee).

Objective 7. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to present age.

Objective 8. To assess marital happiness, depression and self concept as they relate to total years of education completed.

Objective 9. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to total number of children living in the home and number of pre-school children in the home.

Objective 10. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to total number of years of employment since marriage to the present spouse.

Objective 11. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to total number of years of continuous employment.

Objective 12. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to total time spent in interpersonal interaction with spouse and each spouse's evaluation of the amount of time spent together.

Objective 13. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to total time spent by the husband in performing domestic tasks and each spouse's satisfaction with the husband's domestic contribution.

Objective 14. To assess marital happiness, depression, and self concept as they relate to each spouse's evaluation of the amount of time he or she spends in interacting with adults other than the other spouse.

Definitions

Depression. As defined by the Depression Adjective Checklist, this term means an affective state characterized by feelings of being "unhappy," "downcast," "forlorn," "dejected," "hopeless," and "glum."

Dual career families. Families in which both the husband and wife are employed simultaneously.

Equalitarian (companionship). Terms used interchangeably to denote husband-wife roles which often overlap and allow for sharing family responsibilities on an as needed or designated basis without regard for the biological attributes of the sexes.

Housewife (homemaker). These terms are used interchangeably as a title for the wife and her role in performing home responsibilities such as housekeeping, child care, meal preparation, etc.

Marital happiness (marital adjustment). As defined by the Marriage Adjustment Schedule, these terms are used interchangeably to indicate the degree of satisfaction or contentment experienced by a husband or wife in regard to his/her marital interaction.

Marriage role expectation. Defined by the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory, this term means marriage roles expected by different married persons from themselves and their spouses. Marriage roles are classified on a continuum from traditional to equalitarian (companionship).

Self concept (self-esteem). As defined by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, these terms are used interchangeably to denote how one feels or thinks about his/herself.

Traditional marriage roles. A division of labor (usually by sex) creating an interdependence of one spouse on the other in such a way that the primary role of the husband is to provide material support to the family while the wife in exchange provides home oriented services such as child care and housekeeping.

Work overload. The condition experienced by husbands and/or wives when home and work related responsibilities create significant levels of life stress and tension.

Working (employed). Working and employed are frequently used interchangeably in this study to indicate functioning on a job for which one receives financial reimbursement.

This chapter has presented background and justification information for the study. In addition a problem statement, purpose, and objectives have been defined. Special definitions peculiar to this study have also been listed at the end of the chapter.

Following, in Chapter II, is a review of relevant literature related to the dependent variables which are being investigated in this study. Areas in which research is lacking or limited are also discussed. Chapter III is a presentation of the methodological procedures of the study. Results of the designated questions are reported in Chapter IV; in Chapter V evaluation of findings, limitations of the study, and recommendations for future research are discussed.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In reporting the findings described in the research literature, the following topics will be discussed: 1) family role conflict for women; 2) factors influencing alternative role choices by housewives; 3) employment as a viable alternative role for housewives; 4) conflicts encountered by employed wives and their husbands; 5) significance of the homemaker role; 6) impact of the husband's roles; 7) marital happiness and marital roles; and 8) part-time employment and marital happiness. This sequencing provides the reader with a research review of marital roles, the conflicts encountered with these roles, and the impact of the roles on marital interaction and happiness.

Family Role Conflict for Women

Family roles are identified by some researchers as being a source of significant stress and creating unhappiness for women. Gove and Geerken (1977), and Nevill and Damico (1975) report research evidence that the family roles assumed by women after marriage are much more stressful than the roles assumed by husbands. The stressful nature of the female homemaking role is further substantiated in that housewives reportedly experience a greater degree of: depression (Mostow & Newberry, 1975; Ferree, 1976a); more stress and anxiety (Ferree, 1976b); decreased physical health (Burke & Weir, 1976b); and a greater

incidence of mental health problems (Gove & Geerker, 1977; Nevill &
Damico, 1975).

Among the reported stress inducing aspects of the housewive's role
are: social isolation due to a lack of constructive interaction with
other significant adults and failure to feel like a significant
contributor to society (Ferree, 1976b; Gove & Geerken, 1977); lack of
independence secondary to financial dependence on the wage earner
(Wright, 1978); poorly defined, unstructured, and constantly shifting
work roles which decrease objective feedback as to performance
proficiency (Nevill & Damico, 1975; Gove & Geerken, 1977); boredom
associated with increased automation of household responsibilities
(Gove & Geerken, 1977; Mostow & Newberry, 1975); and financial problems
over which the housewife has little control (Wright, 1978; Boeckel,
1979).

Another significant contributor to the stress of the housewife
role is reported to be feelings of role inadequacy. Ferree (1976a)
conducted research wherein investigators interviewed 135 working and
nonworking wives in a "working-class" community near Boston. Many of
the women were high school graduates, three held college degrees, and
36 percent had not graduated from high school. She found that 57
percent of the housewives and 67 percent of the employed women reported
themselves as not being very competent as homemakers.

In discussing the roles of married women, Kolb and Straus (1974)
suggest that, "They [women's roles] train women for subordinate
positions and deny them equal opportunity because of the arbitrary
assignment of women to the primary responsibility for homemaking and

child care" (p. 756). These authors report further that traditional roles for married women involve placing such negative influences and restrictions on women that some feel the family in its present form must be abolished if women are to be truly equal to their male counterparts.

The suggested dilemma of the homemaker is summarized by Clayton (1975) in comparing the role of a housewife with an employee:

	Employed			Housewife
A.	Income producing	Yes	No	
B.	Provides a regulating schedule around which nonwork and leisure activities may be organized.	Yes	No	Almost all nonwork activities refer just to the husband's job. She continues to work after he comes home from his job.
C.	An identification in society's status-prestige system.	Yes	No	There is no promotional system and virtually no way that one housewife can get more status or prestige than another. Almost all of the rewards a housewife obtains are, of necessity, primarily intrinsic.
D.	Associations outside the family network	Yes	No	By societal definition the location of the housewife's job precludes most non-familial contacts. The contacts which do occur are usually transitory.
E.	Meaningful, creative, fulfilling	Yes	Yes	No, Maybe. Our society seems quite willing to view the housewife role as "creative and fulfilling" if the housewife thinks it is, and many housewives do. However, society seems equally willing to accept as valid the criticism made by more than a few housewives that the role and work are generally stifling and occasionally dehumanizing. (p. 436)

In discussing the "fringe benefits" of the homemaker role, Clayton (1975) explains that:

As her husband progresses in his career she will receive less direct help from him, her children will leave home as soon as they are able to make it on their own, the skills she has obtained in school will become obsolete the longer she stays out of the labor force, and she will have ample opportunity to feel lonely and useless. (p. 436)

Homemaking responsibilities are not the only facets of a housewife's responsibilities that are under attack. A number of writer's suggest the function of child rearing is the real culprit in preventing women from self development. Limpus (1970) argues that it is a woman's relationship to her children which seriously prevents her from expressing herself in a creative manner. Millet (1969) suggests that, "Domestic service and attendance upon infants are assigned [to women] while the rest of the human achievement, interest, and ambition is prescribed for the male" (p. 126).

Jones (1970) refers to giving birth as a "bad trip" for many women. The child acts to tie the woman down to the point that she must submit herself to a "second-class existence." Other writers (i.e., Rollin, 1970; Greer, 1970) suggest that the raising of children should be turned over to "professionals" in day care centers so that both wife and husband can be free to pursue careers and other areas of interest and development. Childrearing is often described as burdensome, unchallenging, dull, and time consuming.

Lott (1973) and Lerner and Voth (1973) suggest more conservative changes in order to afford women the time and opportunity for the pursuit of interests outside of the home. They suggest that through mutual cooperation between husband and wife domestic responsibilities can be shared equally, thus removing undue burdens from the wife and at the same time allowing the husband more opportunity for interaction

with his children and appreciation for his home. These authors suggest
that husbands often feel almost as much alienation from the home as
wives do from activities outside of the home.

Factors Influencing Alternative Role Choices by Housewives

The difficulty experienced by many women in finding fulfillment in
the homemaker role and the societal thrust for women to seek self-
expression outside of the home have resulted in many women reassessing
their personal value systems and reevaluating their individual roles
and ways of functioning. With increasing numbers, women are becoming
more involved in religious and community functions as volunteers as
well as participating in the work force as full or part-time employees.

In 1979, over twenty million (49 percent) of all married women in
the United States were working; 58 percent of mothers with school-age
children were working; and 41 percent of the mothers with preschool
children were also employed (Boeckel, 1979, p. 503).

Although work providing an alternate means of personal fulfillment
and work providing financial assistance are the most significant
reasons for women working, a number of other factors are reported to
have contributed to the marked increase of employment among women.
Dowdall (1975) reports research which argues:

> . . . the reduction in family size and increasing availability of
> household aids are more important causes of the increase in female
> labor force participation than are such factors as an "urge for
> emancipation" . . . or "equalitarianism". (p. 122)

Factors such as decreased birthrate, technology in the kitchen,
legislation promoting equal opportunity employment, a longer life span,

increased educational opportunities, rising economic aspirations,
increased societal acceptance of women working, inflation and need for
increased family income, increased employment opportunities for women,
and more agreeable attitudes and assistance of husbands are all reasons
listed for influencing women to seek employment (Farmer, 1971; Clayton,
1975; Weil, 1961; Kievet, 1974; Boeckel, 1979).

Employment as a Viable Alternative Role for Housewives

A number of research studies indicate that work is a satisfying
and meaningful experience for many women. In 1968, Campbell and Harmon
surveyed 5583 women and concluded that in many cases women do enjoy
working. Adams (1975), in assessing the attitudes of successful
executive women, concluded that these women felt their careers were
beneficial in their impact on the family. Bruno Bettleheim (Roleder,
1973) feels that in many cases women who work are less frustrated and
feel more adequate and as a result tend to be more positive influences
on husbands and children. Weiss and Samuelson (1958) report that most
employed women, regardless of education, identified their jobs rather
than their home and family as their chief sources of usefulness and
importance.

In research conducted by Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) in which
women in the work force were analyzed, the authors concluded that self-
expression and development of self-identity were important advantages
of women working. Many women in this study, ". . . indicated that if
satisfactions from work were to be removed, they would experience a
major personal deficit" (p. 530). The authors also found that the

economic gain experienced when both husband and wife were working was also considered to be of great advantage to the marriage relationship and the family.

Blood (1965), in expressing advantages of women working, quotes Siegel, Stolz, Hitchcock, and Adamson:

> Employment emancipates women from domination by their husbands and, secondarily, raises their daughters from inferiority to their brothers (echoing the rising status of their mothers). The employment of women affects the power structure of the family by equalizing the resources of husband and wife. A working wife's husband listens to her more, and she listens to herself more. She expresses herself and has more opinions. Instead of looking up into her husband's eyes and worshipping him, she levels with him, compromising on the issues at hand. Thus, her power increases and, relatively speaking, the husband's falls. (p. 46)

The literature suggests further that other problems encountered with the homemaker role can be rectified by involvement in the labor force. Ferree (1976b), in reporting the results of interviews with 135 working and non-working housewives, suggests that work allows a woman ". . .to get out and see other people," thus reducing the feeling of isolation. The same author also suggests that work provides opportunity for an expression of social contribution, thus providing an increased feeling of worth. Ferree quotes research results presented by Blauner in which the author states: "The need for sheer activity, for social intercourse, and for status and identity in the larger society keeps even unskilled workers on the job after they are economically free to retire" (p. 432).

Work has also been identified as providing wives with better physical health (Burke & Weir, 1976b); improved mental health (Gove & Geerken, 1977; Nevill & Damico, 1975); improved self-esteem (Barry, 1970; Mostow & Newberry, 1975; Ferree, 1976b); decreased problems with

depression (Mostow & Newberry, 1975); more independence and self-determination (Wright, 1978); and significantly increased family income (Boeckel, 1979).

Conflicts Encountered by Employed Wives and Their Husbands

The research discussed thus far seems to indicate that for ultimate happiness and well-being, women ought to divide their attention between home and family and the world of work. In reality, this perception is disputed by a number of researchers and writers. Even though being out of the home may bring women many desired satisfactions, it may at the same time result in marital and familial conflict which in the final analysis may cause husbands and wives a higher degree of unhappiness.

Katz and Knapp (1974), in working with career counseling and resource centers for women, state that many women hope to attain personal fulfillment by entering paid employment preferably of a meaningful nature. Many women suffer from confusion and various degrees of depression brought on by the conflict between deciding to remain in the home or go to work.

> To go to work is contrary to the womanly roles most valued in our culture, those of being able to run a home efficiently, have a happy family life, and rear well-behaved, intellectually curious and creative children. (p. 106)

The authors go on to suggest that being a successful homemaker and being successfully involved in a career are both relatively difficult tasks. To require that one person be successful in both areas may create a great deal of pressure and stress. Success in either of these two life areas seems to be a difficult task in itself.

Even though it is reported in some studies that husbands of employed wives tend to provide more domestic assistance than husbands of unemployed wives (Siegel & Hass, 1963; Sperling, 1976), as Pleck (1977) points out, ". . . fully employed men still do only a fraction of the family work that fully employed women do . . ." (p. 420). A number of researchers (i.e., Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969; Blood, 1965; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971; Axelson, 1963) indicate that even when there is a mutual consensus between married partners that the wife have a job, still the husband most often fails to assume equal responsibility for performing necessary domestic and child raising tasks.

As a result of employed wives being responsible for dual roles, they often experience what Rhonda and Robert Rapoport (1969) term as "role overload." Pleck (1977) suggests that the role overload working women tend to experience causes them to face considerable problems of strain and exhaustion in both their work and family roles.

The limited free time of the working wife reportedly results in relatively low participation in informal leisure time activities such as visiting neighbors (Seigel & Hass, 1963) and interacting with husbands (Greenleaf, 1978). Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) concur with these findings and suggest that when both marriage partners are working, they often have less time for leisure activities, associations with friends and family, and often for each other.

The restricted social interaction reportedly experienced by working women is especially concerning due to its possible impact on the marriage relationship. Renne (1970) and other psychologists

suggest that when marriage partners are able to establish and maintain
interpersonal relationships external to the marriage relationship,
often the marriage will benefit because the marital relationship is not
put under pressure to provide the spouses with all of their social
interactions. In fact, Renne found that:

> People with few intimate associates were more likely than others
> to be dissatisfied with their marriages; in other words, marital
> satisfaction is related to the number of close relatives and
> friends claimed by the spouses. (p. 65)

Rapoport and Rapoport (1969) interviewed 16 "dual career" families
in which the wife had recently terminated work for one reason or
another. In reporting the amount of leisure time spouses spend
together as a result of both marriage partners working, these authors
reported the following research findings:

> In general, most of the couples interviewed thought that the main
> consequence of their both working was that there was very little
> slack left in the system. Several indicated that they were both
> "whacked" by the time they got home and that they had very little
> energy left over for extra activities, particularly on week-
> nights. (p. 12)

These results become even more significant when one considers that
Rossi (1972) and other researchers have found that a critical factor
related to marital happiness is the amount of time spouses are able to
spend with each other.

The role overload experienced by employed wives appears to also
present problems for their husbands. Hunt and Hunt (1977), in
reviewing research on dual career families, suggest that:

> The division of labor in the contemporary nuclear family is an
> important component in individual career success and the
> dual-career family, by altering this division, undercuts the
> career potential of each spouse in a way not adequately
> anticipated in the literature. (p. 409)

The authors go on to say that:

Inasmuch as dual-careerism increases the domestic responsibilities of men, it reduces their insulation from the acute role-conflict women experience when pursuing careers and may simply make such conflict a problem for both spouses (p. 412).

Burke and Weir (1976a) used two mailed questionnaires to evaluate 189 husband and wife pairs in assessing satisfaction with life, marriage, and job of wife working and wife not working couples. The authors summarized their research by stating: "Working women appeared to be in better physical health, held more positive attitudes toward life in general, and towards marriage in particular [than non-working women]" (pp. 284-285).

The authors went on to say:

It is therefore somewhat disturbing to find that husbands of working wives did not show that their wive's employment worked similarly in their favor. Husbands of working wives, when compared with husbands of housewives, were in poor health and in addition, were less content with marriage, work and life in general. The implications of these findings are that men whose wives work are subject to greater stress than men whose wives are not working and they appear to be having more difficulty coping effectively with this pattern of family living. Thus, whatever benefits accrue to the wife and family from her participation in the work force do not appear to mitigate whatever difficulties the husband experiences with this arrangement. (p. 285)

Work itself offers a number of other unique conflicts for many women. A U.S. News and World Report (Working Women, 1979) article reports that 80 percent of all working mothers are still employed in traditional clerical, sales, service or light factory jobs which may be low paying and/or low interest types of employment. In addition, Breedlove and Cicirelli (1974) report evidence that women are influenced on the job by a "motive to avoid success." This was inter- preted to mean that women who are competitive, high achievers are often

viewed as non-feminine and, thus being successful becomes negatively reinforced. This tends to decrease motivation for women to be successful on the job. Rossi (1972) supports this viewpoint and states further that few men either expect women to be career achievers or know how to relate to them when they are. Horner (1972) suggests that women become anxious about achieving success because they expect negative consequences such as social rejection or feelings of being unfeminine.

A number of researchers (i.e., Katz & Knapp, 1974; Rapoport & Rapoport, 1969) indicate that working wives may threaten their husbands either in terms of competency or in terms of assuming an equalitarian role. The work related binds that women find themselves in reportedly cause a good deal of frustration and anxiety to women who are seeking career success.

Siegel and Hass (1963) report significant family related conflicts experienced by working homemakers. This research indicates that working wives argue with spouses at a higher rate than housewives and experience significantly more guilt and anxiety related to neglecting children and the family than housewives. In addition, Brinkman (1976) reports statistics which show the divorce rate among working housewives in his study was four times higher than that of non-working housewives.

Significance of the Homemaker Role

The role of the homemaker and mother is suggested to be of utmost significance to the majority of married women. Siegel and Hass (1963), in reporting research involving 379 New England working and non-working

mothers, concluded: "The women in our sample were almost unanimous in feeling that motherhood was their primary job . . ." (p. 520). Bruno Bettleheim (Scott, 1971), a noted psychologist, states that:

As much as women want to be good scientists or engineers, they want first and foremost to be womenly companions of men and to be mothers. In our thinking on working mothers, the attitude seems to be that it is their motherhood that must somehow be fitted into their working life. Knowing that this runs counter to their natural desires, many women give up trying to fit work into their prime concern with motherhood. Well-intentioned efforts to encourage women to continue in their profession after their children are fairly grown only sidestep the issue, because they start with the assumption that the two -- work and motherhood -- are not really compatible. And they are not, unless work and child care are so arranged that neither childhood or motherhood suffers. (p. 148)

Housework itself has been identified as being a fulfilling experience for a number of women. Malbin (1976) suggests that, "Housewifery is creative and autonomous compared with most jobs which women are likely to fill in the labor force" (p. 913). Ferree (1976b), in research described earlier, found that over 25 percent of the housewives she interviewed not only enjoyed the homemaker role but felt their accomplishments were recognized and that they were involved with a number of significant support groups, thus avoiding loneliness and isolation.

Weaver and Holmes (1975), using Social Surveys, questioned 629 white females (331 had full-time jobs and 298 were full-time homemakers) as to their role preferences. They found that 53 percent of the full-time housewives reported being "very satisfied" with their work. Wright (1978), after reviewing the research literature on working and non-working wives, stated that, ". . . data for the period 1971 to 1976 does not reveal significant differences between working

women and housewives in regard to life in general or to the measurable components thereof: work, marriage, family, and so on" (p. 310-311). This author concluded that attempts to substantiate that women with outside work are happier and more satisfied with life than housewives have been consistently unsuccessful.

Impact of the Husband's Role

In looking at the research literature, it was found that the majority of marriage role investigations have focused on women with only brief comments made regarding the husband role. This is particularly of interest when one considers that in the role research that has been done on husbands, the role of the husband has not only had a significant impact on the husband himself, but also on his family, on his wife, and on the marriage relationship.

Several researchers suggest that the husband's attitudes and roles have a great deal to do with the wife's role satisfaction no matter what her role choice is. Coiner (1979), in investigating "whether the reactions of married mothers to full-time employment are related to aspects of the mother's environment," concluded, "The more positive was the husband's attitude about the wife's working, the lower were her strain and general guilt and the higher was her morale" (p. 443).

Barry (1970), in reviewing marital research, concluded that background and personality factors of the husband (i.e., education level, scores on personality inventories, marital happiness of parents, income, occupation, emotional stability) were significantly more important to marital happiness than were the wife's. In their study of

900 Detroit area wives, Blood and Wolfe (1960) also found that an important source of marital satisfaction for the wife was the husband's prestige or social status.

Nye (1961) investigated the relationship of maternal employment to marital success and concluded that:

> In families in which the wife is employed and the husband disapproves, marital adjustment averages poor. However, in families in which the wife is not employed but the husband would approve of her entering the labor force, marital adjustment is poorer also. (p. 118)

Pleck (1977), in discussing the results of several studies, states, "In marriages where wives held paid employment and valued it positively, marital satisfaction was high if the husband was family oriented, but markedly low if the husband was work oriented" (p. 421).

Bailyn (1970), in gathering information about marital happiness, reported the results of research data collected from questionnaires given to 223 British married women and their husbands. The author reported the findings of this study in terms of marriages with working or non-working wives. Results indicate that increased marital happiness with non-working wife couples was related to decreased job satisfaction and decreased income of the husband and decreased number of children. The author explains these somewhat surprising results by suggesting that husbands who earn less and enjoy work less tend to spend more time at home and less time on the job.

Equalitarian marriages demonstrated increased happiness as husband's income and job satisfaction increased and as sharing of domestic responsibilities between spouses increased. It is demonstrated, thus that the husband's roles and attitudes have a

significant effect on the happiness of marriages and the wife's

functioning. Bailyn goes on to conclude her research by stating:

> Husband's mode of integrating family and work in his own life is
> crucial for the success, at least in terms of marital
> satisfaction, of any attempt of his wife to include a career in
> her life. There is evidence, as a matter of fact, that
> identifying the conditions under which men find it possible to
> give primary emphasis to their families while at the same time
> functioning satisfactorily in their own careers may be even more
> relevant to the problem of careers for married women than the
> continued emphasis on the difficulties women face in integrating
> family and work. (p. 108)

Gross and Arvey (1977) investigated 71 husband and wife pairs

using a questionnaire in order to study the relationship between

husband and wife role sharing and the homemaker satisfaction. They

stated that a wive's satisfaction with the homemaker role was directly

related to the degree of the husband assuming responsibility for

homemaker tasks and child care, and to the husband's attitude toward

women generally.

Burke, Weir, and DuWors (1979) used a questionnaire to evaluate 85

Canadian Senior Administrators and their wives regarding marital

interaction and type A behavior of the husband. (Type A behavior is

behavior which is characterized by being highly achievement oriented

and "driven".) In discussing research results, the authors stated:

> Certain negative feelings such as feelings of depression and
> worthlessness, of anxiety and tension, of guilt and isolation were
> found to be more pervasive and prevalent in wives whose husband's
> behavior was more clearly Type A. (p. 63)

In review of marital satisfaction research done in the sixties,

Hicks and Platt (1970) concluded that, "The instrumental role of the

husband is more crucial to marital happiness than social scientists

have previously believed. It may be even more critical than any other

single variable" (p. 569).

Marital Happiness and Marital Roles

As was pointed out in Chapter I, Gover (1963), in reviewing earlier research studies (1920's to 1950's), found conflicting results as to the effect of housewives working or not working on marital happiness. More recent studies generally suggest "no difference" in marital happiness between spouses of working and non-working housewives or a tendency for a higher degree of marital adjustment in marriages where the wife is a full-time homemaker.

Axelson (1963) used a questionnaire to assess marital happiness of working versus non-working women in a relatively small western town. Husband attitudes toward the wife working were also assessed. Findings suggested that working wives tended to have "poorer" marital adjustments than did non-working wives. Results also indicated, however, the husbands reported a greater acceptance of wives working than had been reported earlier in the literature. This finding was interpreted as possibly being a trend towards the husband's acceptance of new societal roles for women.

Marital adjustments and working wives versus home oriented wives in differing socioeconomic levels (as determined by husbands income) were studied by Blood and Wolfe (Hicks & Platt, 1970) in 1960 and Nye in 1961. These two studies produced differing results. Blood and Wolfe found that in low income families marital adjustment was better in cases where the wife was employed than when she was not employed. Nye, on the other hand, found marital adjustment better among the unemployed wives than the employed wives for all socioeconomic levels although significance was not reached for any of the groups. Gover

(1963) conducted subsequent research which supported the results found by Nye that marital adjustment was better for non-working women than working women in upper middle and lower class groups but most obviously in the lower class group.

Sonenstein (1976), using a questionnaire to evaluate 237 black and white participants in the Boston area, found that for both black and white (but especially white) respondents, ". . . wife's employment was associated with lower levels of marital satisfactions . . ." (p. 7676).

Rapoport and Rapoport (1971) investigated a sample of 298 married women, 34 percent of whom were continuous workers (either having worked without major interruption or, if they did dropout, they intended to return to work before their youngest child was three years old). On a questionnaire, 40 percent of the women reporting marriages which were less than "very happy" were from the continuous workers group and only 29 percent of this same group reported having very happy marriages.

Segre' (1978), using the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test, interviewed 128 women who were working full-time or part-time or were full-time housewives. These women were all graduates of Boston University. The most significant finding of this study was that full-time employed women had the least happy marriages.

A number of authors have conducted research which suggests "no difference" in marital happiness between wife working and wife not working couples. In research conducted in 1974, Thomopoulous used questionnaire data collected from 342 (171 couples) parents of pre-school children to evaluate marital adjustment as it related to the work status of the mother. The author points out that even though

only 19 percent of the women were working out of financial necessity,

only 10 percent of the husbands and 8 percent of the wives felt the

wives working had an unfavorable effect on the marriage relationship.

The author's conclusion to this study was:

> No differences were found between the employed wives and the
> non-employed wives and between the husbands of the employed wives
> and the husbands of the non-employed wives on measures of marital
> satisfaction, marital adjustment, or personal happiness.
> (p. 2486B)

Booth (1977) conducted research to determine whether or not

significant stress was experienced between couples wherein the wife was

either employed or not employed. The sample consisted of 560 Canadian

households in which the husband and/or the wife were interviewed.

Marital happiness was assessed by several responses on a questionnaire.

The author concluded that even though initial adjustment to the wife's

employment created increased stress, after this adjustment had been

made no significant difference existed in marital happiness between

couples with working and non-working wives. Ferree (1976b), in

research described earlier, also found "no difference" between working

and non-working wife couples and marital happiness.

Siperstein (1978) conducted research using questionnaires to

evaluate 23 career wife couples and 26 non-career wife couples to

determine if the wife's employment had any effect on marital

communication. The conclusion of this study was, "The wife's

employment does not appear to effect her marital relationship [as

measured by amount of communication] as evidenced by the data collected

within this sample" (p. 3168).

Several authors have extended their research design to look at a variety of independent variables thought to also effect marital happiness of wife working and wife not working couples. Glenn and Weaver (1978) reported research results of a "face-to-face" survey conducted in 1973-1975. The sample consisted of white American females ages 18 through 59. Marital happiness was determined by responses to the question: "Taking things all together, how would you describe your marriage? Would you say your marriage is very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?" Results of this study indicate no significant relationship between marital happiness and husband's occupational prestige, family income, education level of each spouse, age of each spouse, religious involvement of each spouse, and wives working or not working. The presence of young children in the home significantly decreased marital happiness for wives only.

Gross and Arvey (1977) used a self report question with a 4 point scale to measure marital happiness of 71 working wife and non-working wife couples. This study was set up to determine the effect on marital happiness of: 1) the degree of responsibility the husband assumes for homemaker tasks; 2) employment status of the wife; 3) income level; and 4) wife's satisfaction with the homemaker job. No significance was found between any of these variables and marital happiness.

Hopkins (1977) used 30 husbands from each of two groups, (one with working and one with non-working wives) to investigate correlations between marital adjustment in husbands of dual career and traditional families. The author concluded that the most significant predictor of marital happiness for the husband was the wife's satisfaction with division of labor.

Ridley (1973) measured marital happiness (using the Nye-McDougall Marital Adjustment Inventory) as it related to job satisfaction (using the Bullock Scale of Job Satisfaction). The sample consisted of 210 woman public school teachers and 109 of their husbands. The author found that marital adjustment was high when: 1) wives were low on job satisfaction and husbands were high; 2) both spouses were highly satisfied with their jobs; 3) husband and wife were low on job involvement; and 4) the husband was medium on job involvement and the wife was low on job involvement. The authors went on to state: "When either spouse became highly involved in his job, marital adjustment tended to suffer."

Chadwick, Albrecht and Kunz (1976) also investigated marital roles as they related to marital happiness. These authors received 775 couple responses from mailed questionnaires which had been randomly sent to a large sample of couples in the state of Utah. Results of this study indicated that: 1) the greater the number of children, the greater the role satisfaction for both husband and wife; 2) the longer the time of marriage, the greater the husband's marital satisfaction and the less the marital satisfaction for the wife; 3) similarity of religious activity was a significant indicator of marital satisfaction; and 4) positive evaluation of the spouses role performance rated highly with marital satisfaction.

One of the most referred to examples of research in the literature in the area of marital happiness and marital roles is Orden and Bradburn's research conducted in 1969. Although the authors developed their own assessment instruments which were in questionnaire form, an

attempt was made to increase the sophistication of the measurements used. Marriage happiness was measured using five different indexes; two of these measured the variables of companionship and sociability, one measured tensions, and the other two measured overall marital happiness as reported by the individual's own assessment.

Two important factors in the research conducted by Orden and Bradburn (1969) were the assessment of happiness for both the husband and wife and assessment of the effect on marital happiness when the wife was able to choose to work or when circumstances forced her to work. The most significant findings of this research were that:

> Both partners in a marriage are lower in marital happiness when the wife is denied a choice and is in the labor market only because she needs the money rather than when the wife participates in the labor market by choice. (p. 398)

Orden and Bradburn found that when a woman works out of necessity, both husband and wife experience more tension and less sociability with each other. Subsequent research (Arnott, 1972; Hall & Gordon, 1973; Howe, 1973) gives support to the fact that women feel more life satisfaction when they are able to choose their role, whether it be to remain in the home or to be employed, rather than be forced into it. This finding is possibly an indication of women striving towards self determination.

Part-Time Employment and Marital Happiness

Several studies have dealt with marital happiness as it relates to women working full or part-time and women remaining in the home. Arnott (1972) used questionnaires to survey 178 wives of college faculty members and found that working full or part-time or not working

at all was not the critical determinate of marital happiness, but found
that women who were able to choose their own role were happier in all
settings.

Hall and Gordon (1973) collected questionnaire data from 109
members of womens groups (most of whom were college graduates in the
New Haven, Connecticut area). In assessing part-time work, the authors
found that: 1) generally the two groups of working women experienced
more conflict than housewives; 2) the part-time workers reported the
greatest number of salient roles; 3) the full-time workers experienced
more time conflict than the other two groups; 4) despite these
conflicts, the full-time workers reported significantly greater
satisfaction than part-time workers or housewives; and 5) the
housewives reported the lowest number of salient roles, and also low
levels of time and non-home pressures as well as high levels of
self-related conflicts.

Ferree (1976b), in research described earlier, found that only 8
percent of the part-time workers as compared to 17 percent of the
full-time workers and 26 percent of the full-time housewives, "were not
satisfied at all" with their present circumstances. The author
suggests that:

> Despite its economic disadvantages, part-time work appears to
> provide a more satisfying alternative to housework at lower cost
> in terms of role strain and family dissension than full-time
> employment. Thus, its status as the preferred compromise appears
> entirely rational. (p. 436)

This review of the literature has pointed out that the married
woman's traditional role as homemaker is under attack because it
reportedly hinders her intellectual development, social-emotional

functioning, and thwarts happiness. Work and other out-of-home responsibilities have been offered as viable alternatives wherein many married women report gaining satisfaction and meaning in their lives.

The conflicts encountered by husbands and wives of "dual-career" families (usually due to "role-overload" and/or social factors confronting working women in the work-force) reportedly often decrease both individual and marital satisfaction of spouses. The decreased time alloted for family functioning is also reportedly a negative factor for working housewives.

The role of the husband, although minimally researched, appears to have a significant impact on the functioning and happiness of not only the husband but also the wife and the marital interaction. Research related to marital happiness and marital role choice appears to be inconclusive but suggests that generally marriages of working wives tend to be less happy or as happy as marriages of non-working wives.

The research on marital roles and marriage happiness was relatively sparse in the 1970's, especially research directed at evaluating husbands. Reserch methodology was also found to be weak in many cases especially in terms of instrumentation and failure to investigate other out-of-home roles besides full-time employment.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Following the assessment of the overall nature of the identified research problem and the formulation of the purpose and objectives of this study, it next became necessary to designate a research strategy which would answer the identified questions. Chapter III provides information regarding the methodological approach to this study. First, the sample for the study is described, followed by an explanation of the research design. Next, a discussion of the measures employed to gather necessary data is presented. The procedure by which the study was conducted is outlined followed by an explanation of how the data was prepared and analyzed.

Population and Sample

The data needed to measure the designated objectives was collected from a middle class socio-economic population. This population consisted of each spouse of 124 (248 total participants) married couples with at least one of the spouses in each couple being a professional employee (teacher, counselor, administrator) in the public school system. Participants in this study were selected from elementary and secondary schools in the following school districts: Fremont School District (Fremont County, Idaho); Sugar/Salem School District (Madison County, Idaho); Teton School District (Teton County,

Idaho); Pocatello School District (Bannock County, Idaho); Idaho Falls
School District (Bonneville County, Idaho); Jefferson County School
District (Jefferson County, Idaho); Preston School District (Franklin
County, Idaho); and Weber County School District (Weber County, Utah).

Rationale for choosing this population from which to draw the
sample was as follows:

1. Due to the nature of this research, it was necessary to
contact at least one member of the marital couple in order to explain
the procedure and distribute the research instruments. Other studies
of this nature used questionnaires sent and returned by mail. This
method of distribution was not chosen because subjects might fail to
return their materials, thus, biasing research results. The sample
chosen for this study was contacted in groups and materials distributed
on site. Eighty-three percent of the materials distributed were
returned for inclusion in the study.

2. Because a relatively large amount of effort was required from
the respondents in completing all five evaluation forms, it was
necessary to select a population that would be sympathetic to the
research effort. Thus, educators were selected.

3. The sample provided enough diversity of characteristics (age,
women working, women functioning as homemakers, number of children in
the home, hours worked, income, and years married) to provide a good
cross-section of the middle-class population (see Appendix A).

4. Researchers (i.e., Gover, 1963; Hicks & Platt, 1970; Blood &
Wolfe, 1960) have noted people coming from different socio-economic
backgrounds tend to vary markerdly in regard to some of the dependent
and independent variables being used in this study.

5. Due to the large number of participants necessary to evaluate all socio-economic levels, it was decided that the focus of this study would be on a middle-class population.

The population chosen was composed of white, middle-class Americans from both urban and rural settings in Southeastern Idaho and Northern Utah. The majority of the respondents reported some form of religious affiliation, the dominant sect being The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints. Approximately one-fourth of the wives in the sample were full-time homemakers with the remainder of the wives reporting varying degrees of employment related responsibilities (see Appendix A).

Research Design

This research is designated as a relationship study in that the primary concern is to gain a better understanding of complex behavior patterns by studying the relationship between these patterns and variables to which they are hypothesized to relate (Borg & Gall, 1963). A total of 40 independent variables was selected for use in this study. The dependent variables were marital happiness, depression, and self concept. Data for these variables were collected from the instruments described in the "measures" section of this chapter. An "exploratory" factor analysis was conducted in order to combine related variables into factors. Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the factor scores.

Cohen (1968), in discussing multiple regression analysis, stated:

A note of caution: as we have seen, given even a few factors
(main effects of nominal variables or linear aspects of

quantitative variables), one can generate very large numbers of
distinct independent variables (interactions of any order,
polynomials, interactions of polynomials, etc.). The temptation
to represent many such features of the data in an analysis must be
resisted for sound research-philosophical and statistical reasons.
Even in research using a relatively large number of subjects (n),
a small number of factors (nominal and quantitative scales) can
generate a number of independent variables which exceed n. Each
esoteric issue posed to the data costs df which is lost from the
error estimate, thus enfeebling the statistical power of the
analysis. (p. 442)

Thus, the inclusion of a large number of variables (40 for males

and 40 for females in this study), decreases power of the multiple

regression analysis. The use of factor analysis to combine variables

into factors (12 for males, 10 for females), therefore, decreases the

degrees of freedom, and increases the power of the statistical

analysis.

Multiple regression was selected because it lends itself well to

evaluating data from relationship studies. This statistical procedure

is also valuable in working with multiple variables in that the inde-

pendent variables can be assessed in a step wise procedure to determine

their individual and combined relationships with the dependent variable

while their relationship with each other can also be described. Four

separate multiple regression analyses were conducted, one for each of

the two dependent variables (marital happiness and self concept) for

both husbands and wives. (Note depression was dropped as a dependent

variable after factor analysis -- see Analysis Section for an

explanation.)

Measures

The five measures used to gather data for this study were: 1) the

Marital Status Questionnaire, developed by the writer; 2) the Tennessee

Self Concept Scale; 3) the Depression Adjective Checklist; 4) the
Marriage Adjustment Schedule; and 5) the Marriage Role Expectation
Inventory.

Marital Status Questionnaire

The Marital Status Questionnaire (see Appendix B) contains
eighteen questions and is designed to gather information about
participant's home and out-of-home roles and responsibilities as well
as their feelings toward these roles. Other information gathered by
the questionnaire included: number of children in the home,
educational level, and income. Data for 27 independent variables used
in this study were provided through this questionnaire.

Marriage Adjustment Schedule

A large number of instruments have been used in evaluating marital
happiness and adjustment. Some of these instruments fail to measure
information directly related to marital happiness and many have re-
ported no validity and/or reliability while others list varying degrees
of reliability and validity. Examples of the instruments used include
the: Kelly-Tharp Marriage Role Questionnaire, Barrett-Lennard
Relationship Inventory, Feminine Role Rating Inventory, Tennessee Self-
Concept Scale, Lock-Terman Marital Adjustment Scales, FIRO-B, Marital
Attitude Scale, Marlow-Crown Social Desirability Scale, Inventory of
Feminine Values, Schmidt's Sex Role Inventory, and the Edwards Personal
Preference Profile. Generally, simple questionnaires have been uti-
lized requesting direct responses to the degree of marital happiness.

For the purposes of this study, the Marriage Adjustment Schedule
was chosen as the measure of marital happiness due to the reported

validity and reliability of the test questions and due to its frequent use in research involving marital happiness (Nye, & Rushing, 1969; Bowerman, 1964; Locke, 1951; Burgess & Locke, 1953; Locke & Wallace, 1959). Results of one of the original validity and reliability tests conducted by the authors revealed split half reliability of .90. Validity was measured by the tests ability to differentiate between married people whose marriages were considered to be "well-adjusted" and those considered to be "maladjusted." On investigation, only 17 percent of the maladjusted group inappropriately achieved scores in the well-adjusted range of test scores, whereas 96 percent of the well-adjusted group scored appropriately in the well-adjusted range of scores.

Marriage Role Expectation Form

This instrument was developed by Dunn (1963) in order to distinguish equalitarian oriented individuals from traditionally oriented individuals. Scores on this measure place the respondent on a continuum from traditional to equalitarian. Seven subscales are also available for use including: authority, homemaking, care of children, personal characteristics, social participation, education, and employment. The odd-even reliability of the total score (the basic measure of equalitarian-traditional role expectations) is stated to be .975. Intrinsic validity is claimed on the basis of the way in which the items were selected (which included the consensus of qualified judges).

Depression Adjective Checklist

A report in Buros Mental Measurement Yearbook (7th Edition) by Leonard D. Goldstein (Buros, 1972) states that, "The Depression

Adjective Checklists are clearly the most psychometrically

sophisticated and potentially useful instruments of this type currently

available" (p. 132). A number of validity studies have shown this test

to have correlations of between .60 and .95 in selecting depressed

patients from normals (depressed patients were diagnosed by experienced

psychiatrists). Significant correlations have also been found between

the test and other paper-pencil tests reporting to measure depression

(e.g., the depression scale on the MMPI).

The internal consistency of this test ranges from .79 to .90 and

split-half reliabilities range from .82 to .93, depending on the form.

The test itself is composed of seven different forms, forms A-G. After

consulting with the test publishers, Form E was selected for use in

this study. A measure of depression was selected for use in this study

because depression is often linked to poor adjustment and frustration.

Tennessee Self Concept Scales (TSCS)

The TSCS has been used extensively throughout the literature as a

standardized measure of self concept. The test provides a total score

and the following subtest scores: self-criticism, identity, self

satisfaction, behavior, physical self, moral-ethical self, personal

self, family self, social self, three variably scores, and a

distribution score.

The test manual (Fitts, 1965) reports a number of impressive

normative studies using large diversified sampling populations.

Reported test-retest reliability data indicate that most scores on the

TSCS had reliability coefficients in the .80 to .90 range with several

in the .70 to .80 range.

Content validity is claimed by the authors in that qualified judges were used in selecting items for the TSCS which for the most part were taken from older measures of self concept. Only those items selected unanimously by the judges were retained for test inclusion. The TSCS has also been shown to discriminate significantly (.001 level) between normal and psychiatric patients. Significant correlations with other measures of personality are also noted, for example, .70 with the Taylor Anxiety Scale and .50 to .60 with various scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Richard M. Scunn, in the Mental Measurements Yearbook (Buros, 1972), concludes his evaluation of the TSCS by stating: "In summary, the TSCS ranks among the better measures combining group discrimination with self concept information" (p. 369).

Procedures

Packets were developed for dissemination of the inventories and the questionnaire used in the study. These packets consisted of two folders, one with materials for the wife and one with materials for the husband. Each folder contained the Marital Status Questionnaire, Tennessee Self Concept Scale, Depression Adjective Checklist, Marriage Adjustment Schedule, and the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory. Instructions were included for each participant (see Appendix C).

Participants for this study were acquired by going to school faculty meetings, presenting the intention of the study, and requesting volunteers. Persons participating in the study took a packet home. Spouses were instructed not to communicate with each other relative to their responses to the instruments, and to fill in the desired information. Materials were returned to a designated person at the school

(i.e., secretary, counselor, principal) where they in turn were
retrieved by the writer. Most often several visits to each school were
necessary to prompt the return of materials from some participants.
Eighty-three percent of the packets were returned for use in the study.

Analysis

This study consisted of 40 independent variables and three
dependent variables. (The dependent variable, depression, was
eliminated by factor analysis.) As was mentioned earlier, a factor
analysis was done which combined the variables into 12 factors for
husbands and 10 factors for wives. The factors for husbands were:

Factor 1--Self Concept

Composed of the total score and nine subtest scores of the
Tennessee Self Concept Scale (TSCS).

Factor 2--Work Related Variables

Composed of Marital Status Questionnaire (MSQ) question 3 (number
of years employed since marriage), question 5 (years of continual
employment), present age, and question 16A (husband's yearly income).

Factor 3--Self Concept Inconsistency

Composed of the three variability scores from the TSCS (column,
row, and total variability scores).

Factor 4--Religious Involvement

Composed of MSQ questions 11A (time spent in religious
activities), 11B (self rating of time spent in religious activities),
and 10 (religious denomination preference).

Factor 5--Family Related Variables

Composed of MSQ questions 4A (number of children living at home)
and 4B (number of preschool children living at home), and negative
loadings on MSQ questions 14A and 14B (time spent with spouse, and
rating of time spent with spouse).

Factor 6--Marital Happiness Index

Composed of the total score from the Marriage Adjustment Schedule
and MSQ questions 17 (ranked degree of marital happiness), 14B (rating
of time spent with spouse) and 16B (degree of concern for finances).

Factor 7--Time On Job

Composed of MSQ question 7 (total time spent on job) and negative
correlations with MSQ questions 12A (amount of time in volunteer work)
and 13A (time in activities without spouse).

Factor 8--Volunteer Time

Composed of MSQ questions 12A and 12B (amount of volunteer time
and rating of satisfaction with amount of volunteer time).

Factor 9--Marital Role Expectation

Composed of the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory total score
and the TSCS Self Criticism Score.

Factor 10--Level of Education

Composed of MSQ question 1 (total years of education completed).

Factor 11--Away From Home Time

Composed of MSQ total time away from home and MSQ question 13A
(time in activities without spouse).

Factor 12--Interaction With Others

Composed of MSQ question 18 (rated degree of interaction with adults other than spouse).

The factors for wives were:

Factor 1--Self Concept

Same as husbands.

Factor 2--Work Related Variables

Same as husbands except MSQ question 16A is replaced by question 20 (total years married to present spouse).

Factor 3--Self Concept Inconsistency

Same as husbands, except for a negative loading on MSQ question 15A (husband's domestic contribution).

Factor 4--Away From Home Time

(Similar to husband's Factor 11) composed of MSQ total time away from home, MSQ question 7 (total time in work per week), and a negative loading with MSQ 4B (number of preschool children).

Factor 5--Marital Happiness Index

Composed of MSQ question 9 (freedom to choose present role), the total score from the Marital Adjustment Schedule and MSQ question 15B (rated satisfaction with husband's contribution to domestic responsibilities)

Factor 6--Interaction With Spouse

Composed of MSQ questions 14A and 14B (amount of individual interaction time with spouse and rated satisfaction with amount of time

spent with spouse), and question 17 (ranked degree of marital happiness).

Factor 7--Volunteer Time

(Similar to husband's factor number 8) composed of MSQ questions 12A and 12B (amount of time spent in community service and rated satisfaction with time spent in community service), and question 13A (other out-of-home time not involving the husband).

Factor 8--Religious Involvement

(Similar to husband's factor 4) composed of MSQ questions 11B (rated satisfaction with level of religious activity), 16A (husband's yearly income), and 11A (total time in religious activities).

Factor 9--Interaction With Others

(Similar to husband's factor 12) composed of MSQ question 18 (rated degree of adult interaction with adults other than the spouse) and TSCS self-criticism scale score.

Factor 10--Level of Education

Composed of MSQ question 1 (total years of education completed).

It was noted that the factor analysis failed to identify the depression score from the Depression Adjective Checklist. For this reason, depression was not considered in further statistical analyses. Thus, factors 1 (self concept) and 6 (marital happiness) were identified as dependent variables for husbands and factors 1 (self concept) and 5 (marital happiness) were identified as dependent variables for wives. Separate multiple regression analyses were

conducted for evaluation of each dependent variable. Factor 6 for husbands (marital happiness) and factor 5 for wives (marital happiness) were included as independent variables when factor 1 was being treated as a dependent variable. Likewise factor 1 (self concept) for both spouses was used as an independent variable when factors 5 (marital happiness) and 6 (marital happiness) were being treated as dependent variables.

In order to carry out the sophisticated statistical analysis necessary for use of multiple regression analysis, the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) computer program was used. A stepwise multiple regression with the F-ratio was used to test each question.

There are 15 options available in conducting the SPSS Multiple Regression Analysis. The only option used in analysis of the data for this research was option 2, pairwise deletion of missing data. Seven statistical printout options are also available with the SPSS program. In this study, the following statistical options were used: 2 (means, standard deviations, and number of valid cases); 4 (output of a plot of standardized residuals against the sequence of cases in a file); 5 (Durbin Watson statistic for residuals); 6 (plot of standardized residuals against standardized Y' values with residuals on the vertical axis); and 7 (printout of a correlation matrix and number of cases).

Questions Addressed by the Study

In order to analyze the questions and problems described earlier in the Purposes and Objectives section of Chapter I, factor analysis was conducted to provide data which can be more effectively evaluated

with multiple regression analysis. As stated earlier, factors 1 (self

concept) and 6 (marital happiness index) for husbands, and factors 1

(self concept) and 5 (marital happiness) for wives were treated as

dependent variables. Factors 1 through 12 (excluding factors 1 and 3,

self concept inconsistency, when self concept was the dependent

variable and factor 6 when marital happiness was the dependent

variable), were used as independent variables for males. Factors 1

through 10 (excluding factors 1 and 3, self concept inconsistency, when

self concept was the dependent variable and factor 5 when marital

happiness was the dependent variable) were used as independent

variables for females. The following four questions were constructed

using these factors in order to provide a basis for the statistical

analysis.

Question 1

What is the relationship between marital happiness (factor 6) of

husbands and the following role related variables: self concept

(factor 1); work related variables (factor 2); self concept inconsis-

tency (factor 3); religious related variables (factor 4); family

related variables (factor 5); time on the job (factor 7); volunteer

time (factor 8); marriage role expectations (factor 9); level of

education (factor 10); away from home time (factor 11); and interaction

with others (factor 12)?

Question 2

What is the relationship between self concept (factor 1) of

husbands and the following role related variables: work related

variables (factor 2); religious related variables (factor 4); family

related variables (factor 5); marital happiness index (factor 6); time on the job (factor 7); volunteer time (factor 8); marriage role expectations (factor 9); level of education (factor 10); away from home time (factor 11); and interaction with others (factor 12)?

Question 3

What is the relationship between marital happiness (factor 5) of wives and the following role related variables: self concept (factor 1); work related variables (factor 2); self concept inconsistency (factor 3); away from home time (factor 4); interaction with spouse (factor 6); volunteer time (factor 7); religious involvement (factor 8); interaction with others (factor 9); and level of education (factor 10)?

Question 4

What is the relationship between self concept (factor 1) of wives and the following role related variables: work related variables (factor 2); away from home time (factor 4); marital happiness index (factor 5); interaction with spouse (factor 6); volunteer time (factor 7); religious involvement (factor 8); interaction with others (factor 9); and level of education (factor 10)?

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the preceeding chapter, the methodology of this study was explained. A description of the sample was first given, followed by the research design, procedures used in the study, and an explanation of the method used for analyzing the data. A total of four questions were listed in order to facilitate statistical analysis of the data.

In this chapter, the results are presented in order to answer the questions posed. To begin with, the results of the factor analysis for husbands and wives will be explained. The remaining part of this chapter will be divided into six sections: (1) Descriptive Statistical Data for Variables Used to Assess Questions 1 and 2; (2) Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 1; (3) Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 2; (4) Descriptive Statistical Data for Variables Used to Assess Questions 3 and 4; (5) Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 3; and (6) Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 4. Section I will contain: intercorrelations of dependent variables for husbands presented in tabular form. Section 4 will contain the same data for wives.

In each of the sections reporting multiple regression analysis, the variables entering the stepwise multiple regression equation will be discussed in terms of the proportion of the variance explained on the dependent variable, either marital happiness or self concept.

Independent variables which are deleted from the multiple regression

equation due to failure to meet certain statistical criteria of the

SPSS program will be identified. Any variables reaching statistical

significance will also be indicated.

Factor Analytic Data for Husbands

Due to an insufficient number of responses, the following

questions on the Marital Status Questionnaire were deleted before

factor analysis was conducted: 8a (rating of satisfaction with

homemaker role); 8b (rating of satisfaction with present employment); 9

(rating of degree of freedom to choose present role); 15a (amount of

time husband spends working in domestic responsibilities); and 15b

(rated satisfaction with husband's contribution to domestic

responsibilities). MSQ question 6 (present occupational title) was

excluded from this study due to insufficient levels of job variability

for analysis. A total of 38 variables was finally analyzed. The mean,

standard deviation, and number of cases for each variable are reported

in Table 1.

Factor Analysis of the 38 variables selected for use in this study

produced 12 factors which were used as the dependent and independent

variables for investigation. Factors 1 (self concept) and 6 (marital

happiness index) served as dependent variables for this study. Table 2

presents correlations for variables with the identified factors 1

through 12.

The following variables were deleted as a result of having low

factor loadings with the 12 identified factors for husbands: Marital

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, and Cases -
Variables for Husbands

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cases
*MAS	661.23	37.76	114
MREI	57.86	6.42	114
DACL	6.75	5.22	120
TSCSSC	47.36	9.37	116
TSCSTOT	51.29	10.96	116
TSCSR1	48.82	11.35	116
TSCSR2	53.71	10.33	116
TSCSR3	49.14	11.06	116
TSCSCA	46.88	10.64	116
TSCSCB	53.54	10.94	116
TSCSCC	53.53	11.53	116
TSCSCD	50.22	9.09	116
TSCSCE	49.28	11.47	116
TSCSVTOT	43.43	9.64	116
TSCSVCOL	42.75	10.08	116
TSCSVROW	45.16	9.99	116
TSCSD	45.79	11.22	116
MSQAGE	38.39	9.17	117
MSQ1	15.96	2.52	118
MSQ2	13.88	9.39	118
MSQ3	13.71	9.45	117
MSQ4A	2.52	1.68	118
MSQ4B	0.86	1.01	118
MSQ5	15.08	9.27	117
MSQ7	49.35	11.75	109
MSQ10	1.77	0.43	111
MSQ11A	5.68	4.90	108
MSQ11B	1.61	0.59	108
MSQ12A	2.15	5.84	108
MSQ12B	1.12	0.38	106
MSQ13A	4.84	6.74	106
TOTIME	67.09	60.31	102
MSQ14A	10.53	11.57	103
MSQ14B	1.81	0.76	107
MSQ16A	3.78	1.33	111
MSQ16B	3.72	1.78	108
MSQ17	5.84	1.41	109
MSQ18	1.46	0.55	109

*See Appendix D for abbreviation interpretations

Table 2

Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix - Correlation Coefficients,
Variables and Identified Factors for Husbands

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
*MAS	.38	.02	.05	.28	-.02	.64	.02	.11	.16	-.10	.18	.15
MREI	.07	.03	-.01	-.02	.02	.21	-.21	.02	.84	.05	-.03	.06
DACL	-.36	-.03	-.01	.06	-.07	-.06	-.02	.15	-.36	.25	.20	-.47
TSCSSC	-.09	-.21	.20	-.21	-.31	-.05	.27	.09	.49	.18	.17	-.12
TSCSTOT	.97	.03	-.17	.01	.00	.10	-.01	.01	.01	.02	-.02	.02
TSCSR1	.89	.00	.12	.19	-.05	.01	.04	.01	.11	-.15	.10	.06
TSCSR2	.85	.03	-.32	-.12	-.04	.18	-.06	.10	-.07	.12	-.06	-.04
TSCSR3	.85	.12	-.07	-.03	.04	.01	-.04	-.08	-.05	.07	-.09	.11
TSCSCA	.74	.03	-.09	-.01	-.06	.13	.01	-.21	-.14	.16	-.18	.16
TSCSCB	.84	.11	.07	.13	.11	.02	-.20	.09	-.09	.14	.04	-.03
TSCSCC	.87	-.04	-.21	-.12	-.05	.01	-.02	.07	-.02	.02	.06	-.02
TSCSCD	.79	-.02	-.16	-.05	.00	.28	.00	.01	.16	-.02	-.03	-.12
TSCSCE	.84	.06	-.19	.01	-.02	.00	.20	.07	.07	-.21	.07	.07
TSCSVTOT	-.22	-.08	.95	.00	.02	-.03	-.02	.03	.02	-.05	.04	-.07
TSCSVCOL	-.22	-.13	.85	.11	-.05	-.07	.02	-.01	.10	-.27	.14	-.03
TSCSVROW	-.16	.06	.74	-.19	.14	.06	-.12	.02	-.07	.36	-.18	-.13
TSCSD	.86	.01	.13	-.02	-.02	.12	-.03	-.03	.12	-.04	-.06	.06
MSQAGE	.03	.94	-.03	.07	-.01	.06	-.09	.03	-.02	-.04	-.02	.01
MSQ1	.08	-.07	-.08	.14	.08	-.05	-.08	.10	.09	.82	.03	.08
MSQ2	.06	.95	-.03	.13	.01	-.00	-.04	.03	.03	.04	.03	-.05
MSQ3	.07	.96	-.05	.13	.03	-.01	.00	.03	.01	.03	.03	-.05
MSQ4A	-.08	.04	.02	.28	.74	.15	.12	-.07	-.19	.15	.08	-.06
MSQ4B	-.02	-.48	.26	.14	.53	.18	.30	-.14	-.03	.12	.04	-.02
MSQ5	.02	.92	.06	.05	-.08	.01	.12	.03	.04	-.07	.00	.01
MSQ7	-.11	.06	-.11	.07	.20	-.10	.83	-.01	-.12	-.12	.06	.11
MSQ10	-.06	.10	.03	.64	.23	.20	.26	-.08	-.06	.07	.06	.16
MSQ11A	.02	-.02	-.07	.82	.22	.06	-.03	.01	-.03	-.04	.07	-.12
MSQ11B	.01	.17	.03	.78	.02	-.06	-.01	.04	-.00	.13	-.04	.00
MSQ12A	.01	-.04	.11	-.16	.06	.08	-.41	.71	-.12	-.00	.11	.20
MSQ12B	.02	.19	-.04	.10	-.02	-.06	.17	.81	.11	.11	-.06	-.06
MSQ13A	-.03	-.15	-.26	-.28	.14	-.10	-.43	.05	.19	-.04	.46	.23
TOTIME	-.06	.15	.08	.11	-.13	.02	.08	.00	-.03	.02	.85	-.09
MSQ14A	-.03	-.08	.05	-.11	-.78	.21	-.13	-.11	-.09	.13	.34	.03
MSQ14B	-.01	.10	-.07	-.10	-.61	.50	.14	-.07	-.08	-.12	-.03	.09
MSQ16A	.07	.58	.12	-.15	.10	.05	.30	.05	-.19	-.03	.11	.11
MSQ16B	.26	.21	-.22	-.19	-.07	.51	-.11	.17	.06	-.32	.01	-.24
MSQ17	.22	-.04	.01	.08	-.02	.74	-.08	-.10	.10	.10	-.00	.06
MSQ18	.10	-.01	-.16	-.00	-.13	.07	.05	.10	-.02	.14	-.00	.82

*See Appendix D for abbreviation interpretations

Status Questionnaire question 2 (number of years married to present spouse) and the total score from the Depression Adjective Checklist (originally designated as a dependent variable). Thus, the total number of variables for husbands used in the multiple regression analysis was 36. These 36 variables and the factors to which they belong are listed in the Analysis section of Chapter 3.

Factor Analytic Data for Wives

Due to low response levels, question 8b (worker satisfaction) on the Marital Status Questionnaire was deleted before factor analysis was conducted. MSQ question 6 (present occupational title) was excluded from this study due to insufficient levels of job variability for analysis. A total of 41 variables was finally analyzed. The mean, standard deviation, and number of cases for each variable are reported in Table 3.

Factor analysis of the 41 variables selected for use in this study produced 10 factors which were used as the dependent and the independent variables for investigation. Factors 1 (self concept) and 5 (marital happiness index) served as dependent variables. Table 4 presents correlations of variables with the identified factors 1 through 10.

The following variables were deleted as a result of having low factor loadings with the 10 identified factors being used in this study: the total score on the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory; the total score on the Depression Adjective Checklist; and Marital Status Questionnaire questions 4a (number of children living at home), 10 (religious preference), and 16b (rating of concern over finances).

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Cases -
Variables for Wives

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Cases
*MAS	657.87	40.84	119
MREI	58.48	6.46	118
DACL	7.45	5.32	117
TSCSSC	46.03	8.53	117
TSCSTOT	52.58	10.02	117
TSCSR1	50.79	10.33	117
TSCSR2	54.49	10.85	117
TSCSR3	51.15	8.96	117
TSCSCA	44.64	10.20	117
TSCSCB	57.54	10.62	117
TSCSCC	53.78	10.68	117
TSCSCD	52.68	9.20	117
TSCSCE	51.26	9.32	117
TSCSVTOT	54.33	9.21	117
TSCSVCOL	43.68	9.36	117
TSCSVROW	47.26	9.63	117
TSCSD	47.88	10.61	117
MSQAGE	35.41	8.91	117
MSQ1	15.24	2.36	120
MSQ2	14.06	9.39	119
MSQ3	6.96	6.75	119
MSQ4A	2.45	1.69	119
MSQ4B	0.84	1.00	120
MSQ5	5.35	6.45	119
MSQ7	29.66	20.97	116
MSQ8A	5.70	1.22	115
MSQ9	6.06	1.30	118
MSQ10	1.76	0.43	117
MSQ11A	4.96	3.82	111
MSQ11B	1.55	0.58	111
MSQ12A	1.28	3.10	110
MSQ12B	1.10	0.38	109
MSQ13A	3.50	3.89	109
TOTIME	39.09	20.48	110
MSQ14A	11.66	12.47	110
MSQ14B	1.87	0.79	111
MSQ15A	6.05	6.05	110
MSQ15B	5.03	1.74	112
MSQ16A	3.59	1.32	114
MSQ16B	3.74	1.85	112
MSQ17	5.80	1.42	113
MSQ18	1.49	0.52	112

*See Appendix D for abbreviation interpretations

Table 4

Varimax Rotation Factor Matrix -
Wife Variables and Factors

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
MAS	.37	.10	.04	-.21	.56	.42	-.04	.05	-.03	.15
MREI	.26	-.10	-.34	.15	-.41	.24	-.01	-.17	.14	.37
DACL	-.28	-.03	.01	-.03	-.44	-.06	-.13	.02	.01	-.45
TSCSSC	-.15	-.23	.09	-.02	-.22	-.05	.04	.27	.54	.46
TSCSTOT	.96	-.00	-.20	.02	.11	.08	.00	-.03	.01	.04
TSCSR1	.87	-.09	.12	.00	.12	-.04	-.06	.08	.10	-.02
TSCSR2	.80	.08	-.41	.06	.04	.17	.01	-.01	-.06	.06
TSCSR3	.90	-.02	-.07	.01	.12	.00	.04	-.12	-.00	.03
TSCSCA	.72	-.13	-.27	.15	.15	-.07	-.10	-.00	.15	-.00
TSCSCB	.81	.09	.03	-.09	.02	.09	.08	.11	-.30	.05
TSCSCC	.84	.09	-.24	.13	.07	.12	.03	-.14	.02	.03
TSCSCD	.81	-.07	-.06	-.04	.15	.23	.04	.01	-.07	.02
TSCSCE	.78	.11	-.17	-.08	.01	-.04	-.06	.03	.17	-.04
TSCSVTOT	-.21	-.06	.91	-.04	-.07	-.02	.06	.13	-.11	.06
TSCSVCOL	-.22	-.06	.84	-.00	.00	-.13	-.02	.13	.12	-.02
TSCSVROW	-.13	.05	.68	-.07	-.08	.18	.13	.12	-.45	.15
TSCSD	.89	-.02	.25	-.04	.04	.07	-.03	.01	.04	.01
MSQAGE	-.05	.91	-.06	.10	.08	-.05	.10	.07	-.06	.10
MSQ1	.02	.21	.02	.18	-.08	-.04	-.06	-.22	-.06	.72
MSQ2	-.11	.87	.04	.08	.17	-.14	-.02	.16	-.04	.06
MSQ3	.07	.86	.04	.22	-.11	-.02	-.03	.04	.11	.01
MSQ4A	-.01	-.01	.04	-.46	.19	-.45	-.07	.33	-.16	.08
MSQ4B	.03	-.36	.00	-.74	-.08	-.16	-.14	.03	.11	.11
MSQ5	.15	.71	-.01	.29	-.22	.19	-.01	-.08	.18	-.04
MSQ7	.04	.26	-.07	.86	-.14	.10	-.14	-.02	-.02	.17
MSQ8A	.23	-.03	-.06	-.04	.75	.11	.03	-.03	.06	-.18
MSQ9	.14	-.04	-.10	-.09	.80	.07	-.07	.02	.04	.04
MSQ10	-.02	.13	.14	-.47	.11	-.04	-.11	.41	-.17	-.14
MSQ11A	-.01	.01	.15	-.33	.11	-.11	.01	.63	-.16	-.21
MSQ11B	.04	.04	.11	-.09	-.00	-.03	-.12	.78	.04	-.09
MSQ12A	.01	.04	.01	-.01	.01	.03	.90	.01	-.02	-.00
MSQ12B	-.04	.20	.07	.09	-.31	.11	.77	-.13	-.02	.03
MSQ13A	-.00	-.13	-.05	.11	.20	-.14	.82	-.04	.13	-.00
TOTIME	-.00	.26	-.04	.86	-.07	.07	.15	.08	-.03	.14
MSQ14A	.07	-.14	-.01	.34	.17	.70	.01	-.17	.06	.04
MSQ14B	.08	.03	.04	.15	.03	.80	-.06	-.06	.03	-.08
MSQ15A	.01	-.11	-.52	.13	.22	.11	.16	.18	-.19	.30
MSQ15B	.15	.11	-.19	-.01	.54	.45	.00	.22	-.09	-.02
MSQ16A	-.05	.16	-.04	.23	-.00	.12	.03	.68	.08	.08
MSQ16B	.00	.42	-.32	.06	.11	.40	.17	.22	.02	.03
MSQ17	.20	-.03	-.16	-.07	.29	.66	.03	.25	-.08	.12
MSQ18	.08	.20	-.06	-.02	.09	.08	.09	-.06	.76	-.07

Thus, the total number of variables for wives used in the multiple regression analysis was 36. These 36 variables and factors to which they belong are listed in the Analysis section of Chapter III.

Descriptive Statistical Data for Variables Used to
Assess Questions 1 and 2

Questions 1 and 2 were formulated to facilitate multiple regression analysis on data collected from husbands. Question 1 focused on marital happiness (factor 6) as the dependent variable and question 2 focused on self concept (factor 1) as the dependent variable. The results of these analyses are reported in subsequent sections of this chapter. Correlation coefficients were computed between independent variables, between independent variables and dependent variables (factors 1 and 6), and between dependent variables for husbands. These intercorrelations are presented in Table 5.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 1

Question 1 states: What is the relationship between marital happiness (factor 6) of husbands and the following role related variables: self concept (factor 1); work related variables (factor 2); self concept inconsistency (factor 3); religious related variables (factor 4); family related variables (factor 5); time on the job (factor 7); volunteer time (factor 8); marriage role expectations (factor 9); level of education (factor 10); away from home time (factor 11); and interaction with others (factor 12)?

58

Table 5

Intercorrelations of Variables Used in the
Evaluation of Husbands

					Variables						
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9	F10	F11
*F1											
F2	.02										
F3	-.14	.05									
F4	.06	-.09	.02								
F5	-.04	.08	-.00	.03							
F6	.11	.02	.02	-.06	.04						
F7	.08	-.04	-.00	.00	.07	-.03					
F8	.03	.06	.01	-.04	-.04	-.03	-.05				
F9	.09	-.08	.03	-.01	-.01	-.06	.09	.01			
F10	-.12	.05	-.01	-.13	.01	-.02	.03	-.02	.06		
F11	.09	-.15	-.15	-.06	.18	.03	.04	.14	.01	.09	
F12	.09	.02	.11	-.04	.06	.04	.00	.02	-.12	.02	.21

*See Analysis Section of Chapter III for description of factors

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the relationship between marital happiness (factor 6, the dependent variable), and the independent variables, factors 1 through 5 and 7 through 12. Table 6 presents a summary of the data collected for evaluating the dependent variable, marital happiness, for husbands. The following independent variables were not reported due to insufficient F - lev 1s: work related variables (factor 2), level of education (factor 10) and interaction with others (factor 12).

In looking at the results of the stepwise multiple regression analysis reported in Table 6, the variable self concept was presented first. This variable accounted for the greatest amount of the variance (R Square = .01), with an overall F - level of 1.04, which is not significant at the .05 level. In fact, none of the independent

Table 6

Selected Statistics for Stepwise Multiple Regression
Dependent Variable, Marital Happiness (factor 6) for Husbands

Variable Name	**Multiple R	**R Square	Overall F	Partial F	DF
*F1 Self Concept	.11	.01	1.04	1.04	1/82
F9 Marriage Role Expectations	.13	.02	.72	.42	2/81
F4 Religious Involvement	.15	.02	.62	.42	3/80
F5 Family Variables	.16	.02	.50	.18	4/79
F3 Self Concept Inconsistency	.16	.03	.42	.13	5/78
F8 Volunteer Time	.17	.03	.37	.10	6/77
F7 Time on Job	.17	.03	.33	.10	7/76
F11 Away from Home Time	.17	.03	.29	.03	8/75

*F = Factor
**Represents the correlation coefficient and variance accounted for by
   the variable and all variables previously placed in the model.

variables were significantly related to marital happiness and when

eight factors had been stepped into the analysis, R - Square was .03

and the overall F - level was .28.   In terms of question 1, then, it

must be concluded that no significant relationship exists between the

husband's marital happiness (factor 6) and the independent variables

designated in this question.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 2

As stated earlier, question 2 focused on the evaluation of the husband's self concept as the dependent variable. Results of the multiple regression analysis used to evaluate question 2 will be reported in this section. Correlation coefficients of variables used in the analysis of question 2 were reported in Table 5.

Question number 2 states: What is the relationship between self concept (factor 1) of husbands and the following role related variables: work related variables (factor 2); religious related variables (factor 4); family related variables (factor 5); marital happiness index (factor 6); time on job (factor 7); volunteer time (factor 8); marriage role expectations (factor 9); level of education (factor 10); away from home time (factor 11); and interaction with others (factor 12)? Table 7 presents the results of the multiple regression analysis completed for evaluation of question 2.

Table 7 reports that level of education (factor 10) accounted for the greatest amount of the variance (.01) in evaluating self-concept. However, the overall F - level of 1.14 is well below the level necessary to indicate significance at the .05 level. In fact, even when the variance accounted for by all 10 independent variables is computed (R Square = .07), no significance between the independent variables and the dependent variable was noted (overall F = .56). Thus, it must be concluded that no significant relationship exists between husband's self concept and the independent variables selected for use in this study.

Table 7

Selected Statistical Results for the Stepwise Multiple
Regression Evaluating the Relationship Between Selected
Independent Variables and Self Concept of Husbands
(Factor 1, a Dependent Variable)

Variable Name	*Multiple R	**R Square	Overall F	Partial F	DF
*F10 Level of Education	.12	.01	1.14	1.14	1/82
F6 Marital Happiness Index	.16	.03	1.07	1.01	2/81
F9 Marital Role Expectation	.19	.04	1.02	.90	3/80
F12 Interaction With Others	.22	.05	.98	.87	4/79
F7 Time on Job	.23	.05	.87	.48	5/78
F11 Away from Home Time	.24	.06	.79	.40	6/77
F5 Family Related Variables	.25	.06	.73	.40	7/76
F4 Religious Involvement	.26	.07	.67	.30	8/75
F2 Work Related Variables	.27	.07	.62	.33	10/73
F8 Volunteer Time	.27	.07	.56	.01	

*F = Factor
**Represents the correlation coefficient and variance accounted for by
  the variable and all variables previously placed in the model.

Descriptive Statistical Data for Variables Used

to Assess Questions 3 and 4

Questions 3 and 4 evaluated data collected on wives. Question 3

evaluated the relationship of a number of selected independent
variables on marital happiness (factor 5 - a dependent variable).
Question 4 focused on a similar type evaluation with self concept
(factor 1) being the dependent variable.

Correlation coefficients were computed between dependent variables
(factors 1 and 5), independent variables and dependent variables, and
between independent variables. These coefficients are reported in
Table 8.

Table 8

Intercorrelation of Variables Used in the
Evaluation of Wives

				Variables				
	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8	F9
F1								
F2	-.15							
F3	.02	-.01						
F4	-.01	-.00	-.02					
F5	.01	.01	.01	.02				
F6	.03	-.01	.02	.05	-.03			
F7	.03	.06	.02	.00	-.03	-.02		
F8	.04	.03	-.04	.01	-.04	-.02	.01	
F9	.03	.01	.00	-.02	.02	-.04	-.05	.06
F10	.05	.08	-.01	.01	.00	.03	-.03	.03	-.01

Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 3

Question 3 states: What is the relationship between marital
happiness (factor 5) of wives and the following role related variables:
self concept (factor 1); work related variables (factor 2); self
concept inconsistency (factor 3); away from home time (factor 4);

interaction with spouse (factor 6); volunteer time (factor 7);

religious involvement (factor 8); interaction with others (factor 9);

and level of education (factor 10)?

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the

relationship between marital happiness (the dependent variable) and

independent variables, factors 1 through 4 and 6 through 10. Table 9

presents a summary of the data collected to evaluate marital happiness

for wives.

Table 9

Selected Statistics for Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis
Dependent Variable, Marital Happiness (Factor 5) for Wives

Variable Name		**Multiple R	**R Square	Overall F	Partial F	DF
*F8	Religious Involvement	.03	.001	.11	.11	1/86
F6	Interaction with Spouse	.05	.002	.10	.10	2/85
F7	Volunteer Time	.06	.003	.09	.08	3/84
F4	Away from Home Time	.06	.004	.08	.05	4/83
F9	Interaction with Others	.06	.004	.07	.02	5/82
F3	Self Concept Inconsistency	.06	.004	.06	.01	6/81
F2	Work Related Variables	.07	.004	.05	.01	7/80
F1	Self Concept	.07	.004	.05	.01	8/79

*F = Factor
**Represents the correlation coefficient and variance accounted for by
  the variable and all variables previously placed in the model.

Level of education (factor 10) was not reported in the results of multiple regression analysis for question 3 due to an insufficient F - level.

Data from Table 9 indicate that religious involvement (factor 8) accounted for the highest proportion of the variance (.001) in evaluating the dependent variable, marital happiness (factor 5). The F - level for religious involvement (F = .11) was well below the level necessary for significance at the .05 level. In fact, when all the independent variables were stepped together in the multiple regression analysis they together accounted for only .004 of the variance which again is not significant (.05 level) when the overall F - level (F = .05) is considered. It must be concluded, therefore, that no significant relationship exists between wive's marital happiness and the independent variables selected for use in this study.

Multiple Regression Analysis of Question 4

Question 4 assessed the relationship between wive's self concept and the role related independent variables selected for use in this study. Correlation coefficients for each variable used in evaluating question 4 are reported in Table 8. Question 4 states: What is the relationship between self concept (factor 1) and the following role related variables: work related variables (factor 2); away from home time (factor 4); marital happiness index (factor 5); interaction with spouse (factor 6); volunteer time (factor 7); religious activity (factor 8); interaction with others (factor 9); and level of education (factor 10)?

A stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to evaluate the relationship between the dependent variable (self concept - factor 1) and independent variables factor 2, and factors 4 through 10.

Data reported in Table 10 indicate that work related variables (factor 2) account for the greatest amount of variance (.02) in evaluating the dependent variable, self concept for wives. The reported F - level for work related variables (F = 1.87) is well below the level necessary for significance at the .05 level. Even when all of the independent variables have been stepped into the multiple

Table 10

Selected Statistics for Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis
Dependent Variable, Self Concept (Factor 1) for Wives

Variable Name	**Multiple R	**R Square	Overall F	Partial F	DF
*F2 Work Related Variables	.15	.02	1.87	1.87	1/86
F10 Level of Education	.16	.02	1.06	.27	2/85
F8 Religious Activity	.16	.03	.76	.18	3/84
F7 Volunteer Time	.17	.03	.60	.14	4/83
F6 Interaction with Spouse	.17	.03	.49	.08	5/82
F9 Interaction with Others	.17	.03	.41	.06	6/81
F4 Away from Home Time	.17	.03	.36	.04	7/80
F5 Marital Happiness Index	.17	.03	.30	.01	8/79

*F = Factor
**Represents the correlation coefficient and variance accounted for by the variable and all variables previously placed in the model.

regression model, the variance accounted for is .03 which, with an overall F - level of .30, is again not significant.

It must be concluded, therefore, that no significant relationship exists between wive's self concept and the independent variables selected for use in evaluating question 4.

Chapter IV has presented the results of statistical analysis of data collected in this study. First a factor analysis was conducted in order to identify correlated clusters of variables to be used in further evaluation with multiple regression analysis. Twelve factors were identified for husbands and 10 factors were identified for wives. Four questions were formulated to assist in the statistical analysis of the dependent variables marital happiness (factor 6 for husbands and factor 5 for wives) and self concept (factor 1 for both spouses).

Next, multiple regression analyses were run in order to evaluate each of the four stated questions. The results of these analyses were reported in tabular form with written explanation found throughout the chapter.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A review of the literature indicates that husband and wife roles are presently being scrutinized in terms of determining their impact on the happiness and well-being of the spouses. In particular, the effect of marital roles on marriage relationships is of utmost concern. A review of the research literature in this area provided only limited information about the relationship of different marriage role variables and marital happiness. The lack of sufficient research and the deficiencies identified in the existing research, prompted the formulation of this study.

The objectives of this study focused on determining the relationships between the dependent variables (marital happiness, depression, and self concept) and a number of marriage role related independent variables. Specifically, the question to which this research addressed itself was, "What impact do a number of selected variables related to marital roles have on marital happiness, depression, and self concept?" The intent of investigating this question was not necessarily to infer causation but to identify sources of variance occuring between dependent and independent variables.

The sample for this study consisted of 124 couples, of which one or both spouses were professional educators. Each spouse completed the Depression Adjective Checklist, the Tennessee Self Concept Scale, the

Marital Status Questionnaire, the Marriage Adjustment Schedule, and the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory. The data generated from these instruments provided the initial 40 independent variables and three dependent variables used in this study.

A factor analysis was used to group correlated variables into factors (12 for husbands and 10 for wives). Depression Adjective Checklist scores did not have significant factor loadings with any of the identified factors, therefore, depression scores were eliminated as a dependent variable. Factors 1 (self concept) and 6 (marital happiness), for husbands, and 5 (marital happiness) and 1 (self concept), for wives, served as dependent variables with the remaining variables serving as independent variables.

Four questions were formulated which provided a framework from which the objectives stated in Chapter I could be investigated. Multiple regression analyses were used to evaluate the collected data in such a way that these four questions could be answered.

Major Findings

Each of the four questions generated in Chapter III was analyzed using multiple regression analysis. Questions 1 and 2 assessed data collected for husbands and questions 3 and 4 investigated data for wives. Question 1 addressed the relationship between marital happiness and the designated independent variables. Question 2 addressed the relationship between self concept and the selected independent variables. Questions 3 and 4 respectively focused on the same two dependent variables for wives.

Multiple regression analyses indicated that none of the independent variables, when considered alone or when stepped together in the multiple regression model, demonstrated a significant relationship with marital happiness or self concept for either wives or husbands.

Discussion

In this section, the results of the multiple regression analyses for each of the four questions evaluated in Chapter IV will be discussed. Question 1 and 3, which deal with marital happiness of husbands and wives, will be discussed together as will questions 2 and 4 which deal with husband and wife self concepts.

Multiple regression analysis of questions 1 and 3 indicated no significant relationship between marital happiness and the following independent variables: self concept, marriage role expectation, religious involvement, family variables, self concept inconsistency, volunteer time, time on the job, away from home time, interaction with spouse, interaction with others, work related variables, and level of education. Each of these variables will be discussed briefly.

Self concept has been described by earlier investigators (Barnett & Nietzel, 1979; Hall, 1976; Cohen, 1978; Glick, 1976) as having a significant correlation with marital happiness. However, results of this study do not support a significant relationship existing between self concept and marital happiness. Appendix A indicates that 85 percent of the self concept scores were predominantly restricted to the 40 to 69 percentile range with 69 percent of the scores falling between

the fortieth and fifty-ninth percentiles. The possible effect of this limited range of scores will be discussed later. Self concept consistency (which is described as the degree of variability a person demonstrates in responding to various constructs of self concept on the Tennessee Self Concept Scale) was also unrelated to marital happiness in this study.

In Chapter II, research evidence was discussed which presented differing view points regarding the effect of women working or not working on marital happiness of husbands and wives. The results of this research (which evaluated factors dealing with "job related variables" and "time on the job") support findings of several studies (Thomopoulos, 1974; Booth, 1977; Ferree, 1976b; Siperstein, 1978) which concluded that the work related role of wives (i.e., working full or part time vs. full time homemaking) does not significantly relate to the marital happiness of either the wife or the husband. Looking at the dispersion of scores for the Marital Adjustment Inventory in Appendix A, it appears that marriage relationships of the population sample tended to fall in the "adjusted" range (with only 24 percent of wives and husbands falling in the unadjusted range) and therefore indicated that elevated marital happiness scores were reported by a majority of the couples regardless of the work related role of the wife.

Research quoted in Chapter II suggests that variables such as level of education, interaction time with spouse, away from home time, and interaction with others have been positively correlated with marital happiness in earlier studies; results of this study, however,

do not provide support for any of these relationships. Number of children in the home has been identified as both increasing and decreasing marital happiness depending on the study referred to. This study suggests no relationship between marital happiness and number of children in the home.

Several independent variables were included in this study due to their suspected impact on marital happiness and due to the lack of sufficient research investigation. These variables included: amount of religious involvement, volunteer time, part time employment, and marriage role expectations. Results of this study again indicate no significant relationship between these variables and marital happiness (see Appendix A for score distributions). In Appendix A, it is noted that the scores of the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory generally fall between 50 and 69 (88 percent of the scores for wives and 89 percent for husbands) indicating that the majority of the population sample had equalitarian marriage role expectations.

Questions 2 and 4 dealt with husband's and wive's self concepts. Question 2 asked, "What is the relationship between husband's self concept and the designated independent variables?" Multiple regression analysis of the data collected to answer this question indicated that level of education explained the greatest amount of the variance (.01, F - level = 1.14) on husband's self concept. This relationship (although not statistically significant at the .05 level) has also been identified by earlier researchers (i.e., Barry, 1970) who found that increased levels of education do correlate with increased self esteem.

Even though the results of this study indicate a small degree of relationship between self concept and level of education, a statistically significant relationship was not found. Even when all other independent variables were sequentially stepped in to the multiple regression model, the variance accounted for did not approach significance (R Square = .07 and Overall F - level = .56). No significant proportion of the variance on self concept of husbands was accounted for by the independent variables in this study.

Question 4 asked: "What is the relationship between wive's self concept and the designated dependent variables?" Work related variables explained the greatest amount of the variance (R Square = .02) on the self concept of wives. This relationship is consistent with earlier research (Rapoport & Rapoport, 1971; Ferree, 1976b; Barry, 1970; Mostow & Newberry, 1975) which indicates a significant correlation between women's involvement in the work force and increased self confidence. However, results of this study indicated that work related variables did not account for sufficient variance to indicate a statistically significant relationship (F - level = 1.87) with self concept.

The evaluation of questions 2 and 4 indicated that for the sample used in this study, self concept was not related to the following independent variables: interaction with spouse, interaction with others, away from home time, marital happiness, volunteer time, religious activity, level of education, work related variables, marriage role expectations, time on job, and family related variables. These variables have been clarified earlier in discussing results for

questions 1 and 3. The score distributions for these variables can be found in Appendix A.

In conclusion, marital happiness and self concept for spouses of the population sampled do not appear to be related to the independent variables in this study. It is interesting to note that even though the sample selected was diversified in many respects (i.e., income levels; urban-rural distribution; number of children in the home; age; hours worked per week; years worked since time of marriage; years of marriage to present spouse; hours spent by husband fulfilling domestic responsibilities; and women working versus not working), participants showed much similarity in the way they responded to several of the most significant measures used in this study.

On the Marital Adjustment Schedule, for example, only 24 percent of the wive's and husband's scores fell in the "unadjusted" range. Tennessee Self Concept Scale scores fell generally in the middle range with 69 percent of the wives and 68 percent of the husbands scoring between the 40th and 59th percentiles. Ninety-nine percent of the wives and 98 percent of the husbands were classified as moderately equalitarian or equalitarian on the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory.

The restricted range of scores on these inventories, even though instrumental in demonstrating no difference in the effects of marital roles on marital happiness for the sample investigated, may have contributed to a failure to achieve significant relationships between the dependent variables and these inventory scores. In effect, the range of scores is truncated in such a way as to produce low

correlations due to inability to make comparisons of variable scores
over the entire range of score possibilities.

Implications

In this section, the implications of research findings from this
study will be discussed. A relatively large amount of the literature
reviewed on marital roles had to do with differing ideas and research
findings regarding the effect of the wife's work related role
(full-time employment versus full-time homemaking) on her marital
happiness and self fulfillment.

The results of this study indicate that full-time housewives do
not report higher scores on measures of self concept or marital
happiness than do women who function as full or part-time employees,
community volunteers or participants in church activities (factors 2,
7, 8, and 11 for husbands, and factors 2, 4, 7, and 8 for wives). The
results likewise indicate that marital happiness and self concept are
not necessarily enhanced for housewives by participating in either work
or volunteer related activities outside of the home. Husband's marital
happiness and self concept were also not effected by volunteer or
church related variables or work related variables such as number of
years employed, number of hours spent on the job, hours in community
service, and time in religious activities. The findings for husband's
work roles were consistent with research done by Glenn and Weaver
(1978) in that they too identified no correlation between husband's
work related activity and marital happiness.

Family related variables, (i.e., factor 5 for husbands, factor 6 for wives, number of preschool children and older children in the home, and interaction time with spouse) were not found to significantly relate to marital happiness or self concept. Number of children in the home has been identified as decreasing marital happiness in some populations (Gove & Geerkin, 1977; Burke & Weir, 1977; Glenn & Weaver, 1978) and increasing it with other populations as was reported in a review of the research literature and research completed by Chadwick, Albrecht and Kunz (1976). This study indicates the number of children in the home is not a significant factor influencing marital happiness or self concept.

The participant's scores on the Marriage Role Expectation Inventory (factor 9 for males), although not significantly related to marital happiness or self concept, do indicate that participants report equalitarian marital roles as being most acceptable. This seems to indicate that even in a population considered to be relatively conservative as far as social and family change are concerned (the majority of the population sample belonging to the Mormon Church), equalitarian marriage roles are predominating.

As has been indicated earlier, the population for this study has an above average level of education (factor 10 for husbands and factor 10 for wives; mean = husbands, 15.96 and wives, 15.24). Barry, 1970; Bernard, 1966; and Glen and Weaver, 1978 all report significant correlations with increased education and marital happiness. Even though no significant relationship was noted in statistical analysis between education and marital happiness, it is of interest to note that

participants in this study did not only report above average levels of education but they also had marital happiness scores which also tended to fall in the "adjusted" ranges of the Marital Adjustment Schedule.

Several researchers (Greenleaf, 1978; Renne, 1970) have identified the importance of marriage partners having friends other than the spouse in terms of enhancing marital happiness and self esteem. Again, this study does not provide support for this previous research (factors 12 for husbands and 9 for wives).

In conclusion, reviewing the research literature indicated that many of the early research findings were inconclusive. Many studies failed to use adequate instrumentation and to explore the impact of alternative "out-of-home" responsibilities (other than full-time employment) on marital happiness of both husbands and wives. This study attempted to look at husbands and wives of a middle socioeconomic population using standardized measures and looking at several different forms of out-of-home responsibilities and other factors thought to influence marital happiness. Results of this study failed to identify factors which were significantly related to either marital happiness or self concept of husbands or wives.

In Chapter II, a good deal of research was quoted which suggested that the role of housewife prohibited women from personal fulfillment and happiness. Other research was presented which indicated that many housewives who have chosen to enter the work force are experiencing frustration and decreased happiness due to role overload. Research identifying the significance of other marriage roles (i.e., freedom to choose present role, husband's contribution to domestic

responsibilities) to the happiness of husbands and wives was also identified. Data collected through this study did not suggest a relationship between marital role related variables and the self concept or marital happiness of the spouses.

These results do not support those advocates who suggest fulfillment for women must be found in roles external to the home nor do they provide evidence that women remaining in the home are more fulfilled. Generally, spouses from homes where women were employed and spouses from homes where the women were full time homemakers did not differ significantly on levels of self concept or marital happiness. Other marital role related variables also did not appear to influence the marital happiness of the population investigated.

Limitations

Generalizing the results of this research must be done with caution due to the restricted nature of the sample and the population from which the sample was taken (a middle class, predominantly Mormon population). Although the sample showed sufficient variability in a number of important characteristics (i.e., age, years married, working and non-working wives, years worked, hours worked per week, income, and rural-urban distribution), in other areas participants were similar (i.e., level of education, socioeconomic level, and employment background).

Another problem encountered with the sample was difficulty in preventing sampling bias due to the volunteer nature of participant selection. It is possible, for example, that when volunteers were

requested, generally those spouses who were experiencing higher levels of marital happiness were more prone to participate in this study. Since this study required that both spouses participate, again, possibly those couples with higher marital accord were more willing to cooperate in completing the measuring instruments.

Even though this study attempted to use more standardized measuring instruments than have been used in previous studies, and even though complete anonymity was used, a problem still existed with the "halo effect" in terms of participants responding to "look good". The measures used were obvious in terms of the information they were requesting and, therefore, were susceptible to "faking good".

Recommendations

In order to make the findings of this study more generalizable, it is important that similar research be conducted with different populations. Larger samples from more diverse populations are recommended. It would provide better opportunity for determining variable relationships if a sufficient number of responses, spread over the entire range of response possibilities, could be acquired.

It is also recommended that a research design be constructed so as to reduce the volunteer nature of participant selection. This might be accomplished through individual contacts from a researcher to invite couple participation. Perhaps greater participation could also be stimulated by working through employers to request employee participation.

The problem of faking good on testing instruments might be reduced if some instruments could be designed or identified which are less obvious in gathering desired information. Perhaps individual interviews could be designed as a means of gathering data for research although interviewer's bias and inconsistency may become complicating factors.

The research conducted by this study was generally based on determining the effect of the wife's role on her marital happiness and the husband's role on his marital happiness. More extensive research is also needed to determine the effects on marital happiness of the wife's role on the husband's marital happiness and the husband's role on the wife's marital happiness.

This chapter has reviewed the purpose and objectives, the method of investigation, and the results of the data analyses of this study. The major findings have been presented and implications of those findings have been described. Limitations and recommendations for future research have also been posited. In general, this research has not provided support that marital roles have a significant effect on marital happiness or self concept of the population investigated. Further research on more diverse populations is recommended.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. M. Outstanding, successful women, an in-depth study regarding
the attitudes of successful executive women in achieving their
status. Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1975).
Dissertation Abstracts International, 1975, 36, 4867A (University
microfilms no. 76-3877).

Arnott, C. C. Married women and the pursuit of profit an exchange
theory perspective. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1972, 34,
122-130.

Arvey, R. D., & Gross, R. H. Satisfaction levels and correlates of
satisfaction in the homemaker job. Journal of Vocational Behavior,
1977, 10, 13-24.

Axelson, L. J. The marital adjustment and marital role definitions of
husbands of working and nonworking wives. Marriage and Family
Living, 1963, 25, 189-195.

Bailyn, L. Career and family orientations of husbands and wives in
relation to marital happiness. Human Relations, 1970, 23, 459-486.

Barnett, L. R., & Nietzel, M. T. Relationship of instrumental and
affectional behaviors and self-esteem to marital satisfaction in
distressed and non-distressed couples. Journal of Counsulting and
Clinical Psychology, 1979, 47, 946-957.

Barry, W. A. Marriage research and conflict an integrative review.
Psychological Bulletin, 1970, 73, 41-54.

Bernard, J. Marital stability and patterns of status variables.
Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1966, 28, 421-439.

Blood, R. O. Jr. Causes and consequences of the employment of married
women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 43-47.

Blood, R. O. Jr., & Wolfe, D. M. Husbands and wives: The dynamics of
married living. Glencove, Illinois: The Free Press, 1960.

Boeckel, R. M. (Ed.). Two income families. In Editorial Research
Reports. Washington, D. C.: Congressional Quarterly Inc., 1979.

Booth, A. Wife's employment and husband's stress: A replication and
refutation. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 645-650.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. B. Educational research. New York: David
McKay Co., 1971.

Bowerman, C. E. Prediction studies. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.),
Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally and
Co., 1964.

Breedlove, C. J., & Circirelli, V. G. Women's fear of success in
relation to personal characteristics and type of occupation. The
Journal of Psychology, 1974, 86, 181-190.

Brinkman, J. E. The relationship between marital integration and the
working wife-mother. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon,
1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 37, 1826A-1827A
(University microfilms no. 76-19, 376).

Brinkerhoff, D. B., & White, L. K. Marital satisfaction in an
economically marginal population. Journal of Marriage and the
Family, 1978, 40, 259-267.

Burgess, E. W., & Locke, H. J. The family (2nd ed.). New York:
American Book Co., 1953.

Burke, R. J., & Weir, T.   Relationship of wives employment status to husband, wife and pair satisfaction and performance.   Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 279-287.   (a)

Burke, R. J., & Weir, T.   Husband-wife helping relationships: The "mental-hygiene" function in marriage.   Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 911-925.   (b)

Burke, R. J., Weir, T., & Duwors, R. E.   Type A behavior of administrators and wives' reports of marital satisfaction and well being.   Journal of Applied Psychology, 1979, 64, 57-65.

Buros, O. K.   (Ed.).   The seventh mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: Gryphon Press, 1972.

Campbell, D. P., & Harmon, L. W.   Vocational interests of nonprofit women: Self portraits.   Washington D. C.:   U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1968.

Chadwick, B. A., Albrecht, S. L., & Kunz, P. R.   Marital and family role satisfaction.   Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 431-440.

Clayton, R. R.   The family, marriage and social change.   Lexington, Massachusetts: D. C. Heath and Company, 1975.

Cohen, J.   Multiple regression as a general data-analytic system. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 426-443.

Cohen, P. M., & Burdsal, C. A.   Factor analytic examination of role attitudes of married women.   Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 423-434.

Coiner, M. C.   Employment and mothers' emotional status: A psychological study of women reentering the work force.   (Doctoral

dissertation, Yale University, 1978). Dissertation Abstracts
International, 1979, 40, 443B-444B (University microfilm no. 7915806).

Dowdall, J. A.   Structural and attitudinal factors associated with
female labor force participation. Social Science Quarterly, 1975,
55, 121-130.

Dunn, M. S.   Marriage Role Expectation Inventory.   Saluda, North
Carolina: Family Life Publications, Inc., 1963.

Farmer, H. S.   Helping women to resolve the home-career conflict.
Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1971, 49, 795-801.

Ferree, M. M.   The confused American housewife. Psychology Today, 1976,
10, 76-80.   (a)

Ferree, M. M.   Working-class jobs: housework and paid work as sources
of satisfaction. Social Problems, 1976, 23, 431-441.   (b)

Fitts, W. H. Tennessee self-concept scale manual. Nashville:
Counselor Recordings and Tests, 1965.

Gass, G. Z.   Equitable marriage. The Family Coordinator, 1974, 23,
369-372.

Glenn, N. D., & Weaver, C. N.   A multivariate, multisurvey study of
marital happiness. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40,
269-282.

Glick, B. R.   Self-esteem, the perception of support during marital
conflict, and marital satisfaction. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio
State University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976,
37, 2504B-2505B (University microfilm no. 76-24, 602).

Gove, W. R., & Geerken, M. R.   The effect of children and employment on
the mental health of married men and women. Social Forces, 1977, 56,
66-76.

Gover, D. A. Social-economic differential in the relationship between marital adjustment and wife's employment status. Marriage and Family Living, 1963, 25, 452-458.

Greenleaf, L. K. Factors effecting marital interaction. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1977). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 38, 7595A (University microfilms no. 7808613).

Greer, G. The female enunch. New York: McGraw Hill, 1970.

Gross, R. H., & Arvey, R. D. Marital satisfaction, job selection, and task distribution in the homemaker job. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1977, 11, 1-13.

Gump, J. P. Sex-role attitudes and psychological well-being. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 79-91.

Hall, W. M. The relationship between self-concept and marital adjustment for commuter college students. (Doctoral dissertation, Auburn University, 1975). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 7208A (University microfilms no. 76-10, 899).

Hall, D. T., & Gordon, F. E. Career choices of married women: Effects on conflict, role, behavior, and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 42-48.

Hicks, M. W., & Platt, M. Marital happiness and stability: A review of the research in the sixties. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 553-573.

Hopkins, W. P. An analysis of marital adjustment in dual-career and traditional families. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1977, 37 4144B-4145B (University microfilms no. 77-3646).

Horner, M. S. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 157-175.

Howe, R. R. Relationships between female role concepts and anxiety among employed and non-employed mothers of pre-school-aged children. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33, 7037A-7038A (University microfilm no. 73-12, 534).

Hunt, H. A. The effect of item weighting on the Locke-Wallace marital scale. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 249-256.

Hunt, J. G., & Hunt, L. L. Dilemmas and contradictions of status: The case of the dual-career family. Social Problems, 1977, 24, 407-416.

Jones, B. The dynamics of marriage and motherhood. In R. Morgan (Ed.), Sisterhood is powerful. New York: Vintage Press, 1970.

Katz, J. K., & Knapp, N. H. Housewife, mother, other: Needs and helpers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1974, 53, 105-109.

Kievet, M. B. Will Jill make department chairman? American Vocational Journal, 1974, 17, 40-43.

Kolb, T. M., & Straus, M. A. Marital power and marital happiness in relation to problem solving ability. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1974, 36, 756-766.

Lerner, H., & Voth, H. Women's liberation. Menninger Perspective, 1973, 4, 10-15, 20-21.

Limpus, L. The liberation of women: Sexual repression and the family. In H. Gadlin and B. E. Gaskof (Eds.), The uptight society. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole Publishers, 1970.

Locke, H. J. Predicting adjustment in marriage. New York: Henry Holt Publisher, 1951.

Locke, H. J., & Wallace K. M.   Short marital-adjustment and prediction

    tests: Their reliability and validity.   Journal of Marriage and

    the Family, 1959, 21, 251-255.

Lott, B. E.   Who wants the children?   Some relationships among

    attitudes toward children, parents, and the liberation of women.

    American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 573-582.

Malbin, N. G.   Housework.   Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and

    Society, 1976, 1, 905-922.

Millett, K.   Sexual politics.   New York: Doubleday Publishers, 1969.

Mostow, E., & Newberry, P.   Work role and depression in women: A

    comparison of workers and housewives in treatment.   American

    Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1975, 45, 538-554.

Nevill, D., & Damico, S.   Role conflict in women as a function of

    marital status.   Human Relations, 1975, 28, 487-498.

Nie, N. H., Hull, C. H., Jenkins, J. G., Steinbreener, K., & Bent,

    D. H.   Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.).   New

    York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nye, I.   Maternal employment and marital interaction: Some contingent

    conditions.   Social Forces, 1961, 11, 113-119.

Nye, I., & Rushing, S.   Toward family measurement research.   In J. K.

    Hudden and M. L. Borgatta (Eds.), Marriage and the family.

    Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers, Inc.,   1969.

Orden, S. R., & Bradburn, N. M.   Working wives and marriage happiness.

    American Journal of Sociology, 1969, 74, 392-407.

Pleck, J. H.   The work-family role system.   Social Problems, 1977, 24,

    417-427.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N.   The dual career family.   Human
     Relations, 1969, 22, 3-30.

Rapoport, R., & Rapoport, R. N.   Further considerations on the dual
     career family.   Human Relations, 1971, 24, 519-533.

Renne, K. S.   Correlates of dissatisfaction in marriage.   Journal of
     Marriage and the Family, 1970, 32, 54-67.

Ridley, C. A.   Exploring the impact of work satisfaction and involve-
     ment on marital interaction when both partners are employed.
     Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1973, 35, 229-236.

Roleder, G.   Marriage means encounter.   Dubugue, Iowa: William C.
     Brown Company, 1973.

Rollin, B.   Motherhood, who needs it?   Look, 1970, 22, 15-17.

Rossi, A. S.   Family development in a changing world.   American Journal
     of Psychiatry, 1972, 128, 1057-1066.

Scott, A. F.   The American woman who was she?   Englewood Cliffs, New
     Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.

Segre, J. M.   Self-concept and depression: Mothers returning to work
     or remaining at home.   (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University,
     1978).   Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 3762A-3763A
     (University microfilms no. 7819780).

Siegel, A. E., & Haas, M. B.   The working mother: A review of
     research.   Child Development, 1963, 34, 513-542.

Siperstein, J. W. R.   An assessment of communications and role
     perceptions of career and non-career wives with their husbands.
     (Doctoral dissertation, Rutger's University, 1978).   Dissertation
     Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 3167A-3168A (University
     microfilms no. 7820346).

Sonenstein, F. L. The impact of a wife's employment on working class families. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1978, 39, 7676A (University microfilms no. 76-11, 825).

Sperling, M. A. Some aspects of the modernization of marriage. (Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Stonybrook, 1976). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1976, 36, 3589B (University microfilms no. 77-234).

Thomopoulos, E. H. C. Parents of preschool children: The work status of the mother as it relates to marriage adjustment, anxiety, and equalitarianism. (Doctoral dissertation, Illinois Institute of Technology, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2486B (University microfilms no. 74-23, 999).

Weaver, C. N., & Holmes, S. L. A comparative study of the work satisfaction of females with full-time employment and full-time housekeeping. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1975, 60, 117-118.

Weil, M. W. An analysis of the factors influencing married women's actual or planned work participation. American Sociological Review, 1961, 26, 91-100.

Weiss, R., & Samuelson, N. Social roles of American women: Their contribution to a sense of usefulness and importance. Marriage and Family Living, 1958, 4, 358-366.

Working women: Joys and sorrows. U.S. News and World Report, 1979, 86, 64-68.

Wright, J. D. Are working women really more satisfied? Evidence from several national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 301-313.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Selected Dependent and Independent

Variable Score Distributions

Selected Dependent and Independent Variable

Score Distributions

Age Distributions (Wives)

Total N = 126
Mean = 35.4 years

Class Interval	N	% of Total
20-29	38	30
30-39	52	41
40-49	26	21
50-59	9	1
60-69	1	1

Age Distributions (Husbands)

Total N = 118
Mean = 38.4 years

Class Interval	N	% of Total
20-29	20	17
30-39	52	44
40-49	30	26
50-59	12	10
60-69	4	3

Level of Education (Wives)

Total N = 124
Mean = 15.2 years

Years	N	% of Total
11	1	1
12	12	10
13	8	6
14	10	8
15	7	6
16	52	41
17	25	20
18	7	6
19	1	1
20	1	1

Level of Education (Husbands)

Total N = 122
Mean = 15.96 years

Years	N	% of Total
11	2	2
12	9	7
13	4	3
14	7	6
15	6	5
16	45	35
17	22	19
18	11	9
19	8	7
20+	8	7

Level of Husband's Yearly Income

Total N = 122
Mean = 3.68

Class Interval	N	% of Total
1. Less than $8,000	4	3
2. $8,000 - $11,999	15	12
3. $12,000 - $15,999	41	34
4. $16,000 - $19,999	25	21
5. $20,000 - $23,999	22	18
6. $24,000 or more	15	12

Hours Worked Per Week (Wives)

Total N = 120

Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	31	26
1-9	2	2
10-19	11	9
20-29	5	4
30-39	5	4
40-49	41	34
50-59	21	18
60-60	4	3
70+	-0-	-0-

Hours Worked Per Week (Husbands)

Total N = 110

Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	2	2
1-9	-0-	-0-
10-19	-0-	-0-
20-29	2	2
30-39	5	5
40-49	40	35
50-59	44	40
60-60	15	14
70+	2	2

Years Married to Present Spouse

Total N = 121
Mean = 13.97 years

Class Interval	N	% of Total
1-5	18	15
6-10	34	28
11-15	24	20
16-20	18	15
21-25	10	8
26-30	8	7
31-35	5	4
36-49	4	3

Tennessee Self Concept Total Scores
(Wives)   (Husbands)

Total N = 120

Percentile Interval	N	% of Total
20-29	1	1
30-39	10	8
40-49	37	31
50-59	46	38
60-69	20	16
70-79	6	5
80-89	0	0

Total N = 116

Percentile Interval	N	% of Total
20-29	1	1
30-39	10	8
40-49	37	31
50-59	46	38
60-69	20	16
70-79	6	5
80-89	0	0

Marriage Adjustment Schedule Scores

(Wives) Total N = 121			(Husbands) Total N = 114		
Category	N	% of Total	Category	N	% of Total
Extremely Unadjusted	9	7	Extremely Unadjusted	6	5
Decidedly Unadjusted	4	3	Decidedly Unadjusted	2	2
Unadjusted	6	5	Unadjusted	7	6
Somewhat Unadjusted	11	9	Somewhat Unadjusted	12	11
Indifferently Adjusted	23	19	Indifferently Adjusted	21	18
Somewhat Adjusted	28	23	Somewhat Adjusted	26	23
Fairly Adjusted	27	22	Fairly Adjusted	21	18
Decidedly Well adjusted	11	9	Decidedly Well adjusted	18	15
Extremely Well adjusted	2	2	Extremely Well adjusted	1	1

Marriage Role Expectation Scores

(Wives) Total N = 118			(Husbands) Total N = 115		
Class Interval	N	% of Total	Class Interval	N	% of Total
*30-39	1	1	30-39	2	2
40-49	11	9	40-49	8	7
50-59	53	45	50-59	52	45
60-69	51	43	60-69	51	44
70-79	2	2	70-79	2	2

*Scoring Code = 0-18 Traditional, 19-35 Moderately Traditional, 36-53 Moderately Equalitarian and 54-71 Equalitarian.

Years of Employment Since Marriage to Present Spouse

(Wives) Total N = 120			(Husbands) Total N = 118		
Class Interval	N	% of Total	Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	9	8	0	0	0
1-5	58	48	1-5	26	22
6-10	25	21	6-10	30	25
11-15	15	13	11-15	20	17
16-20	8	7	16-20	18	15
21-25	5	4	21-25	8	74
26+	0	0	26+	16	14

Number of Children Living at Home
Total N = 110

Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	20	18
1	17	15
2	21	19
3	26	24
4	11	10
5	8	7
6	7	6

Number of Preschool Children Living at Home
Total N = 115

Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	57	50
1	27	23
2	20	18
3	11	10

Rated Satisfaction With Homemaker Role--Wives Only

(1-Very Unsatisfied to 7-Very Satisfied)
Total N = 104

Rating	N	% of Total
1	1	1
2	2	2
3	2	2
4	9	9
5	27	26
6	33	31
7	30	29

Rated Satisfaction With Present Role as a Worker and/or Housewife
(1-Very Unsatisfied to 7-Very Satisfied)

(Wives)				(Husbands)		
Total N = 106				Total N = 55		
Rating	N	% of Total		Rating	N	% of Total
1	0	0		1	2	4
2	3	3		2	1	2
3	1	13		3	4	7
4	13	13		4	3	5
5	17	16		5	18	32
6	46	43		6	19	35
7	26	25		7	8	16

Rated Freedom to Choose Present Role as Homemaker and/or Employee
(1-Totally Forced to Choose to 7-Totally Free to Choose)

(Wives)				(Husbands)		
Total N = 119				Total N = 87		
Rating	N	% of Total		Rating	N	% of Total
1	1	1		1	1	1
2	2	2		2	3	3
3	3	3		3	2	2
4	12	10		4	5	6
5	11	9		5	15	17
6	31	26		6	31	36
7	59	50		7	30	34

Total Hours Away From Home Per Week

(Wives)				(Husbands)		
Total N = 110				Total N = 101		
Class Interval	N	% of Total		Class Interval	N	% of Total
0-9	13	12		0-9	2	2
10-19	16	15		10-19	0	0
20-29	9	8		20-29	0	0
30-39	6	5		30-39	1	1
40-49	14	13		40-49	14	14
50-59	35	32		50-59	27	27
60-69	14	13		60-69	36	36
70-79	3	3		70-79	15	15
80-89	0	0		80-89	4	4
90-99	0	0		90-99	1	1
100+	0	0		100+	1	1

Hours Per Week in Church Related Responsibilities

(Wives) Total N = 103				(Husbands) Total N = 107		
Hours	N	% of Total		Hours	N	% of Total
0	16	16		0	20	19
1	10	10		1	7	7
2	5	5		2	3	3
3	2	2		3	6	6
4	9	9		4	5	5
5	12	12		5	13	12
6	16	6		6	17	16
7	5	5		7	6	6
8	10	10		8	9	8
9	4	4		9	2	2
10	7	7		10	8	7
11	2	2		11	2	2
12	3	3		12	1	1
13	1	1		13	1	1
14	0	0		14	2	2
15	0	0		15	0	0
16+	1	1		16+	5	5

Weekly Hours in Community Service

(Wives) Total N = 113				(Husbands) Total N = 102		
Hours	N	% of Total		Hours	N	% of Total
0	54	48		0	44	43
1	29	26		1	22	22
2	15	13		2	17	17
3	6	5		3	7	7
4	6	5		4	4	4
5	2	2		5	3	3
6	0	0		6	3	3
7	0	0		7	0	0
8	1	1		8	0	0
9	0	0		9	0	0
10+	0	0		10+	2	2

Hours Per Week in Individual Interaction Time With Spouse

	(Wives)			(Husbands)	
Total N = 111			Total N = 101		
Class Interval	N	% of Total	Class Interval	N	% of Total
1	12	11	1	9	9
2	11	10	2	10	10
3	6	5	3	8	8
4	14	13	4	6	6
5	4	4	5	6	6
6	5	5	6	7	7
7	5	5	7	4	4
8	5	5	8	7	7
9	1	1	9	2	2
10	6	5	10	11	11
11-15	13	12	11-15	9	9
16-20	11	10	16-20	4	4
21-25	5	5	21-25	4	4
26-30	6	5	26-30	4	4
31-35	1	1	31-35	1	1
36-40	3	3	36-40	2	2
41+	3	3	41+	3	3

Husband's Hours Per Week Contributing to Home Related Responsibilities

	(Wives)			(Husbands)	
Total N = 124			Total N = 99		
Class Interval	N	% of Total	Class Interval	N	% of Total
0	5	4	0	2	2
1	19	15	1	7	7
2	18	15	2	10	10
3	9	7	3	8	8
4	11	9	4	5	5
5	10	8	5	15	15
6	12	10	6	5	5
7	5	4	7	11	11
8	8	6	8	10	10
9	1	1	9	2	2
10	9	7	10	12	12
11-15	9	7	11-15	8	8
16-20	3	2	16-20	2	2
21+	5	4	21+	2	2

Rated Satisfaction With Husband's Domestic Contribution
(1-Very Unsatisfied to 7-Very Satisfied)

(Wives) Total N = 112				(Husbands) Total N = 79		
Rating	N	% of Total		Rating	N	% of Total
1	5	5		1	1	1
2	8	7		2	2	3
3	11	10		3	6	8
4	11	10		4	11	14
5	25	22		5	25	30
6	28	25		6	22	28
7	24	21		7	13	17

Rated Degree of Concern for Finances
(1-Great Concern to 7-No Concern)

(Wives) Total N = 113				(Husbands) Total N = 108		
Rating	N	% of Total		Rating	N	% of Total
1	19	17		1	11	10
2	15	13		2	22	20
3	16	14		3	19	18
4	20	18		4	24	22
5	19	17		5	8	7
6	18	16		6	16	15
7	6	5		7	8	7

Rated Degree of Marital Happiness
(1-Very Unhappy to 7-Very Happy)

(Wives) Total N = 115				(Husbands) Total N = 108		
Rating	N	% of Total		Rating	N	% of Total
1	3	3		1	3	3
2	3	3		2	0	0
3	5	4		3	5	5
4	4	4		4	8	7
5	20	17		5	9	8
6	38	33		6	41	38
7	42	37		7	42	39

Rated Amount of Interaction With Adults Other Than Spouse
(1-Small Amount, 2-Moderate Amount, 3-Large Amount)

| (Wives) | | | (Husbands) | | |
| Total N = 115 | | | Total N = 109 | | |
Rating	N	% of Total	Rating	N	% of Total
1	59	51	1	62	57
2	54	47	2	44	40
3	2	2	3	3	3

Appendix B

Marital Status Questionnaire

MARITAL STATUS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is designed to gather information about the amount of time you spend in different areas of responsibility. It is very important that you answer each question as accurately as possible so please give thoughtful consideration to each response.

Sex _____   Age _____

1. Total years of education completed _____.

2. Number of years married to present spouse _____.

3. Indicate the total number of years and months that you have been gainfully employed, either full or part-time, since your marriage to your present spouse. _____ years _____ months

4. A. List the ages of each child living in your home at the present time. _____

   B. Indicate the number of children living in your home who have not yet attended school. _____

5. If presently employed (either full or part-time), how many years and months have you continually worked without having had an interval of no employment which lasted longer than six months? _____ years _____ months

6. List your present occupational title (i.e., science teacher, homemaker, secretary, etc.) _____

7. If you are a wage earner, how much time do you devote to your job on the average per week? Include work done on the job, personal time devoted to the job and travel to and from the job.

   _____

8. A. If your present role is that of either a full or part-time homemaker, rate (on a scale from 1 to 7) how you feel about this role. (Circle one number)
   Very unsatisfied 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Very satisfied

   B. If you are employed, indicate the degree of satisfaction that you are presently experiencing in your role as a worker. (Circle one number)
   Very unsatisfied 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Very satisfied

9. On a scale from 1 to 7, rate the degree to which you feel you have been free to choose your present roles either as a homemaker and/ or as an employee. (Circle one number)
   Totally forced to choose 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Totally free to choose

10. If you belong to a church or religious group, please indicate which one. _____

11. A. On the average, how many hours a week do you spend in church meetings and in fulfilling church related responsibilities? _____

   B. Do you feel the time you spend in church related functions is: (circle one) (a) large amount, (b) moderate amount, (c) a small amount of time?

12. A. On the average, how many hours a week do you spend fulfilling community or voluntary responsibilities? (Do not include any time already accounted for in question 11.) _____

   B. Do you consider this volunteer work to take: (circle one) (a) large amount, (b) moderate amount, (c) small amount of your time?

13. A. Please indicate the average amount of time spent out of the home per week in activities which do not include your spouse. (Do not include time involved with your employment or time accounted for in questions 11 or 12.) _____

   B. Please indicate the reasons for the time away from home specified in question 13A. _____

14. A. Please indicate the average amount of time spent per week which is devoted specifically to individual interaction with your spouse (dates without the children, communicating, working together on hobbies or special projects, etc.). _____

   B. On the whole, would you say you spend (a) a lot of time, (b) a moderate amount of time, or (c) relatively little time doing things together with your spouse? (Circle one)

15. A. Indicate the average amount of time spent per week by the husband of your household in working with domestic responsibilities.

   _____

   B. On a scale from 1 to 7, indicate the degree of satisfaction you have about the amount of contribution the husband makes in assuming home related responsibilities. (Circle one number)
      Very unsatisfied 1   2   3   4   5   6   7 Very satisfied

16. A. The total gross yearly income of the male wage earner in your home is between (circle one):

   Less than $8000   12,000 - 15,999   20,000 - 23,999
   $8000 - 11,999   16,000 - 19,999   24,000 or more

   I consider this information confidential.

B. On a scale from 1 to 7, indicate the degree of concern you
presently have for problems related to finances. (Circle one)
   Great concern   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   No concern

17. On a scale from 1 to 7, rate the degree of happiness that you are
presently experiencing in your marriage relationship. (Circle one)
   Very unhappy   1   2   3   4   5   6   7   Very happy

18. Rate the amount of interaction you have with adults other than your
spouse which would be considered social in nature. (a) a large
amount, (b) moderate amount, (c) small amount (circle one)

Appendix C

Introduction to Participants

INTRODUCTION

You and your spouse have been selected to be participants in a research study being conducted by Utah State University. Your participation in this study will provide vital information to be used by behavioral scientists to better understand marriage relationships.

All of the data gathered in this research is strictly confidential and to further ensure confidentiality you need not put your name on any of the forms. Please complete each section carefully and in the sequence presented. It is very important that you do not discuss your responses to any of the measuring instruments with your spouse until after you both have completed them all. Please do not allow anyone, even your spouse, to look at your answers to the inventory questions.

Each measuring instrument has complete instructions. Read the instructions carefully before beginning to work on any of the instruments. Please complete the instruments in the following order.

1. Depression Adjective Checklist

2. Tennessee Self Concept Scale (Note: Although each spouse is provided with an answer sheet to this scale, only one test manual is provided per couple.)

3. Marital Status Questionnaire

4. Marriage-Adjustment Schedule

5. Marriage Role Expectation Form

Again, please do not communicate with your spouse about your responses on any of these instruments until you have completed them all.

When you and your spouse are finished with all 5 parts of the assessment, both of you please place all of your answer sheets in the folders, place the folders in the envelope, and return them to the tester.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated!

Appendix D

Interpretations of Abbreviations

Abbreviation Interpretations

MAS	Marriage Adjustment Schedule
MREI	Marriage Role Expectation Inventory
DACL	Depression Adjective Checklist
TSCSSC	Tennessee Self Concept Scales (TSCS) - Self Criticism Score
TSCSTOT	Total Score
TSCSR1	Row 1 Score - Identity
TSCSR2	Row 2 Score - Self Satisfaction
TSCSR3	Row 3 Score - Behavior
TSCSCA	Column A - Physical Self
TSCSCB	Column B - Moral-Ethical Self
TSCSCC	Column C - Personal Self
TSCSCD	Column D - Family Self
TSCSCE	Column E - Social Self
TSCSVTOT	Variability Total
TSCSVCOL	Variability Column Total
TSCSVROW	Variability Row Total
TSCSD	Distribution Score
MSQAGE	Age of Participants
MSQ1	Total Years of Education Completed
MSQ2	Years Married to Present Spouse
MSQ3	Years Employed Since Marriage to Present Spouse
MSQ4A	Number of Children in the Home
MSQ4B	Number of Pre-School Children in the Home
MSQ5	Years of Continuous Employment
MSQ7	Time Devoted to Job

MSQ8A   Satisfaction With Role as a Homemaker

MSQ8B   Satisfaction With Role as a Worker

MSQ9   Freedom to Choose Present Role

MSQ10   Religious Preference

MAQ11A   Time Spent in Religious Responsibilities

MSQ11B   Rating of Amount of Time Spent in Religious Responsibilities

MSQ12A   Time Spent in Community Service

MSQ12B   Rating of Amount of Time Spent in Community Service

MSQ13   Other Out-of-Home Time Without Spouse

TOTIME   Total Out-of-Home Time Without Spouse

MSQ14A   Individual Interaction Time With Spouse

MSQ14B   Rating of Amount of Time Spent in Individual Interaction
           With Spouse

MSQ15A   Amount of Time Spent by Husband Performing Domestic
           Responsibilities

MSQ15B   Degree of Satisfaction With Husband's Domestic Contribution

MSQ16A   Husband's Gross Yearly Income Level

MSQ16B   Concern With Family Finances

MSQ17   Rated Degree of Marital Happiness

MSQ18   Rated Amount of Adult Interaction Time (Adults Other Than
           Spouse)

VITA

Gary L. DeVries

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: Marital Roles and Their Relationship
to Marital Happiness and Self Concept

Major Field: Combined Professional/Scientific Psychology

Biographical Data

Personal: Born in Ogden, Utah, March 27, 1946, son of
Kenneth and Ruth DeVries. Married in 1969 to
Kathryn Griffin, 4 children -- Kristin, Sherilyn,
Julie Ann, and Lisa Marie.

Education: Graduated from Weber High School in Ogden, Utah,
1964; received Bachelor of Arts Degree from Utah
State University with a major in Psychology in
1971; received Master of Arts from Utah State
University with a major in Psychology in 1975.

Professional   1971-73, Dormitory Counselor for the Department
Experience: of Housing, Utah State University, Logan, Utah;
1973-75, Career Guidance Counselor, Sugar/Salem
School District, Sugar City, Idaho; 1975-76,
1977-78, and 1980-81, School Psychologist, Fremont
School District, St. Anthony, Idaho; 1976-77,
Graduate assistant for the Utah State Department of
Vocational Education, Logan, Utah; 1979-80,
Neuropsychology Internship at the Salt Lake City
Veterans Administration Hospital, Salt Lake City,
Utah.